

Jan

1994-95  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
California State University, Sacramento

Thursday, March 30, 1995  
Forest Suite, University Union  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

- I. What is Collegial Governance?  
what does it look like?  
how are decisions made?
- II. What are Faculty prerogatives, obligations, and responsibilities in a collegial governance model?
- III. Institutionalization of Governance at CSUS

**Current Structure**

Faculty constitution creates and empowers the Academic Senate to be The Voice of the Faculty.

Senate Actions, approved by the President, bind all faculty, but not students or staff.

Senate Committees created as subgroups of the Senate, but without authority to act on behalf of the Senate.

Senate committees were created to carry out the responsibilities of the Faculty and make policy recommendations to the Senate re: the instructional program, academic policies, and faculty affairs.

**Problems/Things to Think About**

Before the creation of the Academic Senate (1980) there was simply a Faculty Senate.

The difference is that the Academic Senate is BOTH a Faculty Senate and a forum for the university community.

To operate reasonably well in dynamic and turbulent environments Senate Committees ought to be empowered to make final recommendations on matters that do not affect the entire faculty (within department or schools program changes, for example).

Role of non-faculty on committees (students and administrators)? Who do these designees represent--for whom are they speaking? Themselves or the entities each represents?

## **Current Structure**

NOTE: university committees are not part of the Academic Senate-- they are not provided for in the Faculty Constitution

Senate Chair presides at Senate and Executive Committee meetings--may not act on behalf of Senate

Senate Executive Committee may act on behalf of the Senate.

## **Problems/Things to Think About**

University committees, whose decisions attempt to be binding on The Faculty, are a parallel governance structure that creates problems of governance. These are not Senate committees, are not provided for in the Faculty constitution, are not in the communication loop of Senate committees, nor are the faculty who sit on many of these committees in the communication loop of the Senate.

To operate reasonably well in dynamic and turbulent environments, the Senate Chair ought to be empowered to make certain types of decisions (the Senate can hold Chair accountable through recall).

## STATEMENT OF COLLEGIALITY

Academic governance is a complex web of decision-making and responsibility that translates academic goals and values into university policy or action. Authority in the modern public university derives from two quite different sources: (a) from the power vested by law and administrative code in governing boards and administrators and (b) from the knowledge of the subject matter and from the pedagogic expertise of the faculty.

Collegiality consists of a shared decision-making process and a set of values which regard the members of the various university constituencies as essential for the success of the academic enterprise. It incorporates mutual respect for similarities and for differences--in background, expertise, judgments and assigned responsibilities; and involves mutual trust based on experience.

Collegial governance allows the academic community to work together to find the best answers to issues facing the university. Collegial governance assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for the educational functions of the institution in accordance with basic policy as determined by the Board of Trustees. This includes admission and degree requirements, the curriculum and methods of teaching, academic and professional standards, and the conduct of creative and scholarly activities. Collegiality rests on a network of interlinked procedures jointly devised, whose aim is to assure the opportunity for timely advice pertinent to decisions about curricular and academic personnel matters.

The governing board, through its administrative officers, makes sure that there is continual consultation with appropriate faculty representatives on these matters. Faculty recommendations are normally accepted, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons. The collegial process also recognizes the value of participation by the faculty in budgetary matters, particularly those directly affecting the areas for which the faculty has primary responsibility.

Central to collegiality and shared decision-making is respect for differing opinions and points of view, which welcomes diversity and actively sponsors its opinions. The collegium must be the last public bastion of respect for individuals, whether they are members of the faculty, students, staff, alumni, administration or Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees wishes to maintain the statewide Academic Senate and campus senates/councils separate and apart from collective bargaining. It is the intention of the Board to maintain its efforts to promote collegiality and to support the continuing efforts of the Academic Senate to preserve collegiality in The California State University.

## PURPOSE OF SENATES

### AS 82-65/Ex.      RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACADEMIC SENATES WITHIN A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTEXT

The Academic Senate endorses the CSU Academic Senate's statement on "Responsibilities of Academic Senates within a Collective Bargaining Context," AS-1217-81 (below):

#### ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

AS-1217-81/EX  
March 12-13, 1981

#### ENDORSEMENT OF THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACADEMIC SENATES WITHIN A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTEXT"

WHEREAS, AS 1091, The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) was enacted on September 13, 1978; and

WHEREAS, The enactment of the collective bargaining legislation necessitates a clarification of the role of academic senates and councils within a collective bargaining context; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges endorse the attached document on "Responsibilities of Academic Senates within a Collective Bargaining Context."

Approved unanimously May 8, 1981.

.....  
Attachment to: AS-1217-81/EX

#### RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACADEMIC SENATES WITHIN A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTEXT

##### I. Collegiality and Collective Bargaining

On September 13, 1978, Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. signed into law AB1091, The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA). (Education Code Section 3560, *et. seq.*) This legislation provides faculty members of the CSUC an opportunity to determine whether they wish to be represented by an exclusive agent in negotiations on "wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of

employment" (HEERA, Section 3561, r.). This section of the Education Code also specifies the intent of the Legislature to preserve, under collective bargaining, traditional shared governance mechanisms, including consultation, and the principle of peer review in faculty personnel decisions. These intentions are expressed in Section 3561 b. of the HEERA, which reads as follows:

The Legislature recognizes that joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of such institutions, and declares that it is the purpose of this act to both preserve and encourage that process. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to restrict, limit or prohibit the full exercise of the functions of the faculty in any shared governance mechanisms or practices including the Academic Senate of the University of California and the divisions thereof, the Academic Senates of The California State University and Colleges, and other faculty councils, with respect to policies on academic and professional matters affecting The California State University and Colleges, the University of California, or Hastings College of the Law. The principle of peer review of appointment, promotion, and retention, and tenure for academic employees shall be preserved.

This document has been prepared to describe the respective responsibilities of the Academic Senate of the CSUC and of local Senates or Councils in this collective bargaining context. The relationships, functions, and responsibilities proposed in this document reflect consideration of HEERA, the Constitution of the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges and tradition and practice in the CSUC.

## II. The Traditional Role of the Academic Senate in the CSUC

The Trustees of the California State Colleges approved the Constitution of the Academic Senate on March 8, 1963. Prior to this a majority of the voting faculty at each of a majority of the college campuses had approved the document. Encouragement for the establishment of the systemwide Academic Senate, as well for the creation of an Academic Senate on each campus, came from the Chancellor, members of the Board of Trustees and the California Legislature. The 1961 Legislature adopted Senate Resolution No. 98 and Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 78 requesting the Trustees to establish an Academic Senate at each college "wherein the faculty members shall be freely elected by their colleagues for the purpose of representing them in the formulation of policy on academic and professional matters."

Senate Resolution No. 20, which resolved that the Trustees consider establishing an Academic Senate for the CSUC system, was under discussion in the Senate Rules Committee when the Senate was created in 1963.

An examination of the Constitution of the Academic Senate CSUC, as approved by the Board of Trustees, reveals the official purposes of the Senate:

It shall be the purpose of the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges to serve as the official voice of the faculties of The California State University and Colleges in matters of systemwide concern; to consider matters concerning systemwide policies and to make recommendations thereon; to endeavor to strengthen the Senates and Councils of the several colleges; and to assume such responsibilities and perform such functions as may be delegated to it by the Chancellor or the Trustees of The California State University and Colleges.

Senate participation in academic, professional, and administrative matters during the 18 years of its existence evidences a tradition of shared governance in the CSUC and suggests appropriate responsibilities for the Senate under HEERA. The collective bargaining act makes explicit provision for the preservation of this tradition and mandates continuing senate involvement in academic and professional matters. (See HEERA, Section 3561 b., cited above.)

### III. Academic Senate Participation in Systemwide Governance

The Academic Senate shall continue to serve as the official voice of the faculties in systemwide academic and professional matters (the Constitution of the Academic Senate CSUC, Article 1, Section 1 a.).

The Academic Senate shall be the formal policy-recommending body on such matters and shall also be the primary consultative body on the academic implications of systemwide fiscal decisions. Normally, recommendations of the Academic Senate shall be addressed to or through the Chancellor.

In respect to systemwide governance, the Academic Senate endorses the following principles:

- A. Criteria and standards to be used for the appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure of academic employees shall be the joint responsibility of the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges (HEERA, Section 3562 r.). (Criteria and standards determined jointly by the Academic Senate CSUC and the Board of Trustees shall be considered minimal; campus senates/councils may recommend additional criteria and standards.)
- B. The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall be consulted on the creation of systemwide and intersegmental committees, conferences, or task forces designed to deal with educational, professional, or academically-related fiscal matters, including the charge and composition of such bodies. The Academic Senate shall be responsible for the selection of faculty representatives to serve on or participate in such bodies.

- C. The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall be the formal policy-recommending body on general, systemwide policy decisions related to the following matters:
- 1) minimum admission requirements for students;
  - 2) minimum conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students;
  - 3) curricula and research programs;
  - 4) minimum criteria and standards to be used for programs designed to enhance and maintain professional competence, including the awarding of academic leaves;
  - 5) systemwide aspects of academic planning.
- D. The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall be consulted on the following:
- 1) systemwide aspects of program review;
  - 2) systemwide aspects of the basic direction of academic support programs;
  - 3) systemwide policies governing the appointment and review of presidents and academic administrators;
  - 4) policies governing the appointment and review of systemwide executive officers and academic administrators.

The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall not participate in the process of collective bargaining. Normally, matters affecting wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment shall not be considered by the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate shall endeavor to ensure that educational and professional matters do not become subjects of bargaining.

#### IV. Campus Senate/Council Participation in Governance

The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall have no authority over those matters delegated to the individual campuses by the Chancellor or by the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges. Furthermore, nothing in this document shall be construed to impair the right of academic senates and councils of the several campuses to communicate through appropriate channels with the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, nor to diminish the authority of the campuses and their senates in campus matters of academic/professional criteria and standards.

Because joint decision-making and consultation between administrators and faculty is essential to the performance of the educational missions of The California State University and Colleges, the academic senate/councils of the campuses shall be the primary consultative bodies regarding educational and professional matters delegated to the individual campuses by the Chancellor or by the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges and shall be consulted on fiscal matters which affect the instructional program.

In respect to campus governance, the CSUC Academic Senate endorses the following principles:

- A. Responsibility shall be vested in the faculty or its elected senate/council representatives for:
  - 1) approval of degree candidates;
  - 2) development of policies governing the awarding of grades.
- B. Through the campus academic senates/councils responsibility shall be vested in the faculty or its elected senate/council representatives for developing policies and making recommendations to the campus presidents on the following matters:
  - 1) criteria and standards for the appointment, retention, awarding of tenure, promotion and evaluation of academic employees including preservation of the principle of peer evaluation and provision for the direct involvement of appropriate faculty in these decisions;
  - 2) determination of membership in the General Faculty;
  - 3) curricular policies, such as admission and degree requirements, approval of new courses and programs, discontinuance of academic programs, and academic standards;
  - 4) faculty appointments to institutional task forces, advisory committees, and auxiliary organizations;
  - 5) academic standards and academic policies governing athletics.
- C. The academic senates/councils shall be the primary source of policy-recommendations to the campus president on decisions related to the following matters:
  - 1) establishment of campus-wide committees on academic or professional matters;
  - 2) the academic role of the library;
  - 3) academic awards, prizes, and scholarships;
  - 4) the academic conduct of students and means for handling infractions;
  - 5) development of institutional missions and goals.
- D. The academic senates/councils shall be consulted by the campus presidents concerning:
  - 1) the academic calendar and policies governing the scheduling of classes;
  - 2) policies governing the appointment and review of academic administrators.
- E. This outline of functions and responsibilities is intended to provide the essentials for a satisfactory system of shared governance but should not necessarily be viewed as a comprehensive enumeration of such functions and responsibilities.



## Statement on Collegial Governance

■ *Have you been asking yourself just what the "Fullerton Way" is? This article supplies a good working definition. According to Vince Buck, much of what is contained in this article is drawn from generations of debate on the value of legislatures and other deliberative bodies. References are available on request.*

by Vince Buck

*Vince Buck has taught Political Science at CSUF since 1974. He is currently a member of the local and statewide Academic Senates and is chair of the statewide Faculty Affairs Committee.*



IN HIS BOOK *THE USES OF THE UNIVERSITY*, CLARK KERR points out that of the 85 or so western institutions established by 1520 that are still around today, 70 are universities. Several others are parliaments. It is not by chance alone that these enormously successful institutions are collegial.

The importance of collegial governance to the survival and success of a university should be obvious and yet it is often under attack. The proposed planning document, which is to be used to guide future decision making, must unequivocally state its support of this crucial concept.

Collegial governance is democratic, deliberative governance characterized by rational discussion and reasoned debate. The value of collegial governance to a university is immense. Along with the widely recognized values of deliberation — inclusiveness, legitimacy and avoidance of error—collegial governance is an important factor in creating faculty commitment to an institution and the goals and values of that institution.

Faculty have an important role in governing and shaping the university. It is this role that makes them feel that they have a personal stake in the university, and induces them to give so much of themselves to the institution. It is this role that makes them willing to

engage in so many activities that are critical to the success of the institution, but which are in no way directly rewarded. If this role is diminished, then the faculty and the university are diminished. If faculty are to be limited to carrying out policy and following procedures developed by a hierarchical administration, then they will limit themselves to that alone, and the effectiveness of the institution will be impaired.

Collegial governance through deliberation also leads to legitimacy. Individuals who have a say in developing policy have a commitment to that policy, even if they are on the losing side of the final decision. If a decision is felt to be arrived at by appropriate and inclusive processes, it will be broadly supported within a community. Policy that is developed in a manner thought to be inappropriate will be difficult if not impossible to implement.

---

*"If faculty are to be limited to carrying out policy and following procedures developed by a hierarchical administration, then they will limit themselves to that alone, and the effectiveness of the institution will be impaired."*

---

Finally, collegial governance through deliberation reduces the chances of error. To quote Alexander Hamilton, "... the oftener a measure is brought under examination, the greater the diversity in the situation of those who are to examine it, the less must be the danger of those errors which flow from want of due deliberation."

Collegial governance is often under attack from those who find the process too messy, time-consuming or not amenable to their ends. A deliberative process is by definition slow and "inefficient." Fast deliberation is an oxymoron and a mistake. While consensus-building processes may be slow, they are effective and responsive.

One form of attack is to ignore the collegial body and make decisions without informing it or asking for its approval. A second approach is to overload it with trivial matters. A third approach is to create parallel structures and direct decisions to them.

A final form of attack is to question the representativeness of a deliberative body. There is no perfectly representative legislature. Congress for instance is not 50% female, yet it has legitimacy. (Although many of us feel that its legitimacy would be strengthened if it had more female members.) The United States Senate

is not even based on majority rule, but it is still a legitimate body. Legitimacy has to do with how an institution or process is viewed by those to whom it is of concern. It is my strongly held belief that the collegial governing bodies on this campus (the Academic Senate and its system of committees) have a very high level of legitimacy.

---

*"Collegial governance is often under attack from those who find the process too messy, time-consuming or not amenable to their ends."*

---

These bodies are lacking mainly in the involvement of the junior faculty. This could be vastly improved if the reward system of the university acknowledged the importance of this role.

The legitimacy of these institutions needs to be strongly reaffirmed in the mission and goals statement. I would suggest wording along the line of the following as a new item—VI.A: *By strengthening collegial governance to provide for careful inclusive deliberation of policy proposals and to insure broad support for adopted policies.* □

*In making decisions, the president of a metropolitan university must respond to many external and internal constituencies. One challenge of leadership at an institution which places high value on shared governance is to collaborate with the faculty in the decision-making process. Although collective decisions take more time and may be perceived by outsiders as weakness, in the experience of Weber State University, communication and faculty involvement in decisions results in better and more thorough policies that benefit from greater campus-wide understanding and support.*

## Shared Leadership

In today's changing world the position of university president has become increasingly precarious. A cursory scanning of the media shows that many presidents run into trouble because they have not developed a leadership style that meets the expectations of their multiple constituencies. The most commonly cited reasons for the dismissal of a president are:

- Perceived lack of leadership
- Lack of support from Board of Trustees
- Failure to involve faculty in the decision-making process.

Successfully negotiating governance and decision making is especially problematic in metropolitan universities, with their commitment to multiple internal and external constituencies. As Brownell points out, people have very high expectations for metropolitan universities:

*"The opportunity and burden of the metropolitan university—if it is to be a metropolitan university—is to serve the entire urban region and all its diverse populations, interests, and elements...No institution can meet every need for local development, but the metropolitan university must be involved in every significant political, economic and social dimension of its complex, extensive community" ("Metropolitan Universities: Past, Present and Future." Blaine A. Brownell. *Metropolitan Universities*, 4:3 pp. 18-20.)*

With these expectations, it is easy to become so involved in the community that the president's relationships on campus are undermined. The challenge of leadership is to balance both internal and external demands in an environment of shared leadership. This article explores this dilemma, focusing on the interaction between president and faculty, one critical aspect of shared governance. In particular, we explore how this relationship has evolved at Weber State University. The University was founded in 1889 as Weber Academy by the LDS (Mormon) Church, but became a part of the state system in 1933. Today Weber State serves 14,500 students and offers associate, bachelor and a limited number of graduate degrees. The institution has nearly fifty departments and programs, organized

in seven colleges, and employs about 525 faculty. WSU focuses on undergraduate education, on maintaining the balance between academic and professional programs, and in meeting the cultural and work preparation needs of the community. It is located in Ogden, Utah, and serves a metropolitan population of 273,000.

We begin with the personal point of view of our current president, Paul Thompson.

### Shared Presidential Leadership: The President's Perspective

One of the challenges facing a president who is busy building partnerships between the university and several community groups is to collaborate with the faculty and staff in making decisions. A president who gets too involved in the community runs the risk of losing support, visibility, and the perception of leadership on campus. Maintaining support both on campus and in the community is important but not easy to do. When I was interviewed for the President's job at Weber State I was asked, "Would you be an inside president focusing on the activities on campus, or an outside president focusing on the activities in the community?" I responded that a president cannot afford to be either an "inside" or an "outside" president. To be effective a president needs to be very involved on campus working closely with the faculty and staff, but that alone is not enough. The president also must be very involved in the community working as a fund raiser and with community leaders, regents, legislators, etc. I have found that was easier said than done.

Shortly after I arrived at Weber State to accept the job as president several people talked to me about shared governance at the university, some were very positive about the tradition of shared governance at Weber. They indicated that the faculty were very involved in decision processes that led to effective management of the university. I was told that those presidents who had supported the idea of shared governance were able to be effective leaders and that one president who resisted faculty participation in decisions had a very difficult time in his efforts to lead the university. A few people were somewhat critical of shared governance because it slowed down the efforts to make changes at the university, placed constraints on the president and stood in the way of his efforts to provide strong leadership for the university.

Four years of experience at Weber State have made me a very strong supporter of shared governance. I have concluded that the tradition and policies that have developed here have contributed to an effective working relationship between the faculty and administration and that they have helped the university to make some significant changes in recent years. An analysis of governance at our institution suggests that there are three critical elements that need to be present for the process to be effective. They are:

- communication
- faculty involvement in decisions and
- trust

### Communication

One incident sticks out in emphasizing the importance of keeping the faculty and staff informed about significant developments on the campus. One morning a few weeks after I came to the university, Tom Burton, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, called my office and asked if he and another faculty member could come to see me. They mentioned they had read in the previous night's newspaper that the

### Faculty Involvement in Decisions

The faculty at Weber State expect to get involved in most of the major decisions at the institution. In many areas the faculty are not satisfied to just be informed about an issue that is being addressed; they want to play a significant role in making the decisions. Usually the question about how much to involve the faculty in a decision is fairly clear. Our policies call for faculty to formulate policy in areas such as curriculum, admission standards, and promotion and tenure, etc. On the other hand, faculty don't expect to formulate the fundraising plan for the next five years or to have a major role in drawing up plans for refurbishing the dorms. When a new issue emerges I usually call Tom Burton to discuss it with him. I describe the issue and we talk about the level of involvement that is appropriate for this issue. The different levels include:

- Informing the senate chair
- Informing the senate executive committee
- Informing the senate
- Assigning the issue to a senate standing committee to be addressed or create an ad hoc committee to address it. Usually when a committee addresses the issue it is brought to the faculty senate for discussion and a vote is taken.

These levels are sequential and we could stop at any one of the first three levels. Only a small portion of the issues that I discuss with Tom are eventually assigned to a committee to be handled.

Some of the administrators on our campus are frustrated that the decision process on major issues involves so many people and therefore takes so much time. Local community leaders interested in developing a partnership with the university get impatient when I tell them that we will need to discuss this idea with the faculty. I can understand the frustration and impatience, but I point out that if we plan to implement an idea at the university it will need broad support on the campus. Usually it is possible to get broad support only if the faculty or their representatives participate in the decision.

My experience is that significant changes will not take place without broad participation. For example, in 1989-90 the university initiated a comprehensive review of the general education program. Over a two-year period major changes were made in the program including setting a fixed termination date for all general education courses and approving a completely new list of general education courses. That major change was possible only because the faculty drove the process with active support from the administration.

One concern people have when we talk about faculty participation in decisions is that the faculty will vote down a good idea. They suggest that the administration should just announce a change without giving faculty an opportunity to kill the idea. My response is, "if this is a good idea, we will be able to work together with the faculty to formulate the idea so that the faculty will vote to approve it." If the faculty do not have the opportunity to discuss and approve an idea they will not implement it anyway.

### Trust

Careful thought needs to be given to the issue of trust between the administration and faculty. On most campuses the faculty are inclined to question the efforts of the administration, and often there is a low level of trust. Unfortunately, an administration can spend years trying to build trust in the organization and have that trust

university was opening a branch office for our continuing education activities in a nearby community. They said they hadn't heard about plans to open such an office before, and they wanted to know what we planned to do in that office and if this was the first step of an expansion into the community.

We had a good discussion and they seemed reassured by what I told them. However, they emphasized that the faculty want to be kept informed about significant developments at the university. They indicated that a previous president had not kept the faculty informed and that led to a very strained working relationship between the president and the faculty.

That discussion was brief but had a major impact. It prompted me to be much more proactive in keeping the faculty informed. Whenever we consider a new initiative I ask the vice presidents "Is this something I should discuss with the chair of the faculty senate?" The answer is usually yes. I call Tom Burton quite often to discuss new developments and together we decide if this issue should be discussed with the faculty senate.

In an effort to build trust and maintain a meaningful discourse with faculty and staff, and in response to Tom's visit, I decided to schedule regular meetings to listen to their ideas, interests and concerns. During my first three months at the university I met with every college and division on campus. We set up one hour meetings with groups ranging in size from 15 to 57 people. At those meetings I listened to people's ideas about the university. I asked them to respond to three questions:

- What are we doing that helps us to provide quality education?
- What hinders us in our efforts to provide quality education?
- What do we need to do to improve?

The three questions were helpful in generating a very productive discussion. I learned a great deal about the university and also learned about people's concerns. Meanwhile, it helped me to convey the fact that I listen to people.

I met with over 80 percent of the faculty and staff in that three month period. Based upon their concerns and suggestions, I identified the things that we needed to do to improve the university. At the end of the interviews I wrote a memo to the faculty and staff summarizing what people said in those meetings and informing them of the improvements we intended to make.

That experience was so positive, I concluded that I needed to have meetings at least once a year in order to maintain visibility on campus and a high level of awareness of faculty and staff concerns. However, in the second year I got so busy in community activities, development activities and working with legislators that I didn't take time to hold meetings with the faculty and staff. In the fall of my third year on campus I began to get feedback that I was too involved in the community and not visible enough on campus. A faculty member told one of the regents that "I don't see the president very often. He is always out in the community."

That feedback raised a red flag and I decided it was time to get back to regular meetings on campus. In the third year I set up "town meetings" with every college and division at WSU. I briefly discussed two or three key issues we were addressing and then conducted an open discussion. Once again the "town meetings" gave me a feeling for the concerns and interests of the faculty and staff, and helped me to guide the university in the direction that the campus community feels it should go. I have found that to maintain our tradition of shared governance, it is important to receive this constituent input on a regular basis. Now I am very careful to follow up with such meetings at least once a year.

- It established a valued tradition of governance that has carried forward into recent years as Weber State became a University.

The Faculty Senate operates primarily through its standing committees. The Executive Committee serves as the steering and agenda setting body of the Senate and assumes the role of faculty leadership in legislative and constitutional affairs. Some other committees of the Senate include:

- Academic Resources and Computing
- Admissions, Standards, and Student Affairs
- Appointment, Promotion, Academic Freedom and Tenure
- Curriculum and General Education
- Research, Scholarship, and Professional Growth
- Salary, Benefits, and Budget

These committees have memberships of both faculty and administrators on a ratio which does not exceed three to one. In addition to their ongoing assignments, the committees often receive charges from the Executive Committee relating to special tasks which address the affairs of the campus. For instance, the Curriculum and General Education Committee has recently been asked to assess the effectiveness of our general education program on the basis of established criteria approved earlier by the Senate. The Academic Resources and Computing Committee is developing a campus master plan for academic computing which will prioritize and direct the use of available computing resources in the decade ahead.

Recommendations from the standing committees are presented to the Faculty Senate for approval. If approved, they are then sent to the president for implementation or response. If the president has a question about a Faculty Senate action, he has 21 days to return it with a statement of his concerns to the Senate for its reconsideration. If differences on an issue cannot be ironed out or a compromise reached, then the Senate may ask that the issue be submitted for decision to the Board of Trustees.

With the exception of the 1970s furor over institutional leadership, there has never been in 27 years of shared governance an academic issue submitted to the Board of Trustees for arbitration because of a senate/president impasse. Occasionally an item has been returned by the president for senate reconsideration, but usually the concern centers around a fiscal price tag, strategic priorities, or community relations. Cooperation and joint purpose in these issues have always led to a settlement in the best interest of the institution and the clientele it serves.

If a system of shared governance is to function effectively, support must be given to the infrastructure upon which it is based. The Faculty Senate at Weber State University receives an office budget each year which funds office space, a full-time secretary, supplies and duplicating costs, some out-of-state travel, and approximately two full-time equivalents of reassigned time which is distributed among the senate chair, chairs of standing committees, and members of the Executive Committee.

This fiscal support insures the viability of faculty involvement in the governance process. It has evolved and accrued over 20 years of senate existence and reflects not only a gradual increase of budgetary support but also a build up of mutual trust and respect in the ongoing cooperative experience between faculty and administration at Weber State University.

undetermined in a few days as a result of one decision or event.

Shared governance is very difficult in a climate of mistrust. Leaders need to ask questions about how a decision will be received by the university community. Will it build or undermine trust between faculty and administration? Have we devoted enough time to communicating on this issue so that people understand what is being done and why?

As my experiences indicate, faculty are actively involved in governance at Weber State, but this was not always the case. Before the 1960s their role was very different. The current cooperative relationship described below is the result of important events spanning the past 30 years.

## The History and Role of Faculty Leadership:

### The Campus Perspective

We now leave President Thompson's personal experiences to move to a more general campus view of these issues. In 1966, shortly after Weber State had developed into a four-year college, faculty and administrators discussed needed changes in the administrative structure of the institution. As a result of those discussions a faculty constitution was designed which created an Academic Council giving greater voice to the faculty in the ongoing affairs of the campus. The council numbered 39 faculty members elected apportionately, 4 students, and 13 administrators appointed by the president. The chair of the council was the president of the college. Administrators on the council had voice, but not vote. In 1973, primarily because of an extended confrontation between the faculty and the president, the leadership of the council passed to a faculty member, and in 1974 the name of the Academic Council was changed to Faculty Senate.

This faculty constitution and the academic body it created has become the anchor of the tradition of shared governance at Weber State. The constitution defined in written form the ground rules for faculty/administration relationships and identified the roles of faculty in the shared leadership of the campus.

In the mid-1970s the faculty constitution and its designated powers of governance were severely challenged by a new president who gave little heed to precedent or process. He attempted from the beginning to manipulate programs, especially the general education curricula of the college; he arbitrarily "rotated" deans in all the academic schools; he created a new vice president's position for a former associate who supported his agenda; and he operated outside designated channels in the decision-making process, choosing to function with a sort of "kitchen" cabinet rather than in-line faculty and administrative groups.

The institution was forced into a prolonged and wrenching confrontation between faculty and president, and ultimately governing boards were drawn into the encounter. In time the beleaguered president faded away, as often happens with presidents in trouble; nevertheless, the experience of the 1970s, difficult as it was, produced some positive outcomes:

- It provided a reality check for principles of shared governance that to that time had appeared only on paper.
- It more sharply defined faculty and administrative roles, clarifying expectations and limitations.
- It confirmed the strength of process and precedent.
- It forged a faculty jealous of its constitutional prerogatives.
- It alerted future presidents to an attentive and functioning system of shared leadership.