

- 3) Encourage CSU trustees and system administrative leadership to model collegial behavior. Make collegial behavior the norm for local campus administrators as well as [for] system wide administrators.
- 4) Evaluate administrators on how effectively they work in a shared governance system. Provide faculty with an important role in this evaluation.
- 5) Develop a Senate-sponsored training and orientation program that could be used on campuses to help faculty become familiar with roles in shared governance. Include elements that address system as well as local matters.
- 6) Provide more opportunity for non-senate faculty to participate in and to become informed about, system-wide activities.
- 7) Involve the ASCSU (and local senates as appropriate) in orientation and training in shared governance for new trustees and new administrators—especially new campus presidents.
- 8) Revisit and republicize the 1985 position paper on Collegiality and other “Blue Book” documents. Encourage discussion. Reaffirm or revise as seems appropriate. Encourage discussion. Strongly support and defend the core principles defined in Collegiality.
- 9) Incorporate meaningful faculty participation in all budget and strategic planning processes.
- 10) Provide important roles for faculty in the selection and evaluation of top Chancellor’s Office and campus administrators.
- 11) Avoid unilateral administrative decisions affecting the academic life of the university. Consult (not inform) widely, frequently, and authentically.
- 12) Provide early Senate involvement in issues. Provide opportunities for the Senate to work collaboratively with administrators to seek solutions to problems. Do not limit faculty involvement to simply reacting to administrative proposals.

*Shared Governance Reconsidered: Improving Decision-Making in the California State University* is an essential overview for a campus-wide discussion. It defines shared governance, delineates its associated process and attitudes, and specifies future policy. Fortunately, we will not need to debate the qualities, legitimacy, or nature of shared governance. All we will need to discuss is how to restore it.

April 29, 2004

**To:** The CSUDH Campus Community

**From:** Jerry Moore

**Re:** On Shared Governance

Recent calls for a campus-wide discussion on shared governance are extremely welcome. This discussion should incorporate the definitions, analysis, and policy recommendations incorporated in the excellent 2001 report, *Shared Governance Reconsidered: Improving Decision-Making in the California State University* (at [www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/SharedGovReport.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/SharedGovReport.pdf).)

This important document establishes the history and philosophy of shared governance in the CSU system, outlines criteria that define shared governance, and incorporates specific recommendations that would benefit CSUDH. The report contains several important points:

**Shared governance defines “the relationship between the administration and the faculty in which the faculty participate in giving direction and advice to the university on important policy decisions” (2001:3), a relationship explicitly recognized for more than 20 years.** Since the 1985 report, *Collegiality in the California State University System*, collegiality has been recognized as a synonym for shared governance. Shared governance is distinct from the adversarial relationships of collective bargaining and grievance procedures. Shared governance *is* the norm—or should be.

**Shared governance does not simply exist in the eye of the beholder. There are clear guidelines and criteria relating to process and attitude that distinguish shared governance from other behaviors.** The 1985 report emphasizes two key elements in shared governance: process and attitude. Shared governance is characterized by “mutual respect,” “tolerance,” “a civil regard for differing points of view.” The report also addresses process, envisioning an “open and honest discussion between faculty members and administrators, which would lead to consensus; if no consensus is possible, then compromise is the preferred outcome. If disagreement persists, each party should be willing to explain and reconsider its opinion” (2001:3). The 1985 *Collegiality* report enumerates a sequence of actions and behaviors that should take place as a proposed change works its way through the governance process. In terms of faculty decisions, for example, “administrators should decide contrary to faculty recommendations only if there is clear indication of violation of system or campus policies or clear indication that the faculty committee failed to consider relevant information.” *Collegiality* is fairly precise in identifying various aspects of the process of shared governance. (2001:5)

**The report presents specific recommendations for implementing authentic shared governance.** The report discusses 30 specific recommendations in detail (2001: 10-14). The first dozen are:

- 1) During the workload study process, address the importance of participation in shared governance activities and how this relates to workload issues.
- 2) Clarify and publicize existing policy and agreements on the appropriate roles of the Senate and the Union. Should this not be adequate, form a tripartite committee to explore ways to reduce harmful confusion.