INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REPORT

Governance

*Assessment of University of Scranton
Governance, 2006-2010*

November 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary:

In 2006, as a follow-up activity to the governance reform process that took place at the University from 1999-2002, the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Office conducted an assessment of the University's governance system and processes. The results of this assessment, which consisted of a series of surveys, interviews & focus groups, and process analyses, resulted in several recommendations that were subsequently implemented by the University. Key outcomes:

- The University's definition of governance was reviewed and formalized; a corresponding *Statement of Governance Principles* was also reviewed and revised.
- A policy development process/flowchart was developed to describe the steps of policy development, and clarify the groups involved in formal policy development.
- The University Governance Council was formed, and the University Council was disbanded.
- A Staff Senate was created to provide University staff employees with a forum for communication and an official role in governance.
- The charge of the University's Administrators' Conference, which plays a crucial role in policy development and approval, was reviewed and revised.

Since that time, the University's Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Office has managed policy coordination and governance support functions at the institutional level. Specifically, the Office has produced a guide to governance aimed at education and orientation for members of governance groups, an official University governance Web site[1] to promote understanding of governance, institutional policy and procedures templates[2], and University policy definitions. The Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Office also provides support for the University Governance Council, and is working to create a process and location for the centralized maintenance of institutional policies. The Office has worked with the Planning and Information Resources division as incubator for the development of a divisional policy coordination process model; at the writing of this report, several policies and divisional procedures have been ushered through this process, and work has begun to transition existing institutional policies into the new template.

In order to determine the extent to which these changes and improvements have been successful, and to determine the University's readiness to meet related Middle States Accreditation standards, the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Office coordinated a follow-up study of the University's governance system in the 2010-11 academic year. This study was done at the request of the Board of Trustees at the time they endorsed the new structure that emerged following the 2006 study, which was also requested by the Board. This review focused particularly on those areas of change resulting from the 2006 study and recommendations. This multi-pronged study, which included surveys, qualitative analysis, and interviews of a number of individuals involved in the governance process, has yielded the following key findings:

- The need for improved communication continues to be a significant theme in governance, emerging in each of the three core assessment activities – University survey, the survey of the three senate's, and individual interviews. Though many note that communication has, in general, improved, the need for continued improvement – in particular, the *quality* of this communication and the timeliness/timeline of communication and feedback – is marked. The lack of quality and timeliness, and what is described as "fuzzy" communication, is observed by

---

[1] See: http://matrix.scranton.edu/governance/ .
[2] Both the University policy & procedures templates and University policy definitions have been reviewed by the University Governance Council and the Administrators' Conference.

many to be at the root of other challenges facing governance, and in fact other leadership and decision making processes at the University. Many individuals from across all three representative governance groups expressed desire to hear more about the outcomes of various deliberations, "closing the loop," and more rationale for why these particular decisions were made. More transparency of deliberations at all levels of governance appears to be desired.

- By and large, participants in this study appear to have an appreciation for the extent to which all constituencies of the University community have an opportunity to participate in governance. A tension appears to exist between the extent to which faculty and administration participate in and guide academic policies and influence academic and curricular decisions. Staff members continue to express some sense of disenfranchisement from mainstream decision making processes and the sharing of information related to those processes. Students appear to play a more peripheral role in these processes than do members of the other two senates.

- Feelings about the success of the University Governance Council are mixed. Though many see the creation UGC as a proactive step in bringing together the various governance groups, the exact role of the group in the development of policy is still somewhat unclear. Some feel that this adds yet another layer of decision making to an already multi-tiered consultative system. Others are concerned that, as the group has no authority to make decisions, only recommendations, it has no real authority.

- Most consider the role of the senates' liaisons to the Administrators' Conference to be unclear and only sporadically effective; the lack of "job descriptions" for this role seems to impede individuals' understanding of them, including the liaisons themselves.

- The Staff Senate appears to generally be viewed as a positive addition to the representative governance structure. A number of individuals observed that this makes staff feel like they are "part of things." However, there are ample concerns regarding the effectiveness of the group, some of which may be attributed to the growing pains of a new group finding its feet. Some substantive concerns include the balance of representation as noted above, the balance between the "social" and policy roles of the group, the extent to which the group promotes understanding of policy issues amongst its members, and the extent to which staff consensus building takes place. The Staff Senate struggles with having supervisor/supervisee relationships present in the senate by way of the nature of their organization and election processes – impedes honest deliberations and discussions, and in fact may pose conflict of interest issues.

- The extent to which all members of the governance process, and the University community at large, understand policy development as the core role of governance does not appear to be strong. Many draw a connection between the communication challenges we face in governance and the extent to which people understand what it is all about. Also of concern is a perceived lack of clarity of the role(s) of the groups involved in governance, and how and when they interface with the Administrators' Conference throughout these processes.

Analyses of these findings have led to to the formation of the following **recommendations** for improvement:

- **Roles & Communication:** Overall, those involved in the governance process, particularly those new to it, may benefit from better preparation and formal **orientation** to governance; to facilitate this process, the *Guide to Governance* should be revised. The governance process would benefit from **more openness of materials** from all groups involved. The University's *Statement of Governance Principles* should be reviewed and revised to simplify the statement and to emphasize concepts of **collegiality and transparency, and summary of roles and expectations.** A **formal charge** or constitution for the UGC should be developed. When policy

4

discussions are introduced, clear, mutually agreed upon **timelines** for review and feedback at all levels should be determined.

- o **Individual Senates:** Throughout the study, a number of laudatory remarks, as well as suggestions for improvement, emerged related to each of the three representative senates and the UGC. Data related to these groups will be shared with each, and it is recommended that **those groups review the data and information with an eye to addressing particular issues and opportunities for their own continued improvement**.
- o **Staff Senate:** As a new group, the Staff Senate in particular faces challenges in understanding and developing its role, and finding its way as a cohesive group. The Senate should **consider its use of resources carefully to ensure that it promotes and understanding** of its role and purpose both within its membership and between itself and its constituents, and **balance its social and governance** roles. The Senate may **utilize some its budget to visit other Jesuit institutions** that have representative staff governance groups, to learn about how they manage their operations and role in governance. Some review of the Senate's **representative structure** should take place to address supervisor/supervisee conflicts. The group should consider appointing **a representative** to meet regularly with Human Resources to discuss policy issues, and determine the appropriate way to manage non-policy staff needs and issues that emerge through the Senate.
- o **AC Liaisons:** The President's Cabinet should create more **formal descriptions for roles of the AC Liaisons**. A process for **regular reporting** for the liaison to the AC on issues emerging in their respective senate, and to report back to their senate on issues emerging at the AC level, should be put in place.
- **Policy Development:** The University **should continue to make improvements to the policy development process, promulgating the use of the recently created policy definitions and templates, and University policy web site**. Part of this process should be to take inventory of existing policies that need to be updated, replaced, or discontinued. The University may consider formalizing and coordinating these processes through **the development of a Policy Management Office**. This entity would provide broad support for University policy and governance processes.
- **Middle States Commission on Higher Education Related Issues:** MSCHE has high expectations for the governance, leadership, and decision making processes for the institutions it accredits. In many areas required by MSCHE, we are making positive gains. However, in some areas, we need improvement; in particular, ensuring that governance is collegial in nature, that a process of orienting new members exists, that students have a voice in policy discussion that will impact them. Throughout this assessment, though students do have an equal voice along with the other senates, it emerged both through the lack of student response to surveys and through various interviews, that students seems to lag a bit behind the other two representative groups in terms of how involved and vocal they are in the broader governance process. MSCHE also expects that institutions regularly assess their governance and leadership; as we have consistently done so over the last decade, it is recommended that we **not review governance as a whole formally again until the University prepares for its 2018 Self Study**, but that smaller evaluations take place on particular issues of governance, perhaps coordinated by the UGC, to gather information on concentrated issues, such as communication, needed policies, outdated policies, or other issues of interest to their particular constituencies.

Introduction & Background:
Even a cursory review of the concept and practice of governance in higher education provides varying definitions. An excerpt from the University's 2004 governance assessment:

> Definitions of governance tend to change depending upon who offers them: Gayle et al (2003) "trustees, faculty members, and senior administrators tend to have different goals and objectives [for governance]," and "these differences influence how they use and *define* governance, especially when the adjective *shared* is added" (32).[3] For example, Gayle et al offer a somewhat different definition for describing *shared governance*, "a mutual recognition of the interdependence and mutual responsibilities among trustees, administration, staff, faculty, and students for major institutional decision making relating to mission, budget, teaching, and research" (31).

Davis and Page (2006) discuss a difference between "faculty governance" and "shared college governance," observing the role of the first in enabling faculty to make its own regulations governing matters within its own jurisdiction and the latter as the role of faculty and others to participate in decision making with other constituencies involving broader issues within the institution. It is important to note that, in addition to various permutations of *shared governance*, the term "governance" itself also has specific meaning related to the function of governing boards at the college/university or system level. Waugh (2003) discusses the interweaving patterns of shared governance, and the extent to which governance is largely becoming a more bureaucratic enterprise than ever before, following the broader trend of the professionalization of academic decision making and management. Mallory (2010) discusses the concept of shared governance in relation to shared leadership, built on collaborative, participatory deliberation. Tierney (2004) examines the issue of academic and faculty governance in depth. Olson (2009) discusses the concept of shared governance as a term that has a floating meaning, summarizing that shared governance is ultimately a "delicate balance between faculty and staff participating in the planning and decision making processes, and administrative accountability." Key to figuring out how governance is best engaged in and its goals are accomplished at any institution appears to rest in successfully negotiating these varied roles and levels of participation in decision making, ultimately determining to what extent those roles are either deliberative or advisory. Institutions also need to strike a balance between the policy activities of governance groups and the non-policy (or social) activities representative groups often engage in.

Regardless of the exactly terminology used, these definitions commonly attempt to provide structure around the ways in which individuals within a college or university work together to develop the policies and procedures that guide it, and what the tone and process of that development is. Gayle et al (2003), defining governance as "the structure and process of authoritative decision making across issues that are significant for external as well as internal stakeholders within a university," identifies four traits of effective governance: that it *provides institutional purpose*, *clarifies strategic direction*, *identifies priorities*, and *exerts sufficient control to manage outcomes*" (1); one might add the trait of *transparency* to that list. The authors assert that the "foundation for effective governance processes rests on a clear understanding of the relationship between the assigned governance roles of faculty leaders, senior administrators, and trustees" (24).

Governance, rooted as it is in the interactions of people and processes, is a complex and imperfect business. Much of how we understand governance rests on the extent to which we all have a common

---

[3] Gayle et al describe the different viewpoints taken by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) on this issue.

understanding of what it is – and what it is not. As far back as 1998, a special committee of the then-extant University Senate, following up on issues emerging from a recent Middle States' review, took a close look at our governance system. The Middle States' assessment recommended that the University (1) clarify the roles of the University and Faculty Senates, (2) find ways to improve communication at the University, and (3) search for more meaningful methods for members of the University community to participate in governance.

The then-University Senate's report[4] observes that the complexity of University decision and policy making processes is at least due in to the "formidable array of consultative organizations, all of them operating by their own rules and according to their own timelines, and many of them featuring overlapping jurisdiction" (p. 19). The committee's report focused on the extent to which consultative committees, which had been "permitted to spread like dandelions" (p. 20) interacted with the relatively centralized decision making process at the University. The report identified other concerns with governance, including confusion as to what role various groups and individuals play in the process, the appropriate timing for consultation in the decision making process, and communications between groups involved, including the management of the expectations of the extent to which consultation and recommendations will have an impact on the final decision made. These and other specific observations also emerged later in the 2006 and 2010 governance studies:

- At the University of Scranton we often confuse communication with participation in decision making…when stakeholders are consulted regarding a long-term decision, those stakeholders frequently assume that their recommendations will be taken. When their recommendations are not followed, these individuals frequently become frustrated if the rationale is not communicated to them (p. 23)
- When policy decisions are made these decisions are often not communicated, or communicated in a meaningful way, to those who are affected by those decisions (p. 23)

As a result of 2006 assessment, the University's *Statement of Governance Principles*, first recorded in 2000, was revised to express the following philosophy:

> *"As described in its Statement of Governance Principles, governance at The University of Scranton is rooted in the identity of The University as an American, Catholic, and Jesuit institution of higher education at the beginning of the twenty-first century.*
>
> *The University defines governance as a system of consultation, communication and decision-making that produces institutional policies. The governance process is designed to ensure that all members of the University community – faculty, staff, and students – have opportunity to participate in the policy making process. Governance also plays a key role in creating essential communication venues for cross-campus dialogue on issues that are important to our life as a University.*
>
> *This process is guided by the University's Governance Principles, which flow directly from its Mission and are informed also by the principles enunciated in the Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities (1966) formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. Each of the three representative governance bodies of the*

---

[4] *See*: Governance at the University of Scranton: Report of the University Senate's Special Committee on Governance, October 1998.

University is responsible for ensuring that these principles are reflected in their constitutions and bylaws and otherwise upheld by their governing policies."

The extent to which the University's current governance structure and processes embodies and demonstrates these principles[5] is a key focus area to the 2010 study.

2010-11 Governance Review:

Step 1: Primary Survey

To begin its assessment[6], the Planning & Institutional Effectiveness Office produced and conducted a set of surveys administered to all full-time faculty and staff, and all undergraduate students. The surveys focused on the degree of importance placed on and level of satisfaction with the University's governance principles, as understood through individuals' impressions of and experience with their representative senate. Summary data for faculty and staff responses to this survey are detailed in the following pages; due to a prohibitively low response rate (4%) for the student survey, a summary is not provided. However, other portions of the study will include student opinions and feedback. The clarity or quality of the following attributes of University governance were addressed in the survey, in addition to opportunity to respond to open-ended evaluative statements: communications, responsibilities for policy making, governance roles and responsibilities, response to pressing issues, promotion of understanding of policy issues, constituency participation, consensus building, expression of stakeholder views and suggestions.

Key Findings: Faculty Survey[7],[8]

- At least three-quarters of faculty respondents indicated that all of these areas of governance were *very important* or *important*. Of these, the items with highest satisfaction[9] are the extent to which the Faculty Senate encourages faculty participation in governance (79% *very satisfied* or *satisfied*); the extent to which the Senate allows faculty and other stakeholders to express their views or suggestions (77%); the role of the Faculty Senate in representing faculty to other University policy and decision making bodies is clear (63%); and the Faculty Senate addresses pressing policy issues (61%).
- Lowest satisfaction for faculty respondents is with the extent to which the Faculty Senate builds consensus amongst faculty (40% *very satisfied* or *satisfied*); the extent to which communications regarding University governance and policy are widespread and regular (36%); and that the responsibilities for policy making are clearly designated within the overall governance structure (31%).
- Most faculty respondents (63%) believe the University Governance Council is *very important* or *important* to governance; similar percentages say they understand the role of the UGC. For those respondents who are members of the Faculty Senate, these response percentages are similar. For all faculty respondents, the extent to which the UGC has been a beneficial addition

---

[5] See appendix 1.

6. The data and information contained in this summary is for developmental and institutional improvement purposes only, and does not purport to be a publication of scholarly and/or scientific content.

[7] The faculty survey was distributed to all full-time faculty (n=286); the response rate for this group was 23%. 22% of this respondent group indicated that they were members of the Faculty Senate.

[8] Faculty senates' in general at the master's level consider similar issues. According to a 2009 study by James Archibald at Ohio University's Center for Higher Education, just over half (57%) of faculty senate leaders believe that their administration provides the faculty senate with enough time to consider issues relevant to faculty as they arise, 33% say that they sometimes do, and 10% indicated that they do not. 24% of faculty senate leaders rate their senate as being very effective, 39% rate their senate as effective, and the same percent as somewhat effective, and 10% view their senate as not at all effective.

[9] Highest percentages of respondents indicating that they are satisfied or very satisfied.

to governance is mixed, with 38% indicating they are *very satisfied* or *satisfied* that this is the case, 21% *not very satisfied* or *not satisfied*, and one-quarter (25%) say that they *don't know*. A similar number of Faculty Senate members indicate that they *don't know*, 36% were *not very satisfied* or *not satisfied*, and 43% were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* that the addition of the UGC has been beneficial.

- Throughout the comments portion of the survey, a number of faculty voiced concerns related to the role of the UGC and the extent to which it has been successful. Some comments expressed greater satisfaction with the previous jointly representative group, the University Council. Others were worried that the UGC put yet another layer of decision making into the process, some expressing concern that this further diluted relations between the faculty and administration in decision making processes.
- Other Comments:
  - Several respondents expressed a concern that the role of the faculty in overall University governance seems to be diminishing in scope. Others noted that they feel that the views of faculty are not being taken seriously in the governance process.
  - Several comments voiced confusion and asked question related to the overall role of the University Governance Council and the relationship between the three constituency based senates, requesting more clarity regarding the reporting lines for these groups.
  - Several comments observed concern by some faculty that the Faculty Senate is not truly representative of the views of faculty overall, but rather a forum where a small group of individuals drive their specific point of view. Additional comments suggest concerns with the degree of and timeliness of communication within the Faculty Senate.
  - A number of comments discussed the desire for improved communication between the AC and the various governance groups, with more clarity in terms of the content of deliberations.

Key Findings: Staff Survey [10]
The survey distributed to staff addressed the same governance principles/ areas as did the faculty senate survey. For nearly all items in the survey, at least 90% of staff respondents indicated that all the principles are *very important* or *important*. For two items in the survey, those relating to the Staff Senates' addressing of policy issues, a smaller percentage of respondents evaluated the item as *very important* or *important*: The Staff Senate addresses pressing University policy issues (57% citing this principle as *very important;* 33% identifying it as *important*); and the Staff Senate promotes an understanding of policy issues being considered (54% citing identifying this principle as *very important*; 36% identifying it as *important*).

Elements of governance with the **highest degree of satisfaction[11]** include the extent to which the Staff senate encourages staff participation (50% of respondents being *very satisfied* or *satisfied*); the Staff Senate allows staff and other stakeholders to express their views and suggestions (43%); and the extent to which the Senate has a clear role in representing staff in governance (41%). Areas with the lowest level of respondents' indicating that they are *very satisfied* or *satisfied* are with the extent to which the Staff Senate promotes and understanding of policy issues being considered (34%); and the extent to which the senate builds consensus amongst staff (30%)[12].

---

[10] The staff survey was distributed to all full-time staff (n= 595). The response rate for the survey was 24%. Of this respondent group, 17% indicated that they were members of the Staff Senate.
[11] Highest percentages of respondents indicating that they are very satisfied or satisfied.
[12] For all the items included in the survey, the percentage of respondents who indicate that they "don't know" to what extent they are satisfied ranged from 4% to 15%, higher than rates for faculty respondents to their survey, suggesting that a broader

Most staff respondents believe that the University Governance Council (UGC) is needed in University governance; 45% indicate that this need is *very important*, 37% indicate that is it *important.* Over half (65%) of the staff respondents' understand the role of the UGC; 35% state that they do not.   When asked to what extent they are satisfied that the UGC has been a beneficial addition to governance, just under half of all staff respondents (48%) are *very satisfied* or *satisfied* that this is the case; 19% are *somewhat satisfied*, and 25% *don't know* to what extent the addition of the council has been beneficial. For those respondents to the survey who are Staff Senate members, reaction to this question was more positive: 65% respond that they are *very satisfied* or *satisfied* that the UGC has been a beneficial addition to governance, 22% *don't know*. Seventy five percent (75%) of Staff Senate member respondents indicate that they understand the role of the UGC.

Given the newness of this group, the extent to which individuals are familiar with its structure is important to consider. According to the survey, about a third (35%) all staff respondents are familiar with the Staff Senate's constitution and bylaws; over half are less familiar: 43% know the documents exist but are not familiar with their content, and 21% are not familiar with them. Staff Senate respondents are much more familiar with the senate's constitution and bylaws; 96% of them indicating they are familiar with the documents. Most respondents believe the Staff Senate is needed in University governance: 63% of Staff Senate respondents agree that the need for the Staff Senate is *very important*; of non-senate members, 70% believe this need is *very important*. Ninety percent (90%) of total staff respondents believe the Staff Senate is needed in University governance; however, just over half (51%) of the total staff response pool are *very satisfied* or *satisfied* that the senate has been a beneficial addition to governance, 19% are *somewhat satisfied*, and 16% *don't know*.

The following summarizes additional comments shared in the staff survey:

- Most staff respondents, again, feel that the Staff Senate is important to the University. At the same time, many are discouraged with the current status of the Senate, in particular the extent to which the role and work of the senate and the elected members is made clear, is communicated, and fits into other administrative/management decision making processes. To what extent the Staff Senate has any authority to address concerns raised by staff through the venue is unclear.
- Several comments note confusion about what is happening within the senate, and a perceived lack of communication within the senate itself and between the senate and other staff. Overall, the lack of communication and need for role clarification has caused some staff to assume that the senate is producing few visible, effective outcomes. Such confusion seems to blur the ability of staff members to determine the importance and outcomes of governance; many comments appear to be more focused on the non-policy roles of the senate, suggesting lack of familiarity with the University's definition of governance.
- Some comments observe that though it is important for consensus and unity to exist amongst staff, they perceive that these principles are not fully integrated into the workings of the Senate. Some note that staff members are fearful to express their true opinions because they are intimated by those who are in "power," whether they be within their direct supervisory chain or appear to have a personal agenda to push within the senate itself. The senate has been observed to already be "too political" and a "closed group." And, some shared concern that the chief human resources officer's presence as liaison to the Senate may impede the group's need

---

knowledge gap exists between the degree to which faculty are familiar with Faculty Senate operations and the extent to which staff are familiar with Staff Senate operations.

for candor and open dialogue. Many cite fear of reprimand or intimidation as a reason for less than open communication. Other comments suggest that managers may not be supportive of staff service on the senate. Many would also like to see more opportunity for the "voice of the minority" to be heard.

- Several comments suggested that more information about the role and work of the Staff Senate and the UGC is needed, requesting that more information (such as reports, progress, or messages) be shared via email, the portal, or campus mail.

Step 2: Follow-up Survey

To provide greater context for these findings, a follow up survey was sent to members of the three senates. Seventy-five individuals were included in this survey; 41% responded. Thirty-nine percent (39%) of Faculty Senate members and the same percent of Staff Senate members responded; 23% of Student Senate members took part. Key findings from this survey:

- Confidence in individuals' understanding of the governance system is not high; 57% of the total respondent group felt *a little bit confident*; 40% felt *fairly confident*; and 3% were *very confident*.
- Most respondents did not believe that the definition of governance is widely understood, most indicating that they feel it is understood *a little bit* (58%) or *not at all* (23%).
- Many feel that communication is *very important* (50%) or *important* (43%) to the governance process; however, most believe the quality of communication is *somewhat poor* (58%) or *very poor* (13%). 29% feel the quality is *good*.
- Senate members' rate their understanding of the outcomes of governance as *fairly well* (48%) or understood *a little bit* (48%); many feel that these outcomes are communicated *a little bit* (50%) or *fairly well (*37%) to the campus in general. Most (53%) believe that the outcomes are communicated *fairly well* or *a little bit* (33%) to their senate in particular.
- Respondents' rate the extent to which the outcomes of UGC deliberations are reported back to their senate by their respective representatives *fairly well* (38%), *a little bit* (45%), with some rating this as very well (16%).

Comments related to the strengths and weaknesses of the current governance system are similar to those expressed in the broader governance survey, with the exception that there seems to be a greater awareness of the role of the individuals involved in governance and the role of the governance groups, in particular, the UGC. Respondents to this survey offered the following suggestions for improvement:

- Better, more streamlined communication between governance groups and with the broader University community
- More interaction between senates and more openness of the deliberations of the senates

Step 3: Individual Interviews

Individual interviews with leaders of the senates' and administrators' involved in the governance process took place during the month of March, and were facilitated by students in the graduate Counseling program and staff in the Institutional Research Office[13].

Overall, the following key themes emerge:

- Multiple persons who were interviewed indicated liking that there is an opportunity for student, staff, and faculty input. A number of interviewees expressed that though the current system is imperfect, there has been significant improvement in recent years. As one interviewee

---

[13] These individuals are not involved directly in the governance process or its management.

observed, governance should be "running much more smoothly in about 3 years, after some of the issues have been worked out."

- Several interviewees indicated that awareness across campus in terms of how the process works is a weakness. As one individual noted, "things come from the different senates through the particular governance group and then they also get submitted to the administration, who then looks at these things and then it comes back. And so sometimes, I think things can get lost in the process…ensuring the communication is timely and that the info coming and going to each of these bodies is being dealt with on a timely matter is probably the best way to put it".

- Communication is noted as a challenge for many interviewees, and is "not always clear or as swift as it should be." Although everyone has a voice in governance, what goes up does not always come down, and vice-versa, in a consistent or clear way; an "information lag" often develops. Several interviewees noted that the lack of response at times from the Administrators' Conference regarding various policy issues is viewed as somewhat disrespectful to the members of the senate or senates who have spend a lot of time and energy in reviewing the policy information. However, as one interviewee summarized regarding the UGC, depending on the issue at hand, some tension is natural, but "communication is generally thoughtful and reflective, and that people really want to work together and make this the best possible governance group it can be."

- Several interviewees noted that although not everyone appears to fully understand the roles of the various groups in governance, many do understand them, but "that it is useful for people to be reminded of their roles." One issue that emerged during the interview process is that there are some "random committees and structures" around campus which others don't understand "where they fall or why they exist." What role these groups have in decision -making or formal governance is not really clear. Another issue that was of concern to a number of interviewees is uncertainty over the nature and effectiveness of the AC liaisons at large. For the Staff Senate in particular, this continues to be a challenge, as does the broader issue of having various managerial levels present in its representation.

- Several interviewees noted that, for both Student Senate and the Staff Senate, there is a wide mix of governance and social, non-governance activities. Members of these senates need to consider how to best balance these needs.

Principles

As described in its *Statement of Governance Principles*, the governance system at The University of Scranton:

A. Seeks to ensure widespread communication, understanding, participation and reasonable consensus.
B. Addresses pressing issues in a streamlined, adaptive, flexible way and encourages the appropriate use of sunset rules for committees and task forces.
C. Attempts to generate widespread understanding throughout the University community of the differences among policy-making, implementation of defined policy, and consultation regarding policy.
D. Allows stakeholders in the policy-making process to express their views and suggestions when policies affecting them are being reviewed and when the best solutions are being considered.
E. Ensures regular, two-way communication between representatives of stakeholders participating in policy-making and those they represent.
F. Seeks to guarantee that participants in the policy-making process are provided with the appropriate resources and information so that they may participate in a timely fashion.
G. Recognizes that the primary responsibility for policy-making and decision-making in each area of University life must be clearly designated.

Each governance body of The University of Scranton is responsible for ensuring that these principles are reflected in their constitutions and bylaws and otherwise upheld by their governing policies.

Resources and Works Cited:

Archibald, James G. (January 18, 2010). Faculty senate leader survey: preliminary results for
        master's institutions. Center for Higher Education, Ohio University.

Birnbaum, Robert. (1991). Faculty in governance: the role of senates and joint committees in
        academic decision making. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 75. San Francisco:
        Jossey-Bass.

Davis, Lynn K. and Page, Deborah L. (Nov-Dec 2006). Governance review without tears. *Academe
        92* (6), 20-26.

Gayle, Dennis John, et al. (2003). Governance in the twenty-first-century: Approaches to effective
        leadership and strategic management. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 30* (1).

Kezar, Adrianna. (2004). What is more important to effective governance: relationships, trust, and
        leadership, or structures and formal processes? *New Directions for Higher Education, (127),* 34
        36. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Kezar, Adrianna and Peter D. Eckel. (2004). Meeting today's governance challenges. *The Journal
        of Higher Education*, *74* (4). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mallory, Bruce L. (2010). Practicing what we preach: democratic principles in institutional governance.
        New Directions for Higher Education, *152*, 91-97. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Olson, Gary A. (July 23, 2009). Exactly what is 'shared governance'? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
        www.chronicle.com .

Tierney, William C. and Vincente M. Lechuga, eds. (2004). Restructuring shared governance in
        higher education. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *127*. San Francisco: Jossey-
        Bass.

Waugh, William L., Jr. (January 2003). Issues in university governance: more "professional" and less
        academic. *The Annals of the American Academy, 585*, 84-96.