Report of the FAEC Subcommittee on Shared Governance (4/23/14)

Members: R. Becklen, D. Chen, D. Crawley, S. Kurzmann, K. McMurdy (chair)

I.   **Charge to the Subcommittee**: The FAEC Subcommittee on Shared Governance was formed by the FAEC, for the purpose of internally conducting a pilot study of issues of shared governance at Ramapo College. This is not an FA task force or committee. Our final report will be made to the FAEC. The FAEC may then choose to present our findings to the FA.

Goals: The goal of this subcommittee was to perform an unbiased case study analysis of shared governance at Ramapo College. The steps to this process included:

1) to decide on a working definition of shared governance;

2) to assemble an unbiased sample of significant decisions from the last four years;

3) for each decision, to assess the extent to which shared governance was successfully

achieved and analyze the various factors that contributed to that success;

4) to prepare a report summarizing findings and making recommendations for the future.

II.   **Definitions of Shared Governance**

As a starting point, in 1966, the AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities described the need for shared governance: "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" (p. 136). "… a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems" (p. 136).

Shared governance requires a spirit of collegiality and mutual respect between the Board of Trustees, administration, faculty, staff, and students. Fundamental to shared governance is the recognition that the integrity of a college is maintained best by recognizing areas of expertise and assigning primary decision-making responsibilities based on that expertise, while maintaining open communication and collaboration with all relevant constituencies. For example, based on the principles set forth in the AAUP statement, it is the responsibility of the faculty to determine curriculum and issues of pedagogy, and to substantially contribute to decisions regarding academic space and

academic policy. In comparison, decisions regarding the physical plant apart from educational spaces along with the internal operations of the institution lie more within the purview of the administration. Budget allocations and strategic planning, including such items as enrollment goals and the relative emphasis of teaching and research/scholarship, merit the input of all constituencies to the Board of Trustees.

Shared governance necessitates open communication and joint engagement in planning and assessment between the administration, faculty, and staff. Although different areas of principal responsibility exist, shared governance means that important decisions are not made without serious consideration of the timely input of other relevant bodies. In addition to collegiality, clear procedures to ensure communication and collaborative discussion are key. Shared governance should be ongoing to ensure the integrity of the decision-making process.

Although the AAUP guidelines, and various publications, lay out the need for, the responsibilities of, and various perspectives on shared governance, it is beneficial for each institution to further specify guiding principles for how shared governance will operate at that institution. An excellent example of this is the Shared Governance Statement for the State University of New York. (See Appendix A.)

III.   Working Definition Used by the Subcommittee

We looked for the following components of shared governance at Ramapo:

1) Recognition of the decision-making authority structure;
2) Respect and collegiality;
3) Respect for expertise and decision-making domains;
4) Timely and effective communication;
5) Clear procedures written for various decisions, and compliance with those procedures.

Recognition of the Decision-Making Authority Structure

The Board of Trustees is the final authority, but the Board has delegated executive authority to the President. The President, in turn, has delegated authority for academic decisions to the Provost. Deans are appointed by the Provost and are the direct supervisors of the faculty within their respective units. (Moreover, the academic functions of faculty at Ramapo take place within convening groups.) It is reasonable for faculty to respect this "chain of command" whenever possible. Faculty should also understand that in many cases, both the administration and faculty are bound by the collective bargaining agreement with AFT.

Respect and Collegiality

When describing the manner in which the personal interactions that make up the act of "shared governance" take place, the words "respect" and "collegiality" are frequently invoked. Without further explanation, however, these can be little more than empty platitudes. In the context of shared governance at an academic institution, and specifically at Ramapo College, we interpret them in the following way. Faculty, Administration and other constituencies should approach decision events and policy deliberations with the understanding that they all share the same overarching goal, i.e., optimizing the long-term health of the College and the quality of education for current and future Ramapo students. This assumption of a common goal should provide the framework for a constructive debate, even when there are passionate disagreements over how best to achieve that goal.

Respect for Expertise and Decision-making Domain

Out of respect for faculty expertise, decisions about curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process will generally be the primary responsibility of the faculty. Conversely, some policy decisions on the part of the administration need not involve shared governance at all, as their effect on the Faculty may be negligible and the Faculty may have negligible expertise in this area. It is important to recognize, however, that many decisions, while clearly within the purview and expertise areas of the administration, directly affect the ability of the Faculty to fulfill their academic mission (for example, facilities decisions). Hence, for such issues, it may still be essential to involve and consult with faculty meaningfully, even when the issue is not within their purview or expertise. Based on such considerations, there is a natural distinction to be made among three levels of involvement by any particular party/stakeholder in a given decision event:

(1) primary responsibility - recommendation of decision-making body should be followed by the governing board or designee "except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail." (AAUP, 1966, Faculty, para 3).
(2) secondary - no final responsibility for the decision, but should substantially contribute to discussions and decision making; should be formally and meaningfully consulted.
(3) tertiary - does not need to be consulted, but should be informed of the decision and thought process.

Timely and Effective Communication

Communication should be early and often. While it is important to build a "spirit" of communication and a general expectation, good communication generally doesn't happen by chance. Therefore it is important to build a communication infrastructure and establish an explicit communication schedule for decision-making events of various types. Communication before and during the event is crucial, but **closing the loop** is too. It is important to let all interested parties know what the final decision

was, and how it was made. In the absence of this communication step, rumors and unsubstantiated claims can gain steam and undermine other ongoing shared governance efforts.

Clear Procedures and Compliance with those Procedures

Formal descriptions of policies and procedures are essential and should be readily accessible to the college community, whenever possible. It is not realistic or appropriate to have a formal procedure or policy for everything. However, significant misunderstandings can be an indicator of when more explicit guidelines are necessary. (A positive example is presented in Appendix B: the Board of Trustees Policy/Procedure 201, calling for established guidelines on the hiring of new deans, and subsequent procedure document from the Provost's Office.)

IV.   Methodology

Much of the methodology for our assessment of shared governance at Ramapo has been driven by the language and framework of *academic* assessment, as there is clearly a very strong analogy to be made. When we assess our academic programs, we proceed roughly with the following steps:

1) Settle on a set of desired **outcomes** for the program.
2) For each outcome that is to be assessed, choose a **course** for which this outcome should reasonably apply.
3) Select some type of student work to be **scored** with respect to that outcome (a particular exam question, for example), and come up with a sufficiently precise **rubric**. (Note: Some attempt should be made to choose representative student work in an unbiased way.)
4) **Close the loop**. In other words, based on the information gathered from the assessment, make appropriate changes to the program so that there is a greater measure of success at delivering the outcome in future iterations.

In building the analogy with assessment of shared governance, we viewed "shared governance" itself as the desired outcome. (This could obviously be refined to obtain a more perfect analogy.) Whereas the assessment of an academic outcome requires one to choose **courses** for which that outcome should reasonably apply, we chose to focus on **types/categories of decision events** for which the principle of shared governance should reasonably apply. Then, each individual decision event within that category can be viewed as being analogous to a sample of student work - ready to be **scored** by an appropriate **rubric**.

So, what does a rubric for scoring decision events with respect to the outcome of "shared governance" look like? We proposed the following general rubric, which could clearly be refined to more closely match any particular category of decision events.

General Rubric for Assessing Shared Governance

1) How did the issue arise? Who initiated?
2) Who had primary responsibility for the decision? Who were the other interested parties? (ex., affected Convening Groups or Units, all faculty)
3) Was there a predefined/documented procedure for making the decision? Otherwise, was a good faith effort made to establish and communicate an appropriate procedure?
4) Was the procedure followed?
5) Was there appropriate communication and consultation during the process?
6) To what extent did the final decision align with the recommendations of the body that had primary responsibility and interested parties? If the recommendations were not followed, was this due to resource limitations or collective bargaining?
7) Was a good faith effort made to "close the loop," i.e., inform interested parties about the final decision and the rationale for the final decision.

Unbiased Event Selection

The question of how to choose representative decision events in an unbiased way is a tricky one. In our original assessment model, each individual decision event (without regard to category) was to play the role of a sample of student work. Hence, it was important for us to "randomly" look at the pool of "**all** decision events for which the Principle of Shared Governance should reasonably apply." To this end, we set out to diligently pore through the minutes of various decision-making bodies across the College (ARC, FAEC, FA, Provost's Council, Deans' Council, President's Cabinet, and Board of Trustees), in order to compile a master list from which we could draw random events for our assessment. We ultimately came to the realization that decision events can reasonably be classified into *categories*, and that it made sense to focus our efforts on those categories that meet a vague threshold for potential conflict or controversy. We also recognized that some categories were more within the purview of the faculty than others. (See Appendix C.) Within any particular category, the data set becomes sufficiently small that one can simply investigate all instances, and this became our new model for Unbiased Event Selection.

Investigation Approach

Having compiled a list of events, and decided upon a list of fundamental questions that should be answered, one still must have a method for obtaining the answers. Looking over the minutes of various decision-making bodies, we realized that these would never be sufficient. It is simply a reality about minutes that they are generally "sanitized" before publication. It is easy to see which topics generated discussion, but it is not possible to know the nature of that discussion. Moreover, important substantive policy discussions don't always happen within formal meetings. They happen informally between Faculty, Conveners, Deans, and Administrators. Thus, we came to accept that interviews with the faculty and staff involved in each decision were an essential part to any legitimate data gathering process. Whenever

possible we tried to obtain multiple perspectives and compared the information gleaned with any official documentation that was available.

Methodological Limitations

The choice of cases was not exhaustive and was made partly based on the knowledge of the members of the subcommittee. A more formal selection of cases would have been more representative of actions at the College as a whole. There was also a need to respect the confidentiality of faculty and staff who spoke with subcommittee members, as they spoke with great candor. Therefore, specific interviews are not included with this report.

V.   **Findings**

a. Course approval processes
ARC decisions for the past 4 years were reviewed via the archives of ARC minutes and discussion with the ARC chair. Overall, this is a successful area of shared governance, with primary responsibility resting with the faculty. The process is clear and includes individual faculty, conveners, appropriate faculty bodies (such as the Graduate Council, Writing Across the Curriculum Committee, and so forth), Deans, ARC, and the Provosts. With few exceptions, courses approved by this faculty body were appropriately approved and implemented by the administration. Exceptions to this have been courses approved by faculty for less than 4 credits.

b. Program approvals, changes, closings:
Each of the new master's programs was examined in order to determine if the written process for program approval was appropriately followed.

With respect to the MBA, MAEL, MASS, and MSE programs, the findings were that, overall, these programs did go through the appropriate procedures, and in the final analysis, had the support of both the administration and the relevant faculty. The curriculum for each program was developed and approved by the faculty, as appropriate. (See Appendix D for the relevant excerpt from the ARC Manual.) The decisions about resources were made by the administration. The programs themselves did not wholly originate from the faculty, and there appear to have been some differences of opinion between administration and faculty about where educational focus and resources should be. However, on the whole these appear to be reasonable examples of shared governance.

With respect to the proposed MSW program, there appears to have been a lack of appropriate consultation between the administration and the senior Social Work faculty over several years concerning the planned changes in personnel, resources and organizational structure leading up to the proposed master's program. Further, the

program faculty were not afforded the opportunity to speak directly with the Provost about these changes. However, even though some sources were critical of the manner in which recent changes have been implemented, they are supportive of the program itself and hopeful that the prospects for the MSW program are good.

c. Personnel processes
    i. Deans and Assistant Deans searches
The search process for the Assistant Dean of Teacher Education was perceived as problematic by the relevant faculty – from the constitution of the search committee by the Dean in what is perceived to be a biased manner – to the final weighting of candidates by the Dean. In contrast, the most recent search for a Dean in the School of Humanities and Global Studies was reported as successful and ultimately without conflict. Similarly, while the recent search for a new Dean of TAS ultimately failed, leading to the appointment of Eddie Saiff as Interim Dean, faculty from that search committee reported that the official procedure had been correctly followed. (See Appendix B)
    ii. Deans reappointments
Faculty input regarding the job performance of the deans has not been substantial prior to two years ago. The form used by the Provost to solicit faculty views contained a number of items about which faculty have limited knowledge, and did not address areas important to faculty. For the past two years, the FAEC has conducted an evaluative survey of the deans to inform performance evaluations of the deans by the Provost. The Provost has said that she discussed the outcomes of the surveys with each dean, although it is not clear if the input was used in reappointment decisions.

d. Academic policy decisions
    i. A summer schedule change was made by the Provost for summer 2014 without prior consultation with the faculty. The FAEC conducted a survey with faculty about this change. In total 93 faculty members (43%) responded to the full survey; 54.8% believed there would be little or no pedagogical impact of the changed schedule, 23.6% said there would be a negative effect, and 21.5% believed there would be a positive effect. Asked about their preferences, 65% prefer TWR, 18% prefer MWR, and 18% had no preference. Although not unanimous about preferences, the faculty were displeased about the lack of (prior) consultation regarding this decision.
    ii. The move of the substance abuse minor from psychology to social work was made by the administration without full consultation with either convening group. In the same vein, a faculty line was not replaced in psychology and was given to social work to support the program. While the outcome of this move

may be benign, or even positive, in the long run, the process was perceived by the faculty involved as violating the spirit of shared governance.

iii. Decisions regarding online student evaluations. This issue was initiated by the administration, investigated by the FAEC, and discussed and voted on by the FA. The FA voted against a move toward online evaluation across the college. This decision was upheld by the administration, allowing faculty to continue to choose how they did evaluations. This was a successful example of shared governance.

iv. The change in the policy regarding Independent Study credits was presented and discussed at the Provost's Council, ARC, and FAEC with input from the faculty at large. The changed policy was voted in by Provost's Council and put into effect following full deliberation, in support of shared governance.

v. Plans for the new science and social science building. Plans were carefully reviewed by both faculty and administrators with the architects. Requested changes in plan were implemented as possible, supporting shared input into this decision making.

VI. Summary of Findings

Taken together, these cases indicate the following: 1) routine curricular decisions are generally made by the faculty and respected by the administration; 2) some academic policy decisions have been made collaboratively, and others have not; 3) most new programs have followed a collaborative process and have appropriately followed college procedures, but that has not been true for all new programs; 4) the constitution of search committees and the outcomes of those searches have been generally appropriate, however, there are examples of searches that have been perceived as biased.

VII. Specific Recommendations Based on Case Studies Examined

a. The faculty and the Provost should have more opportunities for direct contact with each other. Communication between faculty and higher administration is not always achieved by going through the deans on matters. Limited time at unit councils and other factors prohibit that communication from being consistently effective across units. While not advocating bypassing any dean, there should be more opportunities for conveners, program directors, and other faculty representatives to bring issues directly to the Provost with the dean in attendance as appropriate.

b. Care should be taken to avoid any indication of favoritism or conflicts of interest regarding search committees and the outcomes of searches. Guidelines on constituting appropriate search committees should be developed and followed.

c. Administrators outside of the units themselves should consult the FA when they would like faculty representation on administrative committees (such as marketing committees, fundraising, etc.). Using this method will 1) provide for the most appropriate faculty representatives in terms of appropriate expertise and seniority, and 2) the faculty assembly as a whole will know which faculty are serving on which committees, which will increase the sense of faculty participation in the decision-making process.

d. The administration and faculty would benefit from greater transparency regarding new programs, how those programs are marketed, and what the requirements are for program continuation. There are tensions among a) the administration's need to market the college and create programs to increase revenues, b) the need for resources to sell those programs, c) budget issues and faculty perceptions of how funds are allocated, and d) faculty directors' responsibilities with respect to marketing programs. A standard method for the calculation of revenues and expenses, specifically as pertains to graduate programs and in the context of decision-making about program continuation, is imperative.   With clearly defined, written ground rules, there may be less frustration and misperception.

VIII.   Recommendation for Ongoing Assessments

a. Establish an ongoing Shared Governance Committee, as a subcommittee of the FAEC, to evaluate the successes in shared governance each semester and the opportunities for improvement. Include administrative representation as well as faculty on this subcommittee.

Rationale. We discussed two options for a standing committee. First, the body could be formed as a standing committee of the Faculty Assembly. This course of action has the advantage of widening the pool of participants, potentially bringing into the process faculty members who are knowledgeable, motivated, and passionate about the issue of shared governance. On the other hand, the shared governance assessment body could remain a subcommittee of the FAEC. One advantage of this option is that contentious issues of shared governance are generally brought to the attention of the FAEC anyway, so it would not be as difficult to actively seek out and remain apprised of all such issues. Another key advantage to this approach is that a small subcommittee of the FAEC would be better able to guarantee and respect confidentiality of individuals (faculty and/or administrators) who provide sensitive information. We found this to be absolutely essential for attaining honest, meaningful information from individuals with first-hand knowledge of various difficult situations. Weighing the pros and cons of the two options, our group feels that the second (formalizing a shared governance subcommittee of the FAEC)

would be the more prudent approach. In either case, however, we feel that it is crucial to view the Administration as a partner in the shared governance assessment process. Thus, the FA might want to consider including one or more representatives from the Administration on its committee. Alternatively, the FAEC subcommittee would want to set up regular meetings with the Provost to ensure genuine cooperation.

b. Duties of the shared governance assessment body

The first duty of the assessment body will be to formalize a framework and process for assessing shared governance. We feel that our trial run at this process was very successful and provides a model that would be an excellent starting point. The basic steps are as follows.

(a) Formally define Shared Governance at Ramapo College with a brief but carefully thought-out conceptual statement.
(b) Outline a list of guiding principles that elaborate on the conceptual definition. This may lead to a general rubric for assessing shared governance as it pertains to a particular but general decision event.
(c) Create (and continually update) a list of categories of decision events for which the principle of shared governance should reasonably apply. For each category, refine the general rubric to better reflect the process for decision-making within that particular category. Identify the primary bodies or individuals who have authority in making each type of decision, as well as secondary "interested parties" who should be meaningfully consulted, and tertiary parties who must be explicitly informed.
(d) Identify when policies and procedures are not clear and/or not accessible.

Note: Again, it is crucial that the Administration be involved in the process of developing a formal framework for assessing shared governance (as outlined above). We feel strongly that the impact of any ongoing effort to assess and improve shared governance at Ramapo College will be seriously diminished if the Faculty and Administration do not begin with a common set of principles and conceptual framework.

Once the framework for assessment has been formalized, the assessment body will take the necessary steps to remain apprised of all decision events that fall within the pre-described categories. Assess events based on (1) the relevant rubric, (2) the official record of events, and (3) private interviews with individuals. Judgment of the body will be used to prioritize events. Judgment of the body will also be used

to determine when a sufficient number of individuals have been interviewed to attain a fair assessment, and how best to protect the confidentiality of those individuals whenever appropriate.

Share reports periodically with both the FAEC and Provost's Office, including recommendations as to how shared governance might have been improved.

Shared Governance in the State University of New York

What is shared governance?

Meeting the challenge of supporting and measuring effective shared governance can usefully begin with both a definition of and a rationale for shared governance. The 1967 *"Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities"* published by the American Association of University Professors (and subsequently endorsed by two other representative national academic governance organizations) for the first time formally articulated and made legitimate the faculty role in academic governance.

What came to be known as the *Joint Statement on Government* described the relationship among trustees, presidents, and faculty as intertwined through "mutual understanding, joint effort, and inescapable interdependence." The document (also for the first time) enunciated two basic principles: "1.) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision making participation of all the institutional components, and 2.) difference in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by the reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand."[1] According to Robert Birnbaum, a scholar of governance, this was the introduction of the term "shared governance" (p. 3).[2]

More than establishing the faculty's "'primary responsibility' for educational matters such as faculty status, and programs of instruction and research," Birnbaum contends that the *Joint Statement* "also articulated the importance of faculty involvement in educational policy more generally, including the setting of institutional objectives, planning, budgeting, and the selection of administrators" (p. 3). This inclusive idea of governance would engage all campus sectors in ownership of the future of their institutions. This can be seen as the origination of the concept of "stakeholders."

What core principles should frame and inspire shared governance?

The following organization of key ideas can serve as general guiding principles for designing resources for governance organizations. Although not meant to be inclusive, this set of principles is designed to illustrate

---

[1] American Association of University Professors. (2001). Statement on governance of colleges and universities (1967). In *Policy documents and reports, ninth edition* (pp. 217-223). Washington, D. C.: Author, p. 218.

[2] Birnbaum, R., July 2003, "The end of shared governance: Looking ahead or looking back." Prepared by the Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis (Los Angeles, CA).

the complexity of considerations that must be included in the development of meaningful resources and measurement tools. The principles will be organized by using Lee Bolman & Terrence Deal's[3] four frames, designed to examine aspects of leadership within organizations.

1. **Structural.** Providing easy access to the "structural" aspects of a governance process can facilitate an organized approach to review of topics, and guide steps required for action. For example, orientation sessions for new members and trouble-free access to updated governance documents (such as by-laws and handbooks) avoid schisms between "insiders" and "outsiders" within governance organizations. "Shared governance" can be improved when all members understand what is involved in proposing and approving governance rules. Bolman & Deal stress that using this approach enables the organization to make sure that essential structural elements within the organization are complete and up-to-date.

Embedded in the discussion of "shared governance" within the documentation of Middle States (the accreditation organization for all institutions of higher education in New York) are many "structural" principles:

> *Fundamental Elements of Leadership and Governance: An accredited institution is expected to possess or demonstrate the following attributes or activities:*
>
> - *a well-defined system of collegial governance, including written policies outlining governance responsibilities of administration and faculty, and readily available to the campus community;*
> - *written governing documents, such as a constitution, by-laws, enabling legislation, charter, or other similar documents, that:*
>   - *Delineate the governance structure and provide for collegial governance, and the structure's composition, duties and responsibilities….*
>   - *a separate document may establish the duties and responsibilities of the governing body as well as the selection process;*
>   - *assign authority and accountability for policy development and decision making, including a process for the involvement of appropriate institutional constituencies in policy development and decision making;*

An explicit discussion of "shared governance" incorporated into the documents of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges resonates with the *Joint Statement,* and in addition, outlines many "structural" requirements for effective governance:

> [4]There is no single model of shared governance. However, there is general agreement about the elements of effective shared governance. Such governance requires

[3]Bolman, L. & Deal, T., 2008. *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership.* 4th ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
[4] *The Role of Faculty in Shared Governance*, Statement approved by the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, October 18, 2008.

- well-defined areas of authority that are the primary responsibilities of each of the governance components (i.e., faculty, administration, governing board, students, etc.);
- recognition that various areas are interrelated and that all components have a stake in the overall governance of the institution; and
- collegial and cooperative relationships among all components.

2. Human resource. The second Bolman & Deal frame focuses on the issues and concerns of people involved in organizations. In the case of "shared governance," this could be seen as concerns for facilitating meaningful constituent involvement. Maximizing transparency and communication, concerns that have received increased visibility in recent years, are consistent with this frame. Discontent within a campus, when governance is called upon to serve in a mediating role, is also relevant to this frame. It should be noted that "shared governance" differs from the representation by unions of constituents. Although, at times, interests between governance and collective bargaining units may overlap, they are not identical.

Principles related to the human resource frame could include references to ways the organization can pay attention to representational issues, such as those related to diversity, which include empowerment, morale, and access to resources. Note that SUNY's commitment to broad representation involves every group, including students. In fact, there is a voting student member of the SUNY Board of Trustees.

Awareness of concern for constituents, consistent with the human resource frame, is included in one of the seminal documents of SUNY. Although more than three decades old, the excerpt below from Chancellor's Statement (1973), has been affirmed by each SUNY Chancellor since 1973 and appears as a definition of **"Campus Governance"** in the 1982 *Policy Manual* (p. 123):

"The University reaffirms the validity of governance as the appropriate and organic process for the involvement of constituent groups in campus decision making. University faculty, staff, and administration are reminded of the charge contained in the 1972 Master Plan that *the governance arrangements within the University will be increasingly clarified and improved methods of consultation will be developed to reflect the need for effective governance based upon widespread participation*… Since these challenges go to the very heart of the University, it is appropriate to underscore the traditional legal framework which establishes and protects University governance." (Emphasis added)

Recognition of the empathetic aspect of "shared governance" can serve to highlight the human dimension of the sometimes abstract concept of "shared governance."

3. *Political*. Inherent in the very nature of governance is politics. All governance leaders must, at times, intentionally address concerns that are more important to one group than another. How this is handled can go a long way toward building, or undermining, the credibility of the governance organization. This is particularly of concern at critical times (e.g., when a search for a campus administrator is underway, when

dire budget circumstances require triaging of resources). Birnbaum argues that effective shared governance is concomitant with progress within institutions of higher education. Referencing Derek Bok's 2003[5] analysis of governance, he emphasizes the way in which governance effectiveness contributes to the potential for an institution of higher education to achieve its mission. He suggests that:

> "governance and institutional purpose are related … proposals that suggest, either explicitly or implicitly, that the faculty role in shared governance should be reduced or limited [are] more likely to diminish rather than improve institutional effectiveness." (p. 6)

It is to the benefit of all to address differing points of view before these differences become politicized. Examples of concerns that might move from disharmony to disenfranchisement are included in Middle States, e.g., the following expectations:

- *a process for …providing continuing updates for current members of the governing body on the institution's mission, organization, and academic programs and objectives;*
- *a procedure in place for the periodic objective assessment of the governing body in meeting stated governing body objectives;*
- *a chief executive officer, appointed by the governing board, with primary responsibility to the institution; and*
- *periodic assessment of the effectiveness of institutional leadership and governance.*

Through the Middle States review process (self-study followed by external review), campuses can make manifest their explicit depoliticizing of their governance process. The toolkit of resources, to be provided via the "Shared Governance Transformation Team" will be designed to assist in this process.

4. Symbolic. "Symbolic" is the most unexpected of the four frames, and with it, Bolman & Deal encourage consideration of how organizations can inspire ideas and actions. Evidence of symbolism can be tangible (e.g., location for meetings of the governance organization, awards related to governance, the governance leader carries the mace at the campus convocation, the governance leader regularly introduces the president at events), or more abstract (e.g., use of a campus "theme" to stimulate conversation, arts activities, or symposia, that relate to governance, design of a "Conversations about Governance" series, modeled along the lines of the "Conversations in the Disciplines" series).

When shared governance on a campus includes a symbolic dimension, constituents can identify and connected to the *meaning* of governance, as well as governance actions. In Bolman & Deal's model, an organization that incorporates the "symbolic" will pay attention to making sure the *work* of the organization is important and meaningful. For example, incorporating traditions and ceremonies that express the mission of the organization illustrate the symbolic. An example of the symbolic is evidenced in the University Faculty Senate document, *Traditions.* This product of the Student Life Committee of the University Faculty Senate in

---

[5] Bok, D. (2003, 4 April). Academic values and the lure of profit. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* pp. B7-B9.

2008 (updated several times since then) includes descriptions of symbolic activities on many campuses. Copies have been distributed to all SUNY and Community College campuses. The wording of the introduction highlights the symbolic nature of this document, explaining that "Traditions are a significant part of the college experience. At best, they celebrate life, recognize individual or group achievement, and contribute to the development of a distinct campus identity. " Introduction, n.p.)

Symbolic activities by governance organizations can facilitate involvement by constituents at all levels.

Board of Trustees Policy and Provost's Procedure for New Dean Selection

Section:	*200*
Section Title:	*Executive*
Policy Name:	*Appointment of Academic Deans*
Policy Number:	*201*
Approval Authority:	*Board of Trustees*
College Policy Executive:	Chief Planning Officer
Responsible Executive:	*Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs*
Responsible Unit:	*Office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs*
Date Adopted:	*February 9, 1972*
Date Revised:	*October 1, 1988, December 14, 1988; June 7, 1995; June 10, 1998; November 2006, September 22, 2008, February 22, 2010, September 26, 2011, September 2013, January 2014*

1. **Policy Statement**

   Deans are appointed based on an established search process and may include external candidates. The recommendation for dean will be made by the search committee to the provost and by the provost to the president. Appointments shall be made by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the president.

   Initial appointment to the position of academic dean shall be for and initial three year term of office, renewable at 1-3 year terms.

2. **Reason for Policy:**

   This policy defines the process for appointing academic deans and the college librarian. Additionally, it permits the initial multi-year appointment for the chief academic and administrative officer of an academic unit since they may have or are eligible for concurrent academic rank and would otherwise be limited to single-year contracts.

3. **To Whom Does The Policy Apply?**

   Deans of the Schools and Library

4. **Related Documents**

1) Appointment of Academic Deans Procedure

2) Concurrent Tenure & Academic Rank Eligibility for the President, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, Academic Deans, & Other Academic Administrators (Policy 326)

http://www.ramapo.edu/administration/botpolicies/policies2/board_of_trustees_300/Tenure-by-Exceptional-Action-for-Acad-Admin-Policy-326-022509.pdf

3) Contracts for Managerial Employees/Initial Appointment and Multi-Year Policy (Policy 449)

http://www.ramapo.edu/administration/botpolicies/policies2/board_of_trustees_400/Contracts%20for%20Managerial%20Empl_Initial_Appt_and%20Multi-Year_449.pdf

5   **Contacts**
Office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs

201-684-7529

Appointment of Academic Deans

Summary of Job Responsibilities

The chief academic and administrative officer of an academic unit is entitled dean (College Librarian) and reports directly to the provost/vice president for academic affairs. Each has authority and responsibility for planning and achieving the educational objectives of the unit, delivery of instructional programs, and development of high quality in teaching, scholarship and professional service. The dean is responsible for the continuing review, assessment, and improvement of the total unit consistent with College mission and goals, and therefore makes recommendations to the provost/vice president for academic affairs on particular matters related to planning, faculty, scheduling, personnel, curriculum, instruction, budget and other related issues

Search Process

Deans are appointed based on an established search process and may include external candidates. The recommendation for dean will be made by the search committee to the provost and by the provost to the president. Appointments shall be made by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the president.

Term of Appointment

Initial appointment to the position of academic dean shall be for an initial three year term, renewable at 1 – 3 year terms.. Multi-year appointments are essential for academic dean positions to ensure stability and continuity of the curriculum, appropriate academic planning, assessment and other activities that warrant continued leadership.

Concurrent Academic Rank

If at the time that (s)he assumes an administrative role, the newly appointed dean is a member of the Ramapo College faculty, or if the dean has been awarded concurrent academic rank upon initial appointment, the dean shall retain academic rank while serving as administrator.

Evaluation of the Dean

Evaluation of performance shall be done by the provost/vice president for academic affairs with input from the respective academic unit.

Termination of Deanship

If the dean chooses or is asked to leave the administrative deanship assignment, the provost may offer that individual a full-time faculty appointment at the College. If tenure has been awarded, the provost will move the individual into a full-time teaching assignment unless removal is sought pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:1-1 et seq. If a full-time faculty assignment at the College is provided, the individual becomes a full-time faculty member and the appropriate salary shall be determined as per the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) contract salary schedule. The individual will assume their faculty title upon the termination of the administrative position as dean with the term of the contract determined by tenure status.

When a dean who has concurrent academic rank chooses or is asked to leave the deanship position and is given a full-time faculty assignment at the College, the provost may approve administrative leave/reassigned time for the purpose of preparing the administrator to teach or for other purposes where such approval is necessary to meet a programmatic or other administrative need and when in the best interest of the College.

Related Documents

1) Appointment of Academic Deans (Policy 201)

2) Concurrent Tenure & Academic Rank Eligibility for the President, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, Academic Deans, & Other Academic Administrators (Policy 326)

http://www.ramapo.edu/administration/botpolicies/policies2/board_of_trustees_300/Concurrent_Tenure_Acad_Rank_Pres_ProvostVPAA_326_092308.pdf

3) Contracts for Managerial Employees /Initial Appointment and Multi-Year Policy (Policy 449)

http://www.ramapo.edu/administration/botpolicies/policies2/board_of_trustees_400/Contracts%20for%20Managerial%20Empl_Initial_Appt_and%20Multi-Year_449.pdf

Procedure 449

http://www.ramapo.edu/administration/botpolicies/policies2/board_of_trustees_400/Contracts%20for%20Managerial%20Employees_449_Procedure.pdf

Procedures for Selection of Deans

An Academic Dean will serve as the leader of one of the schools or the library at Ramapo College. Continuation is dependent upon effectiveness in working with the faculty, the administration, and other internal and external constituents.

When it is announced that a Dean will be leaving the school/library leadership position, the Unit will work with the Provost to determine the availability of a compelling internal candidate or the need for an external search for the next Dean. The following actions will be undertaken:

A. **Review Committee Selection**
   1. Six (6) faculty members will be selected from the Unit by the Unit Council.
   2. Three (3) members will be selected from outside the Unit in consultation with the Provost. These individuals may be alumni, staff, administrators (at least one), or faculty from another Unit.
   3. The charge to the Committee will be delivered by the Provost. Included within the charge will be an emphasis on the need to keep confidential all deliberations of the Committee.
B. **Consideration of Internal Candidate(s)**
   1. Committee members will review the current job description and, from this description, compose a list of required qualifications. This list, along with the job description, will be used as the internal ad.
   2. A call for candidates and nomination of candidates, including the list of required qualifications, will be distributed to all Ramapo College faculty.
   3. The Chair will receive nominations and request submission of candidates' materials.
   4. All Committee members will review the candidates' materials.
   5. The Committee decides if any viable (meeting the required qualifications) candidates exist.
   6. All viable candidates are invited to make a college-wide presentation. The Committee may collect feedback from members of the college community.
   7. The Committee determines if there are any compelling (possessing the skills and abilities necessary at this point in the history of the Unit and the College to meet internal and external demands and to move the Unit forward) internal candidates.
   8. If a compelling internal candidate(s) is available, the Chair submits an unranked list of recommended candidates to the Provost and President. This list should also include the outcomes of committee voting on each candidate.
   9. If no compelling candidate is available, the Chair submits the Committee's recommendation for an external search to the Provost and President.
   10. The Provost, after consultation with the President and the Board of Trustees, will communicate acceptance or rejection of the Committee's recommendation.

C. **Initiation of an External Search**
   1. The Chair will consult with the Offices of Human Resources and Affirmative Action.
   2. The Committee will prepare the position ad; the Provost will approve the ad and will work with Affirmative Action to have the ad placed.
   3. The Committee will receive and review candidates' applications.
   4. The Committee will conduct telephone interviews of viable candidates.

5. The Committee will select three (3) to four (4) compelling candidates for campus visits and will invite candidates to Ramapo College. The Committee may seek input from other members of the college community.
6. The Committee will recommend a list of unranked compelling candidates to the Provost.
7. The Provost, in consultation with the President and Board of Trustees will select the new dean.
8. An announcement of the appointment of the new dean will be made by President/Provost.

12 November 2008; Updated March 2012

Appendix C
Shared Governance Subcommittee of FAEC - College Decision Categories

Categories for which faculty should have a significant, primary role in shared decision making
Faculty tenure, reappointment, and promotions processes
Sabbatical Leaves
New Programs
New Courses
Faculty hiring decisions
Design of new or renovated academic spaces

Categories for which faculty should have a secondary role in shared decision making
Academic Policies (including scheduling policies)
Academic hiring (other than faculty)

Categories for which faculty have a limited role or tertiary role in shared decision making
Financial
Financial & Capital projects (including routine maintenance)
Nonacademic policies
Residence life policies
Student affairs policies
Nonacademic hiring decisions

VIII. New Program Proposal: Review and Approval Process

A. Narrative of New Program Proposal Request Process

All proposals for new undergraduate and graduate programs, and certificate programs that bear credit, undergo the following review and approval process and procedure.

Proposals for new programs must include a description of how the proposed program aligns with the College's Mission.

Request	Convening group	Unit Council	Dean	Graduate Council	ARC	Faculty Assembly	Provost	BoT	AIC
New undergraduate program	D	D	D		D	D	D	D	D
New graduate program	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
New credit-bearing certificate*	D	D	D	(D)[6]	D	D	D	D	D
New non-credit-bearing certificate*	I	I	I	I	I	I	D	D	I

D = decision item; I – information item

Pre-Program Proposal

Interested parties who wish to propose a new program prepare a 1-3 page narrative briefly describing the proposed program and its goals, and stating how the program satisfies the following criteria:

- It is consistent with and appropriate for the mission of the College and the School, as defined by the State of New Jersey Commission on Higher Education. The required documentation in accordance with the *Academic Issues Committee Manual* of the NJ Presidents' Council, compiled by the Office of Academic Affairs, New Jersey Commission of Higher Education. The *AIC Manual* (updated annually) is available in the Office of the Provost and on NJPC's website.
- An analysis of the resources needed to make the program viable has concluded that the program is feasible in terms of resources and impact on other existing programs at Ramapo and neighboring schools.
- An analysis has been done indicating the level of likely interest among existing students (or potential

---

* Certificates may be credit-bearing packages of existing courses, non-credit-bearing packages of learning experiences, or packages combining credit-bearing courses and non-credit-bearing learning experiences. For definitions of certificate programs, and procedures to create them, see Academic Affairs Procedure 300-V)
[6] Graduate Council approval only required for graduate-level certificate programs

students) in the particular program.

This pre-program proposal narrative is submitted to the Provost for comment. The Provost's comments are added to the packet. Note that the Provost's input at this stage is commentary only; it is not a yes-or-no recommendation step, as that will occur much later in the process.

New Program Proposal

1. The originators of the proposal assemble the following package:
    a. An *Academic Review Committee (ARC) New Program Request Form*
    b. *Pre-Program Proposal* with Provost's comments
    The School ARC representative works with the faculty member until the package is complete.

2. The originators of the proposal submit the package, completed in step 1, to the following groups for review and approval:
    a. Convening Group (CG) (if a convening group exists)
    b. School Curriculum Committee (CC) (for Schools that have such a committee)
    c. Unit Council (UC)
    d. Dean of the program's home school
    e. Graduate Council (for graduate programs)

3. The originators of the proposal submit the original and two (2) copies of the package to the School's ARC representative or Chair of ARC. In addition, the package should be provided electronically (e.g. as a pdf); ARC will forward information copies to:
    a. Faculty Assembly (FA) President
    b. Deans' Council (DC)
    c. Provost
    d. President
    e. Other designated interested parties.

4. ARC votes to approve or not approve the proposal.
5. The Chair of ARC notifies, by email, the following:
    a. Originators of the Program Proposal
    b. Convening Group (CG) (if a convening group exists) and Graduate Council (if it is a graduate program)
    c. Dean
    d. Faculty Assembly (FA) President & Faculty Advisory Council (FAC)
    e. Provost
    f. President
    g. Other designated interested parties

6. If approved and where FA approval is necessary, the Chair of ARC requests that the Faculty Assembly (FA) President bring the approval to FA for a vote.

7. If the program proposal motion is passed by the Faculty Assembly (FA), the Chair of ARC forwards all documentation to the FA President; and who submits the following documents to the Provost for consideration:

     a. Program Proposal Request Package
     b. Recommendation made by the Faculty Assembly (FA)
     c. Faculty Assembly (FA) minutes

8. The Provost may/will review recommendations from the Dean's Council before rendering a decision.

9. If the program is approved by the Provost, it is presented to the Board of Trustees for final on-campus approval.

10. If the program is approved by the Board of Trustees, the Provost's Office notifies the Registrar, Enrollment Management, Dean(s), and proposal originator(s), and submits the program to the Academic Issues Committee (AIC) of the New Jersey Presidents' Council (NJPC).
     a. New minors (whether attached to existing majors of the same name and CIP classification, or stand-alone minors) are sent to NJPC's AIC as information items only.
     b. New majors and new graduate programs are sent to NJPC for 30-day review by peer institutions, following which additional materials may be required to be submitted before the AIC makes a recommendation on the program to the full NJPC; this step may take 2-3 months beyond the 30-day review. Final approval is granted by the NJPC, except in cases where programs exceed institutional mission (i.e., new graduate programs).
     c. If new graduate programs are approved by NJPC, the Provost's Office submits a Request to Exceed Mission petition to the NJ Commission on Higher Education. The program can not be offered until CHE approval is granted; this step may take up to a year.