

Final Report of the Executive Task Force on Governance

2010-2011

INTRODUCTION

This is the Final Report of the Executive Task Force on Governance. The body of this document presents our final recommendations. These grew out of the concerns that were raised in Focus Groups, interviews, and discussions with the various Senates and administrators as well as the research we did on the development and reforms of Santa Clara's collaborative governance model since it was developed in 1994-5, the literature on university governance issues, and other, comparable models.

This final draft of our recommendations reflects the advice of the administrators and faculty and staff leaders who met with us and essentially supported all our proposals in a day long Governance Retreat, May 7, 2011.

What we found, in more than a year of work and conversation, was that the Santa Clara model of collaborative governance is valued by those who have participated in the governance process over the last twenty years but that there were places where the process, rather than the principles, needed more specificity or some reforms. That is what we have done in the hope that this will contribute to the further growth of our community as a collaborative body committed to the educational goals of Santa Clara University and to robust discussions and examination of all sides of the various issues that present themselves in the future so that we can be the best that we can be as a community and university.

We are grateful to all those who contributed their thoughts and concerns in the various stages of our research and deliberations and particularly for the thoughtful counsel of the Retreat Participants. We look forward to broader discussions of these recommendations by our whole community. And, in the end, we hope that these recommendations will receive the support of the faculty, staff, and students and be integrated into a full governance document that will serve to improve our governance process in the interests of all those in this community and its educational goals.

The Executive Task Force on Governance, 2010-11

Jane L. Curry, Chair

Andre Delbecq

Gail Gradowski

Leilani Miller

Don Polden

Jeanne Rosenberger

Jim Rowan

Robert Warren

Jacqueline Wender

EXECUTIVE TASK FORCE ON GOVERNANCE
CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
07/24/2011

This document provides a summary of key concerns raised and recommendations made to improve the shared governance process at Santa Clara University. The recommendations are designed so that, after they are discussed, amended (if necessary), and supported by the Santa Clara University community, they can be integrated, with the various provisions that have been passed from 1994 on, into a coherent, clear governance document. This final integrated document will then serve as the Santa Clara Governance model. In the future, revisions can be incorporated into this single document.

CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4
Final Locus of Dialog – University Policy Committees	4
Communications Flow	6
Profile of a Successful Committee	8
University Coordinating Committee	12
Create Appointments Committee	14
Committee Appointments	17
Responses and Appeals	19
Role of the Faculty Senate	20
Relations with Trustees	21
Orientation	23
Staffing Support to Ensure Effectiveness of Governance Process	26
APPENDICES	28
1994 Governance Document	
1995 Governance Document	
2004 Governance Retreat / Review	
2008 UPC Charter	
History of Governance at SCU	
Best Practices in Governance	

CHAPTER ONE: OVERALL CONCERNS

This section describes the concerns raised through focus groups, surveys, and conversations with administrators, faculty and staff throughout the '10-'11 academic year. Many positive comments were made; for brevity's sake, this document only mentions concerns. Chapter Two provides recommendations to address each of the concerns delineated below. For the purposes of this document, "policy" is defined to mean policies appropriate for UPC consideration, as described in Chapter Two, Section One.

A frequently heard concern is that UPCs only recommend, but administration may overrule, modify or fail to implement a UPCs recommendation rendering meaningless months of work. Although we find no evidence that this has occurred with any frequency, it is important to address the concern since "final locus of dialog" is at the heart of Santa Clara's University Governance Policy.

Faculty and staff on a number of Focus Groups reported problems with getting full and timely information on topics they were deliberating. Others reported concern that they could not present relevant information when they consulted with constituency groups.

For the UCC, making appointments has been problematic and time consuming because of the difficulty in defining and evaluating "competence" of individuals for committee appointments (it has been misused by some as "agreeing with the prevailing policy") and the increased size of the faculty and staff. In the process, many people who have much to contribute are left out of the process.

It would be beneficial if guidelines were made available to the campus at large concerning committee responsibilities.

As a result of the foregoing, the appointments process has become so time consuming that the UCC has insufficient time to direct policy matters to the respective UPCs or to coordinate policy deliberations that should be considered by more than one UPC.

The culture of engagement has decreased in recent years making it more difficult to find people who are willing to serve on UPCs.

The link between UPC members and the groups they represent has been weak, hampering the consultation process.

When special task force or committee deal with a policy issue of gravitas at governance level there is a concern that the decision making unfolds in a manner parallel to the UPC process honoring norms of the collaborative governance model in appointment of members and consultation with the three constituencies.

There are too few committees, overburdening the existing UPCs, and there is no mechanism to add new committees or turn ongoing standing committees into permanent committees.

From time to time, a UPC, after expending considerable time and effort, has made a policy change recommendation to an administrator and never received a response. This leads to a sense of frustration and disillusionment with the governance process."

The Faculty Senate has become the orphan in the policy process. Without a designated role in the policy process, it has become an ad hoc organization which has actively been seeking a way to institutionalize its role in the UPC process as well as the generation of policy and appointment of faculty representatives who will both have competence and a clear tie to the faculty.

The role of Trustees in decision-making processes is not fully understood. Faculty and staff seek greater understanding of their role, greater communication about the programs and units that make up the university, and more participation in decision-making.

There was a general concern across the focus groups that new UPC members do not receive adequate (if any) orientation regarding the University's overall model of shared governance. Further, there is insufficient orientation relative to the particular UPC to which participants are assigned. Finally, an adequate orientation provides a moment for all stakeholders to renew commitments to norms and processes of collaboration at the heart of the Santa Clara governance model.

Following thoughtful and constructive discussions about how to improve the governance process at SCU, it is apparent that someone needs to be charged with managing the governance process and held accountable for ensuring the success of the agreed-upon practices.

CHAPTER TWO: RECOMMENDATIONS

Final Locus of Dialog – University Policy Committees

Concerns:

There has been a decrease in the understanding in all groups of the university community of the role and process for collaboration.

There has not been clarity as to what kinds of issues need to go through this collaborative process.

The University Governance Document states:

Policy concerns could be initiated bottom up from individual constituents within the University community, top down from UPCs or administration, or laterally from committees and councils of the University community. UPCs will decide whether an issue falls within their domain.

In instances where there is dispute or lack of clarity regarding which UPC is the appropriate policy body, the University Coordinating Committee will make a domain decision (which could involve forming a special purpose University policy task force).

Current Proposal:

The UPCs will be the final collaborative bodies with the authority to:

- Formulate and recommend new University policy and major strategic change, and
- Review significant change in existing policy

It is expected that key stakeholders or their representatives will be invited into dialog with UPCs at appropriate states of decision-making (the rule of three: when defining the problem, early formulation of solutions, final modifications) resulting in pooled judgments and conflict resolution.

Comment [SCU1]: R1, reiterating

However, UPCs are the final locus of dialog in collaborative policy formulation, and the unfolding of their decision should reflect the rule of three: when seeking inputs for defining the problem, when seeking inputs relative to the early formulation of solution elements, !when seeking modifications that would improve final recommendations.

It is expected that faculty, staff, students and administrators will work closely to resolve differences and that the normal outcome of UPC deliberations will be the approval of their

recommendation by the appropriate administrator. The administrator is expected to provide a response to the recommendation within 45 days, and before a policy goes into effect.

Trustees hold the ultimate legal and moral responsibility and authority for the University, and therefore must ultimately determine and approve University policies and major strategic changes.

In rare instances where a UPC and appropriate administrator are unable to reach agreement through dialog within the UPCs decision sequence, the UPC may submit its position document to the President or through the President to a Trustee Committee for consideration.

Examples of issues appropriate for UPC consideration are:

- Significant changes affecting faculty, staff, or student policy manuals and handbooks;
- Significant changes to academic sections of academic bulletin; (e.g. curriculum, requirements for graduation), and
- Significant concerns brought to the UCC by faculty, staff, or student senates, administration, or trustees, associated with changes that impact on prior understandings, systems, resources and stakeholders in an important way.

However, it should be noted that it is the process wherein the UCC exercises its judgment that an issue has sufficient “gravitas” that determines referral to a UPC or special task force rather than any predetermined definitional category.

A special task force or committee dealing with a policy issue of gravitas similar to a UPC, the special task force or committee should conform to the same process norms as a UPC (e.g., final locus of dialog, rule of three regarding communication with key stakeholders, etc.).

These norms should be part of the formal charge given to the special task force or committee.

Comment [SCU2]: R2, reiterating

Communications Flow

Concerns:

Faculty and staff report a concern that there is insufficient communication between UPCs and their constituent governing bodies (e.g. between Faculty Senate and Faculty Affairs/Academic Affairs; between Staff Senate and Staff Affairs).

Faculty and staff report a lack of visibility and information flowing out of UPCs to the community.

Members of UPCs report that the process of the responsible administrator or office acting on a recommendation from the UPC does not always work smoothly.

Faculty and staff report some inconsistency in access to information needed for informed discussion.

Recommendation One:

A. Chairs of Faculty Affairs, Academic Affairs, and Staff Affairs should attend their corresponding Senate.

Comment [SCU3]: R3, new

B. The Senates should receive a regular report from the chair of each relevant UPC.

Comment [SCU4]: R4, new

Recommendation Two:

A. The governance website <http://www.scu.edu/governance/committees/> will provide post regularly minutes from each committee.

Comment [SCU5]: R5, reiterating

B. An annual summary report, based on the annual UPC summary meeting, will be provided to the University community. It will include UPC membership rosters for the upcoming year.

Comment [SCU6]: R6, reiterating/new

Recommendation Three:

A. The administrator who regularly receives policy recommendation from a UPC will serve on the committee or appoint a designate. If the administrator appoints a designate, that individual should be empowered to act with the full authority of the administrator in this capacity, to avoid creating a layering of designate and administrator.

Comment [SCU7]: R7, new

B. The administrator (or his/her proxy) is expected to attend the UPC meetings; for each issue before the UPC, the UPC and the administrator should clarify who is the responsible decision-maker.

Comment [SCU8]: R8, new

C. The administrator should observe the timelines described in the 2008 Charter update <http://www.scu.edu/governance/committees/policy.cfm>; the administrator is expected to provide a response to a UPC recommendation within 45 days.

Comment [SCU9]: R9, reiterating

Recommendation Four:

A. In the spirit and interests of shared governance as well as effective policy collaboration, members of UPCs and other collaborative university committees and task forces should be given all information necessary for fruitful discussion. It is the responsibility of administrators and committee members to insure that all relevant information is provided in a timely fashion.

B. Transparency in the decision process should be held as a principle at all levels. In unique circumstances, some information that is shared with the Committee may be designated as not appropriate to be shared with outside constituencies.

Comment [SCU10]: R10, reiterating

Comment [SCU11]: R11, reiterating

Profile of a Successful Committee

Comment [SCU12]: R12, reiterating

Concern:

This profile of a successful committee provides best practices to be used to structure current university committees and create processes for the ongoing operation of those committees. The purposes of these recommendations are to improve participation in key governance groups, increase transparency in results of committee action and to improve reporting of committee activities and decisions.

Recommended Guidelines:

- A. Formation and composition of committees.
 1. A committee's members should have:
 - Relevant skill, experience and knowledge;
 - Respect of their constituencies;
 - Established stakeholder networks, and
 - Relevant intergenerational and rank representation.
 2. For continuing or standing committees, the composition of the committee should be established at the end of the preceding term (academic year) so that an orderly transition in leadership can occur and so that the work of the committee can commence at the beginning of the new term.
 3. The outgoing chair of the committee should contact the incoming chair to provide a list of uncompleted agenda items or a brief statement of ongoing committee responsibilities to the incoming chair.
 4. The incoming chair should contact the leadership of a committee (commonly the chair) to which his or her committee reports for information on work that the committee should undertake in the coming term.
 5. The incoming chair should contact members of the new committee (whether new or continuing members).
 6. The UCC should make explicit the qualifications and eligibility of faculty and staff for service on committees. Ideally, this information would be made available on the website and in staff and faculty handbooks and manuals. For most committees, all faculty—including pre-tenure, lecturers, and senior lecturers—are eligible for appointment and where any such group is not eligible to serve, the documents should be clear on this fact. Similarly, participation by staff members should be made clear and those serving should receive appropriate credit for participating from their department or school/college.
- B. Setting the agenda for the coming term

1. Prior to the commencement of the new term, the chair should prepare a draft agenda of topics or responsibilities that the new committee will take up in the new term. This agenda for the new term should be distributed to the new committee members as a “discussion item” for the first meeting of the committee.

2. The agenda items should reflect the committee’s ongoing responsibilities for discussion and action and any new items that the chair believes should be considered by the committee. In this regard, it is essential that the chair and members of the committee are provided with a formal statement of the committee’s charge or responsibilities.

C. New and continuing member orientation

1. It is expected that new members will participate in a short, well planned orientation session conducted by the responsible university or UCC leader. The orientation should consist of a discussion of the role of the committee in the university’s system of shared governance, copies of necessary documents related to the work of the committee, and the university’s appreciation for the member’s service.

2. If appropriate, the continuing members of the committee should be asked to participate in an orientation that is intended to prepare them for the new term.

D. Conduct of meetings

1. Meetings of the committee should be scheduled for the entire term of service (e.g., academic year, quarter or semester, until completion of a study or report, etc.) at the beginning of the term and, if possible, on a regular and recurring basis (e.g., second Wednesday of each month). The location of the meeting should be established at the same time and, if possible, should be maintained throughout the term.

2. Meetings should be conducted by rules of procedure (e.g., Roberts Rules of Order) including adhering to requirements for a quorum, taking action by motion following a “second”, majority vote, etc. However, for committees that are not expected to take and report formal action, formal adherence to rules of procedure may be relaxed by agreement of the group.

3. Committee meetings should be preceded by a written agenda submitted by the chair (or his or her proxy). The agenda should be submitted to committee members at least one day in advance of the meeting and should indicate “new business” and continuing matters (sometimes referred to as “old business”). In addition, chairs should indicate whether formal action on an agenda item is contemplated (such as by designating the item as an “action item”). Agenda items should be routinely submitted by the chair to the committee or individual to whom the committee reports.

4. For all UPCs and other comparable committees under the same guidelines as UPCs, a written record of the proceedings should be maintained and made available to appropriate audiences, including committee members. These “minutes of the meeting” may be prepared by

the chair or by an appointed secretary of the committee. The minutes should indicate who has attended the meeting, any formal action taken by the committee, any objections to action taken by the committee, and the person who prepared the minutes. Any pertinent documents should be attached to the copy of the minutes. Minutes of a meeting should be reviewed and approved for accuracy by the members of the committee at the next regularly scheduled meeting. A copy of the approved minutes and pertinent documents shall be posted on the appropriate governance website, except where matters of confidentiality indicate otherwise.

5. Committee leadership should consider the use of technology (such as telephone conferencing, web-based audio/visual conferencing capabilities, Skype-type software, etc.) to broaden options for members to participate. The conduct of meetings via such technology will be particularly helpful to include JST faculty and staff in the discussions.

E. Reporting

1. At the end of each chair's term, the chair should prepare and submit to the committee, individual to whom the committee reports, and the UCC, a statement of the committee's work during the term. For continuing or standing committees, this report might be a collection of the minutes of the meetings during the term and a statement of unfinished business. Unless confidentiality issues indicate otherwise, these annual reports should be distributed via the university "list-serve" system to all faculty and staff.

2. For ad hoc or temporary committees, the chair should submit a final report as requested in the committee charge. This document should be submitted to the committee or individual who established the ad hoc committee and requested the report.

F. Other resources

1. The university should prepare a short and simple statement of rules for the conduct of university committee meetings and the statement should be provided to each new committee chair, along with a copy of this document.

2. Consider on-line resources such as:

<http://www.mycommittee.com/BestPractice/Committees/tabid/135/Default.aspx>

3. <http://www.robertsrules.com/default.html>

4. Running Meetings: Expert Solutions to Everyday Challenges (Harvard Business School Press, 2006).

University Coordinating Committee

Concerns:

The UCC has been overburdened by the appointments to various committees and unable to focus on the necessary coordination and direction.

UCC attempts to run orientations have not always been possible time-wise.

The meaning of “competence” has not been clear and sometimes is used as “agrees with us”.

Not all issues have been brought by the administration to the UCC in time to be properly dealt with by the UCC.

Committees dealing with governance level issues are not all UPCs and are not always subject to open appointment processes and/or open consultation. There needs to be a process to both ensure that new UPCs can be established and that governance level issues dealt with by non UPC committees or taskforces follow the rules of governance.

Overall Recommendation:

This will involve collecting and directing issues to the responsible UPC or, should the issue fit under the purview of more than one UPC, directing the issue to those UPCs and ensuring either informal or formal coordination of consideration of the issue by the relevant UPCs.

Additionally, the UCC shall provide an annual orientation of those involved in governance work and the yearly review of UPC work. Finally, the UCC shall make the final appointments to all UPCs and governance level committees and taskforces.

Recommendation One:

Any administrator who initiates or proposes a policy change shall promptly notify the UCC or the same.

Comment [SCU13]: R13, reiterating

Recommendation Two:

- A. The UCC shall direct issues to the appropriate UPC or UPCs and shall monitor the consideration and coordination of policy decisions. It shall also ensure that the UPCs consult with their respective constituent groups.
- B. When policy issues arise that significantly affect more than one segment of the community (faculty, staff, students), the UCC will determine the appropriate coordination process. If the overlap is limited, informal consultation between the

Comment [SCU14]: R14, reiterating

Comment [SCU15]: R15, reiterating

relevant UPCs will be required. For significantly greater overlap, a joint committee may be formed.

Recommendation Three:

- A. The UCC shall select the Appointments Committee membership from the individuals nominated by the individual schools and colleges.
- B. The final membership of the Appointments Committee shall be based on the criteria specified in Appointments Committee Recommendation One, B.
- C. The UCC shall also make the final selection of individuals to sit on the various UPCs as well as committees and task forces dealing with governance level policies based on the recommendations of the Appointments Committee from the self-nominations, Faculty and Staff Senate recommendations, and ongoing dialog with the Deans, Directors, and managers.

Comment [SCU16]: R16, new

Comment [SCU17]: R17, new

Recommendation Four:

- A. The UCC shall oversee the governance process and orientation.
- B. There shall be an annual orientation meeting and an annual summation meeting for all UPCs with the UCC.
- C. The UCC shall meet with the chairs of Faculty Affairs, Staff Affairs and Student Affairs at the start of each quarter to review the coming months' agenda.

Comment [SCU18]: R18, new

Comment [SCU19]: R19, new

Comment [SCU20]: R20, clarifying

Comment [SCU21]: R21, new

Recommendation Five:

The UCC may consider and recommend the creation of additional UPC committees or converting long standing ad hoc committees or task forces into permanent committees if the policy area of the committee or task force meets the criteria of governance level issues. It shall do this by following the governance process as specified in the "Locus of Dialog". The UCC shall consult with the administrator responsible for that area of policy. Their recommendation would then go to the Faculty and/or Staff Senate for consideration, and then to the administrator in charge of that area of policy for final approval. The administrator's decision can be appealed to the President.

Comment [SCU22]: R22, clarifying

Create Appointments Committee as an Advisory Committee to the University Coordinating Committee

Concerns:

In many focus groups it was frequently stated that making appointments has been problematic and time consuming. A number of concerns were raised

Because of time pressures, there is a tendency to regress to nominating individuals in personal networks since no means of generating competency based nominees except the faculty senate survey has been available.

Given the increased size of the faculty and staff many individuals with related skills are felt to be off the radar screen. While chairs, deans and associate deans are familiar with skill sets because they review annual reports, many faculty members do not have access to this information. Finding the skill sets will require some search behavior with these gatekeepers.

The pool of candidates is increasing limited because of a pattern of “protecting non-tenured faculty from service obligations and pressures on tenured faculty for increased scholarship.

There is a difference between “recruiting” through a careful conversation with an individual regarding the fit between a particular set of strategic challenges and the individual’s skill set, versus “asking” without such dialog. Given the work-life stresses of the current environment, simply being asked rather than recruited through careful dialog is likely to lead to a “no.”

Finally, there is a need to create a pool of future “candidates” since it often takes some forward planning to make space for a major service commitment.

All of this suggests the need for some help for the UCC.

Principle: A successful strategic decision making committee is the result of meticulous recruiting.

Recommendation:

Create Appointments Committee as a Subcommittee to the University Coordinating Committee

Because of the burden of time associated with obtaining recommendations for, recruiting, and preparing nominations for appointments to UPCs and special task forces, we suggest augmenting the UCC through an Appointments Subcommittee. The subcommittee will manage the process of maintaining a pool of potential candidates for key positions. This will free the UCC to focus on policy concerns, and final appointment choices. The Appointments Committee would not be a UPC.

Comment [SCU23]: R23, new

Recommendation One

A. The Appointments Committee would consist of six faculty and six staff. For faculty positions, each School / College would nominate two faculty members. For staff positions, the Provost's Office would offer three nominees with the remaining nominees coming from each of the three other major administrative divisions. In both cases, the nominations would be forwarded to the UCC, which would then select six faculty and six staff for the AC. Terms would be staggered.

B." The final membership of the Appointments Committee would be the responsibility of the UCC taking into account nominees who are:

1. well networked;
2. able to collect and interpret information regarding skills and competences of potential candidates within their network;
3. reflect a distribution across generations;
4. have the ability to recruit candidates in a collaborative manner;
5. understand the need to represent the interests of the university as a whole; and
6. have experience with SCU governance.

Recommendation Two

The Committee's primary purpose would be to nominate well-qualified candidates for UPCs as well as special committees and task forces dealing with issues delineated in the Locus of Dialog recommendation. They will do this by developing and maintaining an ongoing and regularly renewed pool of candidates. Candidates from the pool will come from three sources:

A. Recommendations based the skills and competencies of faculty within individual colleges and schools and recommendations from senior administrators of staff whose competencies and responsibilities relate to the charge of various UPCs and ad hoc committees.

B. Self referrals based on annual survey of eligible faculty and staff as to their interest in serving on specified UPCs and their experience that would qualify them to serve. The survey results will be shared with the respective Senates to assist in making recommendations of candidates to fill the vacancies. The names would also be added to the candidate pool as self-referrals.

C. Recommendations from the respective Senates for candidates who could fill the vacancies.

The Appointments Committee would have an on-going dialog with the Faculty and Staff senates, and Deans, Directors, and Managers, to identify and communicate about the issues and needs of the various UPCs and special committees and task forces for which candidates are needed.

In addition, at the end of the academic year the Appointments Committee would:

A. Advise the Faculty Senate and Staff Senate of vacancies on UPCs for the following academic year;

B. Advise Deans, Directors, and Managers of vacancies on UPCs for the following academic year.

The respective Senates Administrators, Deans, Directors and Managers would be given a timely due date for the submission of nominations following conversations with the AC members regarding the matrix of skills and attributes needed in a particular year.

Committee Appointments

Concerns:

The culture of engagement has decreased in recent years making it more difficult to find people who are willing to serve on UPCs.

The increases in the faculty and staff sizes have made it more difficult for the UCC to evaluate “competence” in appointments, even if it is limited to an evaluation of “serves well on committees.”

It is difficult to evaluate “competence” so it can be conflated with “agreeing” with the prevailing policy.

The link between UPC members and the groups they represent has been weak, hampering the consultation process.

Overall:

All provisions on the composition of individual UPCs should remain as laid out in the descriptions linked from this page: <http://www.scu.edu/governance/committees/> with these changes, additions, and recommendations which are intended to increase the culture of participation in university service by making membership more inclusive and also insuring that university service is recognized for both faculty and staff.

Recommendation One:

A. All tenure track faculty, senior lecturers, and renewable term lecturers are eligible to serve on UPCs and other university committees or task forces, should they wish to be considered.

Comment [SCU24]: R24, new

B. Staff, whose jobs permit their participation, are eligible for staff positions on UPCs and other university committees or task forces should they wish to be considered.

Comment [SCU25]: R25, reiterating

Recommendation Two:

There seems to be a continued tension regarding what is meant by “competency based” UPCs. Does this mean a “narrow set of technical skills?”

We suggest using the expression “based on a matrix of competencies” specific to the challenges a UPC or special committee is charged with in a particular time period.

Comment [SCU26]: R26 new

This “matrix of competencies” might include such considerations as:

Conceptual skills

Relevant experience
Reputation within a stakeholder network
Appropriate diversity
Differentiated career stage
etc.

A UPC and the UCC should reflect on the “matrix of competencies” desired in their charge to the Appointments Committee in any given year.

Recommendation Three:

A. Those who elect to serve on UPCs, committees, and task forces should receive commensurate credit for their university service in their faculty or staff evaluations.

Comment [SCU27]: R27 new

B. No individual should be compelled to serve or considered derelict if they decline to serve because it would put too much pressure on them when they are in the tenure or promotion process, in the case of faculty, or have personal and professional responsibilities which would make committee work an undue extra burden.

Comment [SCU28]: R28 new

Recommendation Four:

Jesuit School of Theology faculty and staff will, for the purpose of committee membership, be eligible for membership on UPCs and governance level committees and task forces should they wish to be considered.

Comment [SCU29]: R29, new

Responses and Appeals

Concerns:

Policy issues are often put forward, after going through the governance process, to the administrator in charge and then nothing is done with them.

There has been no clear process for appealing decisions by administrators that reject or change policies that have gone through the consultative governance process.

Recommendation One:

If approval of a policy change is required by an authority beyond that of the administrator on the UPC or other governance level committee, that authority shall respond within 45 days of receiving the proposed policy change. Such a response may include a decision to accept, reject, or modify the proposed change or express the need for more time or information.

Comment [SCU30]: R30, clarifying

Recommendation Two:

If a response is not received within 45 days, the proposing committee shall inform the higher-level administrator of the need for a decision.

Comment [SCU31]: R31, new

Recommendation Three:

If a policy change is expressly rejected by a higher authority or if no response is received, the Academic Affairs, Staff Affairs, Student Affairs, or governance-level committee may appeal the rejection to the next higher authority (the University president, or through the President to the Board of Trustees).

Comment [SCU32]: R32, clarifying

Recommendation Four:

University Budget Council and Planning Action Council recommendations go directly to the University President and cannot be appealed.

Comment [SCU33]: R33, clarifying

Role of the Faculty Senate

Concern:

The Faculty Senate has become the orphan in the policy process. Without a designated role in the policy process, it has become an ad hoc organization which has actively been seeking a way to institutionalize its role in the UPC process as well as the generation of policy and appointment of faculty representatives who will both has competence and a clear tie to the faculty.

Recommendation One:

Relevant UPCs (with the exception of the UBC and Staff Affairs) are expected to report on their deliberations on policy issues relevant to the faculty three times to the Faculty Senate in the course of their deliberation of any policy issue. These reports may be delivered in written form or orally to the Executive Council of the Faculty Senate at the following points:

Comment [SCU34]: R34, new

- A. When defining the problem to be dealt with in order to apprise the faculty of the issue or issues they are considering;
- B. When it is formulating the solutions so that the Council can voice its support and concerns;
- C. After the policy recommendation has been drafted to allow for a Faculty Senate vote before the UPC forwards the issue to the appropriate administrator.

All votes, for or against, on a policy recommendation should be reported to the President.

Recommendation Two:

To facilitate these exchanges, the Chairs of the UCC, Faculty Affairs, Academic Affairs, Research Committee, and the faculty representative on Student Affairs, as well as a faculty representative on the UBC or any UPCs created in the future relating to faculty interests, should be ex-officio members of the Executive Council of the Faculty Senate.

Comment [SCU35]: R35, new

Recommendation Three:

Faculty Senate Council minutes will be sent to the President's Office for presentation to the Board of Trustees.

Comment [SCU36]: R36, new

(Note: These provisions build on the bylaws of the Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Council sections. The intention is to insure that the "Rule of Three" is followed and the Faculty Senate as the constituency representative is a part of ongoing policy recommendations.)

Relations with Trustees

Concerns:

Through focus groups, surveys, and other discussions with individuals and groups, the Task Force heard a variety of concerns regarding the relationship between the Board of Trustees and the university community. These concerns are summarized as follows:

Faculty and staff report that they do not know what the Trustees and Regents do.

Faculty and staff perceive that the Trustees do not have adequate exposure to, and information about, the programs and units that make up the university.

Faculty and staff feel that their interaction with Trustees is often in the form of a summative review, and another level of administration to grapple with.

Faculty and staff would like to see constituent representation in Trustee discussions and decision-making.

Some of these concerns simply indicate a lack of information about an important governance body, leading to possible misconceptions or misunderstandings.

Recommendations:

The Task Force recognizes and appreciates the particular role that the Trustees play in the life of the university. We recommend that the President and the Trustees engage in discussion about the concerns that faculty and staff have raised. We offer some ideas for consideration, some of which may currently be in practice, but could perhaps be strengthened.

A. On the university governance website, add a brief explanatory paragraph above the names on the pages <http://www.scu.edu/about/administration/trustees.cfm> and <http://www.scu.edu/about/administration/regents.cfm>

Comment [SCU37]: R37, new

B. To the Trustee page, add a list of the current Trustee committees.

Comment [SCU38]: R38, new

C. After each Trustee meeting, publish skeleton meeting minutes (obviously excluding confidential or sensitive dialog), perhaps as an entry in the President’s monthly blog.

Comment [SCU39]: R39, new

D. At each Trustee meeting, add one report item on a program or unit of timely interest, for example, the new Environmental Justice program, or a progress report on the Core, or a report on the Wrongful Prosecution initiative in NCIP.

Comment [SCU40]: R40, new

E. At each Trustee meeting, create an opportunity for informal social contact with a selected group of faculty and/or students, perhaps over a meal or during a reception. For example, with the NCAA re-accreditation underway, this would be an opportune moment to invite a group of student-athletes to lunch.

Comment [SCU41]: R41, new

F. Invite the chair of the Academic Affairs Committee to sit *ex-officio* on the Trustee Academic Affairs Committee.

Comment [SCU42]: R42, new

Orientation

Concern:

There was a general concern across the focus groups that new UPC members and new faculty members do not receive adequate (if any) orientation regarding the overall University's model of shared governance. Further, there is insufficient orientation relative to the particular UPC to which participants are assigned. Finally, an adequate orientation provides a moment for all stakeholders to renew commitments to norms and processes of collaboration at the heart of the Santa Clara governance model.

Recommendation One:

Continuous Orientation for the University Community As a Whole

Comment [SCU43]: R43, new

New faculty and new staff orientation programs, new chair and administrative orientation programs, the annual strategic agenda setting meetings of deans and chairs, the first Fall meeting of Faculty and Staff Senates and other key boundary spanning groups ... all of these gatherings should include an overview of the governance model as a continuing and standard agenda item. Particular attention should be given to how major policy issues may be raised, presented to the University Coordinating Committee for triage to a UPC, and how decisions will be processed within a UPC inclusive of feedback and involvement according to the rule of 3 (when defining the problem, when early solutions begin to be considered, and for final modifications). Re-commitment to norms of collegiality and shared governance can only be elicited through continual awareness building.

This will require that those responsible for these informational gatherings be given the resources and incentives to include governance as an agenda item.

Recommendation Two:

Orientation for Those Involved in UCC and UPC Committees Each Year.

Comment [SCU44]: R44, new

New members of UPCs are expected to participate in a short, well-planned orientation session conducted by the responsible university or UPC official. The orientation should consist of a discussion of the role of the committee in the university's system of shared governance, copies of necessary documents related to the work of the committee (e.g. previous year's minutes and list of major decisions), and the university's appreciation for the member's service.

If appropriate, the continuing members of the committee and the administrator representative should be asked to participate in an orientation that is intended to prepare them for the new term.

Recommendation Three:

Assign Responsibility for Conducting an Annual Orientation Program

Comment [SCU45]: R45, new

Although responsibility might be given to a staff person to resource and coordinate orientation programs, all stakeholders should be represented and play a role. Thus participants should include representation from the Trustees, Top Administration, Deans and Chairs, Faculty and Staff Senates as well as the constituents who will participate in the forthcoming year's UCC, UPCs, and any special task forces. A public recommitment to the norms of shared governance, made real through reviewing stories of past successes and difficulties can establish an atmosphere of positive motivation.

A. Suggested Topics for An Orientation Meeting

1. SCU's share governance model
 - a. Structure
 - b. What is a "Major Policy Issue"
 - c. Final locus of dialog
 - d. Rule of Three
 - e. Appeals
2. History, successes, challenges
3. Norms of collegiality

B. UPC Formation, Review of Past Actions and New Challenges

At the first meeting of the year, each individual UPC should meet with past chairs and/or prior key members present. Expectations regarding the role of an effective Chair and committee members should be set forth. Exemplification of prior exemplary decision processing, and prior challenges or errors should be discussed. Group "forming" with time to become acquainted with the gifts of each group member should take place. Norms regarding proper decision sequencing to involve stakeholder groups should be clarified. Background documents and history regarding the forthcoming year's policy issues should be shared. Schedules for meetings and deadlines associated with agendas established. Norms for sharing information at each stage of decision-making, for posting information regarding progress on a web site, and formatting for final reports should be shared.

Key Topics

- a. Purview/jurisdiction of their committee
- b. Annual reports from prior years
- c. Decision sequencing and rule of 3
- d. Maintaining communication flows
- e. Expectations of Chair and Members
- f. Requirements for final reports

C. Create a locus of responsibility for conducting annual orientation efforts. This may involve a staff person responsible for logistics, materials, historical documents, etc. It should include an orientation committee with key stakeholder representatives.

Comment [SCU46]: R46, new

Note: The State University of New York (SUNY) system has a particularly vibrant governance orientation program. As we consider how to implement various orientation aspects into our shared governance at SCU, this would be a good program to look at.

Staffing Support to Ensure Effectiveness of Governance Process

Concern:

The process of collaboration is complex.

One year appointees with full or virtually full teaching loads can not manage all of this guidance and monitoring as well as orientation with only a part time staff person for the Faculty Senate and UCC.

General Recommendation:

To support the governance process, a staff person who understands the governance process should be tasked with and given resources for coaching, mentoring, and evaluating each years' governance endeavors. Early warning signals regarding problems within a UPC or in the relations of a UPC with key stakeholders should be brought to the surface through timely progress reviews. Assistance should be provided to resolve the difficulties before the problems become severe and governance credibility is diminished.

Comment [SCU47]: R47, new

Recommended Tasks:

Construct a written set of job responsibilities that reflect best practices for ensuring effective governance. Assign an individual to implement the assigned tasks.

A. Tracking Information

1. Committees
 - a. Statement of Purpose/Charge
 - b. Composition of Committee
2. Membership
 - a. Names and contact information of members
 - b. Terms of appointment
 - c. Designation of chair, vice chair
 - d. Committee turnover; filling vacancies
3. Policies Under Discussion
 - a. Current policies under review
 - b. Policy issues that have been resolved (disposition)
 - c. Policies that have not been resolved and are not on the current agenda of the Policy Committee
4. Documentation¹
 - a. Meeting Agendas
 - b. Meeting Minutes
 - c. Reports and Background Materials

¹ Who is responsible for maintaining information for the Archives?

d. Final Recommendations

B. Communication

1. Send letter of welcome to all new members that includes the name of committee chair and contact information; date, time and location of first meeting; copy of the Statement of Purpose or Charge of Committee; information on current policy issues under discussion
2. Send invitation to all new committee members with the date, time and location of the next orientation session
3. Compile an Annual Report on Governance accessible on the Governance website with a link distributed to key constituents

C. Orientation to Policy Committees

1. Schedule quarterly orientation for all new appointees
2. Review the Purpose and Charge of the Committee
3. Share information from the UCC about what constitutes a policy
4. Provide historical information related to past policy discussions, current policies under consideration and future agenda items
5. Provide copies of relevant documents (flow chart, brochures, etc.)
6. Explain the Rule of Three
7. Respond to questions regarding attendance, committee participation, etc.
8. Coordinate separate orientation for committee chairs and vice chairs
9. As appropriate, encourage incoming committee members to attend at least one meeting of the committee prior to the start of their terms

D. Annual Meeting or Retreat for Policy Committee Chairs and Administrative Liaisons

1. Discuss policy issues under consideration by each committee; update per I.C.1
2. Identify process improvements in the Governance Process
3. Identify communication improvements in the Governance Process
4. Arrange an appropriate way to thank policy committee members for their service

E. General Issues

1. Provide support to the UCC
2. Maintain master list of committee vacancies
3. Manage expiration of terms to ensure cross-over of members
4. Manage changes in committee chair or vice chair due to sabbatical leave, etc.
5. Maintain current versions of Statement of Purpose and Charge of all committees
6. Update SCU Governance Documents (Flowchart, brochures, etc.)
7. Conduct monthly outreach to committee chairs for updates

8. Review all committee minutes to keep track of policies under discussion (C.1-3)²
9. Create and disseminate a template for meeting minutes and End of the Year Reports
10. Maintain and distribute the *Profile of a Successful Committee*
11. Coordinate the annual orientation meeting and summation meeting of the UPCs with the UCC
12. Maintain and regularly update the Governance website
13. Staff the Appointments Committee (TBD)

² If the staff person managing governance becomes aware of an issue being discussed by one policy committee that should be shared with other committees, the Chair of the UCC will be notified.