



University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	12-13-39
Title:	An Assessment of Shared Governance at the University of Maryland
Presenter:	Devin Ellis Chair, Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee
Date of SEC Review:	January 24, 2014
Voting (highlight one):	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or 2. In a single vote 3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	<p>The Senate Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee has made many recommendations on various issues related to shared governance practices and standards since the last Plan of Organization Review. In preparation for the current review, the ERG Committee suggested that a broad review of current practices may be valuable in bringing information and concerns to the Plan of Organization Review Committee (PORC). On February 8, 2013, the SEC charged the ERG Committee with conducting a thorough review of shared governance practices at the University of Maryland (UMD) and making any appropriate recommendations to the Plan of Organization Review Committee on improving shared governance at the University.</p>
Relevant Policy # & URL:	<p>Plan of Organization for the University of Maryland http://www.senate.umd.edu/governingdocs/Plan_of_Organization.pdf Policy on Shared Governance in the University System of Maryland http://www.usmh.usmd.edu/regents/bylaws/SectionI/I600.html</p>
Recommendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ERG Committee recommends that information about shared governance bodies and opportunities to participate in shared governance at UMD be kept in a central and readily accessible location so that members of the campus community who are interested in participating in governance can be directed to opportunities at the College and Divisional levels. - The ERG Committee recommends that the Plan of Organization should reference additional shared governance bodies that play a significant role in governance and decision-making at the University, as formal recognition of the impact these bodies have. The committee recommends that PORC consider any appropriate changes to the Plan to reflect the roles these bodies have at the University.

	<p>- The ERG Committee recommends that PORC consider articulating principles in the Plan of Organization regarding the importance of record-keeping in shared governance bodies. In particular, the committee recommends the Plan state that bodies that engage in financial decision-making should be held to higher standards and should keep records wherever possible, unless overriding concerns prevent records from being kept.</p>
<p>Committee Work:</p>	<p>The ERG Committee began discussing its charge in February 2013, and a subcommittee was tasked with identifying pertinent points of information necessary to study the current practices and procedures related to shared governance. It drafted questionnaires to be distributed to deans and Vice Presidents at the University to inquire into practices in each College and Division. In April 2013, the committee met with the Director of Assessment from the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) to discuss gathering information from the campus community. The committee agreed that a campus-wide survey on shared governance would likely not be effective, and decided to focus its efforts on disseminating the questionnaires developed by the subcommittee.</p> <p>The ERG Committee distributed its questionnaires in August 2013, and it reviewed responses throughout the fall semester. In its review, the committee found that there are a myriad of opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to participate in institutional governance, both in the Colleges and in each Division at UMD. While the committee expected opportunities to exist in the Colleges, it was encouraged by the extent of opportunity in the Divisions as well, and noted that while the membership of these bodies are generally not elected, they are generally representative of all constituencies and provide meaningful input to the Division. The committee found that there are a small number of shared governance bodies at UMD that discuss financial or personnel matters in some way, and found that for the most part, shared governance bodies usually do keep records in some way.</p> <p>In December 2013, the committee agreed upon information to be shared in its report, and voted to approve three recommendations related to standards and practices of shared governance at UMD.</p>
<p>Alternatives:</p>	<p>The Plan of Organization Review Committee could reject the recommendations and retain the current practices and Plan of Organization language related to shared governance participation and principles.</p>
<p>Risks:</p>	<p>There are no associated risks.</p>
<p>Financial Implications:</p>	<p>There are no direct financial implications, but implementation of the</p>

	recommendation related to information storage may incur some costs.
Further Approvals Required:	If the Plan of Organization Review Committee (PORC) incorporates these recommendations into the revised Plan of Organization (Plan), they will be included in the final Plan that is submitted for approval by the University Senate, Campus Referendum, and the President.

Senate Elections, Representation, & Governance Committee

Senate Document 12-13-39

An Assessment of Shared Governance at the University of Maryland

January 2014

BACKGROUND

In January 2013, the Senate Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee asked the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) to charge it with reviewing shared governance practices across campus, in preparation for the upcoming review of the University of Maryland Plan of Organization. The ERG Committee noted that since the last review of the Plan of Organization, it had made many recommendations on various issues related to shared governance practices and standards, and suggested that a thoughtful and broad review of current practices may be valuable in bringing information and concerns to the Plan of Organization Review Committee (PORC) in the 2013-2014 academic year. On February 8, 2013, the SEC charged the ERG Committee (Appendix 3) with conducting a thorough review of shared governance practices at the University of Maryland (UMD) and making any appropriate recommendations to the Plan of Organization Review Committee on improving shared governance at the University.

COMMITTEE WORK

The ERG Committee began its review of the charge (Appendix 3) on February 21, 2013. The committee discussed the charge and formed a subcommittee to begin planning while the committee focused on completing its previous charges prior to the end of the spring semester.

The subcommittee began its work by discussing various points of data it would like to collect and how it could collect the information needed. The subcommittee noted that shared governance bodies in Colleges and Schools can be found in each College Plan of Organization, and discussed ways to determine whether those bodies operate according to the specifications of the Plan, whether they follow standard practices understood by the ERG Committee to be central to the principles of shared governance, and whether additional bodies exist outside of Plans of Organization that have an impact on shared governance as well. In discussing practices beyond Colleges and Schools, the subcommittee recognized its lack of understanding related to practices in Divisions, and determined that it could learn about higher-level bodies by querying the Vice Presidents regarding the practices within each Division at the University as well.

The subcommittee identified a number of factors it considered important to the assessment, and began crafting questionnaires to capture the scope of its inquiry. It decided to formulate a draft and request feedback from the full committee, as well as from a few administrators who work closely with the Senate.

The subcommittee also discussed whether the committee should attempt to gather feedback from the broader University community on its views of how shared governance operates at UMD. The subcommittee brainstormed ideas, such as running a campus-wide survey, reaching out specifically to various bodies (such as College Assemblies, the Student Government Association [SGA], the Graduate Student Government [GSG], or others) that provide an avenue for constituent input on the operation of different aspects of the University, and querying members of the University Senate.

In considering a campus-wide survey, the subcommittee spoke with the Director of Assessment in the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA), and invited her to speak with the full ERG Committee in April 2013 to have a broader discussion on the feasibility, intended purpose, and appropriateness of such a survey. In its initial discussions, the subcommittee learned that the technical and practical hurdles to launching a survey would not be insurmountable. However, it also learned that the most important point in launching a survey is to know what big question the survey is meant to answer. The committee discussed this point in depth at its meetings in April and May 2013.

In May 2013, the committee discussed the technical details related to survey design. The committee learned that it would likely expect a very low response rate from a survey on shared governance, lower than the rate seen in most University surveys, which fall between 10 and 30 percent. After much discussion of the issues involved, the committee agreed that creating a survey related to shared governance feedback would likely not yield encouraging results, because of a lack of a meaningful response rate, and that it would be difficult to determine what the committee would want to accomplish from such a survey.

Shared Governance Questionnaires

In the fall of 2013, the committee focused on gathering information on shared governance practices in each College, School, and Division of the University. In August 2013, the ERG Committee distributed questionnaires to each Dean and Vice President to request information about shared governance bodies. The committee felt such a broad inquiry would yield a great deal of information related to the status of shared governance at UMD.

In its questionnaires for Colleges and Schools, the ERG Committee asked each dean to provide information on the councils, committees, advisory groups, and other bodies within the College or School which are specifically designed to provide input from faculty, staff, and students on the operations and direction of the College. The committee asked that each College provide information for bodies enumerated in the College Plan of Organization, but also for any additional bodies not included in the College Plan. The committee specified that its scope did not include inquiry into bodies composed exclusively of faculty administrators or other administrative bodies whose purpose is to assist in the practical functions of the College. The questionnaires requested information on:

- The frequency of meetings for each body;
- Whether agendas are kept for each body, and where and for how long they are retained;
- Whether minutes are kept for each body, and where and for how long they are retained;
- Whether records of votes taken by each body are kept, and where and for how long any materials or other such documentation of items approved by the body are kept;
- How recommendations from each body are transmitted to the Dean of the College, and where the records of those recommendations are kept;
- Whether each body has staff support from the Dean's Office or from another source in the College;
- Which bodies, if any, consider personnel matters;
- Which bodies, if any, consider budget matters;
- The current membership of each body; and
- The current staff and student representatives on the College Assembly.

Likewise, the ERG Committee asked each Vice President to provide similar information on bodies in the Divisions which are specifically designed to provide input from faculty, staff, and students on the operation of any part of the Division. The questionnaires requested information on:

- The composition of each body, in terms of how many members from each constituent group serve on each body;
- Who or what created each body and gave it its charge (for example, was the body created by the Vice President or did it originate from a policy requirement, etcetera);
- Whether each body had been created under the current Vice President or a previous Vice President;
- How the members of each body are chosen;
- Whether each body has any written documents detailing its composition and/or operation;
- Whether each body was charged with giving input on personnel matters;
- Whether each body was charged with giving input on financial matters;
- The frequency of meetings for each body;
- Whether agendas are kept for each body, and where and for how long they are retained;
- Whether minutes are kept for each body, and where and for how long they are retained;
- Whether records of votes taken by each body are kept, and where and for how long any materials or other such documentation of items approved by the body are kept;
- How recommendations from each body are transmitted to the appropriate administrator, and where the records of those recommendations are kept;
- Whether each body has staff support from the Division; and
- Which of the bodies included, if any, are considered by the Division to fall under the definition of shared governance outlined in the Board of Regents Policy on Shared Governance in the University System of Maryland.

During the fall of 2013, the ERG Committee reviewed responses to its questionnaires and examined the broad picture presented related to the scope of shared governance at the University. It then categorized responses to examine trends across Colleges and Divisions in relation to specific questions. A brief overview of the information received is included in Appendix 1 of this report.

Findings

In its review of the questionnaires, the ERG Committee identified points of information it finds relevant to the assessment of the current state of shared governance and provides these points below. The committee notes, however, that any numbers or trends calculated using the information provided in the questionnaires are only an approximation – the committee did not undertake a scientific or methodologically sound study, and its ability to draw conclusions is somewhat constrained by the data received. The committee provides this information for education and general understanding, but acknowledges that there may be deficits in its understanding based on the responses received.

Opportunities for Participation

The most encouraging point showed by the data reviewed was in relation to the sheer scope of shared governance and number of opportunities to participate in institutional decision-making. As an approximation, the ERG Committee finds that there are over 400 opportunities to participate in shared governance through the University Senate alone (found by adding the number of total seats on the Senate and on each Senate committee). The information provided by the Colleges, Schools, and Divisions indicates that there are at least 1200 opportunities to participate in shared governance bodies within Divisions. Also, without accounting for participation in College Assemblies (which are required by the

UMD Plan of Organization), there are at least 645 additional opportunities to participate in governance within Colleges and Schools.

In reviewing the opportunities shown, the ERG Committee discussed a general, anecdotal impression that the campus community does not always have appropriate expectations and perceptions in relation to shared governance. Members shared comments and opinions from colleagues and community members suggesting that shared governance is not effective and does not allow enough opportunity for meaningful participation. The information gathered from the questionnaires at the very least shows there are a wide variety of opportunities to be involved in shared governance at every level of the University. The committee also discussed the difference between formal governance guided by written documents and expectations, and lower-level governance that provides important input in a way that is representative but not as formalized. The committee was interested to learn that in looking at both types of governance opportunities, there seems to be more than adequate opportunities for meaningful participation in institutional direction-setting and policy-making by all constituencies. The committee did note, however, that it cannot be sure how well these opportunities are publicized and made available to the constituencies, or whether these opportunities yield diverse participation from year to year.

What is Shared Governance?

In its questionnaires, the ERG Committee made a distinction between bodies that are defined as a part of shared governance and those that are not. The ERG Committee considers as a part of shared governance the Senate, University Councils, and bodies within Colleges with a majority of elected members whose purpose is to provide an opportunity for the constituency to provide input on the direction of the College. These and other College-level bodies are provided for in the UMD Plan of Organization, either directly or through the provisions related to College and School Plans of Organization. In addition, the Policy on Shared Governance in the University System of Maryland (USM) (I – 6.00) (Appendix 2) states that shared governance should be implemented at all levels of the University and that each institution should in particular ensure that these principles are appropriately implemented in all administrative units.

In its review, the ERG Committee found that the principles of shared governance are indeed implemented beyond the Senate and beyond College-level bodies. The committee asked for information on College-level bodies not articulated in the College Plan of Organization, in order to determine the full extent of shared governance in Colleges even beyond what is stated in Plans. The committee also asked the Vice Presidents to identify, for each Division-level body, whether they believe the body to be a shared governance entity as defined and governed by the USM policy. At the Division level, there are a great many bodies that are considered to be a part of shared governance by the Division. In many cases, these bodies do not have elected memberships, but are representative of all constituencies and provide meaningful input on substantive issues in the Division. The ERG Committee was interested to see how much is considered to be shared governance, outside of what is stated in UMD Plan of Organization, and encouraged to see the extent to which administrators have committed to implementing the basic principles of shared governance in the Divisions.

Participation within Colleges and Schools

Prior to beginning its inquiry, the ERG Committee had a basic understanding of the types of bodies included in College-level deliberations because of its work with reviewing and approving College Plans of Organization. However, this charge gave the committee an opportunity to look more broadly at bodies and practices across all Colleges, instead of focusing on the minute details associated with one College.

The committee understood from its work with Plans of Organization that each College would have a College Assembly that includes some form of representation of staff and students, along with all faculty

in the College. In reviewing the information provided, the committee found that the use of the College Assembly varies. In some cases, the Assembly meets once a year for a “State of the College” presentation, whereas in others, the Assembly meets monthly and votes on resolutions or recommendations to be forwarded to the Dean.

In general, beyond the College Assembly, Colleges and Schools across the University provide opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to participate through a myriad of other shared governance bodies. While understanding that each College has its own needs, the ERG Committee noticed that the number of opportunities to participate vary widely between colleges. Committee members noted, for instance, that a very large College in some cases may not have nearly as many opportunities as a much smaller College. The committee found these differences interesting, although the committee did not presume to judge whether one situation is more appropriate than the other, as the committee has little understanding of the day to day needs of each College and School involved.

In examining the information provided more closely, the committee hypothesized that perhaps some differences between Colleges could be partially attributed to the ERG Committee’s changes in the past few years related to standard practices for shared governance bodies. As it has been reviewing Plans of Organization, the ERG Committee has also been fine-tuning its standards and the rigor it applies to its reviews of Plans as well. The committee noted differences in Plans last approved in the early 2000s and Plans approved in the last one to two years, and suggested that perhaps the increase in opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to participate and for the increase in procedural details related to the operation of the bodies in various Colleges may in part be related to the committee’s work to encourage such in more recent Plans of Organization.

Participation within Divisions

The ERG Committee was very interested in the responses it received regarding shared governance in each Division at the University. While it was clear that Colleges and Schools would have opportunities to participate, it was much less clear to the committee what would be reported in regards to the activity outside of Colleges. Whereas College governance is guided by the Plan of Organization for the University and that of the College, Divisions and Offices operating outside of Colleges and Schools do not have such detailed structures for the implementation of shared governance. The committee was pleased to see the extent of representative participation across all Divisions of the University.

Participation in Financial or Personnel Matters

The USM Policy on Shared Governance (Appendix 2) states that faculty, staff, and students have the ability to participate in decision-making related to a wide range of issues, including budget priorities, and policies and procedures relating to personnel issues, while also noting that institutional leaders have final decision-making authority in these and all other matters. Notwithstanding this statement of policy, the ERG Committee did not expect to find a great deal of participation among shared governance bodies in these types of decisions.

Despite its expectations, the committee did find some evidence, both in Colleges and in Divisions, of bodies that discuss financial or personnel matters. By its estimation, there are approximately twenty shared governance bodies across campus that discuss personnel matters (this number does not include College APT Committees, since each College is required to have such bodies as well), and approximately forty bodies that discuss financial or budget matters. The nature of engagement in financial matters for these bodies varies, from being informed about large expenditures to reviewing and approving budgets. Participation in personnel matters likely ranges as well, although the information provided is not specific enough to illustrate this point.

Record-Keeping in Shared Governance Bodies

The ERG Committee asked many questions to ascertain whether the bodies under consideration keep records. As a general standard, the committee encourages that shared governance bodies ought to keep records (in the form of agendas, minutes, and documentation related to items approved or rejected) so as to encourage openness and accountability in decision-making as well as to create institutional memory for those involved with the body. In its review, the committee found that in most cases, bodies do keep records in some form and retain them for an appropriate period of time. The committee recognizes that there are instances where confidentiality is necessary and situations where candid deliberation is required, but wherever possible encourages adequate record keeping.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The ERG Committee presents the above to provide context and information to the Senate Executive Committee and to the Plan of Organization Review Committee. In addition, the ERG Committee offers the following recommendations for consideration:

- 1) The ERG Committee recommends that information about shared governance bodies and opportunities to participate in shared governance at UMD be kept in a central and readily accessible location so that members of the campus community who are interested in participating in governance can be directed to opportunities at the College and Divisional levels.

The ERG Committee finds that shared governance is a vast enterprise at the University of Maryland, and is encouraged to find so many opportunities for all constituencies to participate in institutional decision-making and deliberation. However, the committee also feels that most members of the University community are unaware of how many opportunities there are to become engaged with shared governance and contribute to the University in a meaningful way. The committee believes that more emphasis ought to be placed on disseminating information on the existing opportunities to become engaged, and feels that a step in this direction would be to have one location to house information on opportunities at the Senate, College, and Divisional levels. The committee believes that a central repository of information will broaden awareness and lead to a higher diversity of participation at all levels of the University.

- 2) The ERG Committee recommends that the Plan of Organization should reference additional shared governance bodies that play a significant role in governance and decision-making at the University, as formal recognition of the impact these bodies have. The committee recommends that PORC consider any appropriate changes to the Plan to reflect the roles these bodies have at the University.

The ERG Committee is concerned that a great proportion of the exercise of shared governance is not actively recognized by the Plan of Organization and therefore is not always viewed as important to shared governance at UMD. The committee feels that a large number of opportunities to provide input at the University are not articulated as a part of shared governance by the Plan of Organization, and recommends altering this in the current revisions to the Plan. There are many bodies with high importance and participation, that consider themselves to be a part of shared governance and serve a valuable purpose to the direction of the University that PORC could consider referencing in the Plan. As examples, the committee suggests considering the SGA and the GSG for reference, as these bodies provide significant quality participation for students in deliberation and decision-making, and as these bodies are engaged at all levels of the University through ex-officio appointments across campus. In addition, bodies operating within the Divisions that have a significant impact on financial matters, like the Committee for the

Review of Student Fees (CRSF), may also be candidates for consideration because of the unique impact they have on financial decision-making.

- 3) The ERG Committee recommends that PORC consider articulating principles in the Plan of Organization regarding the importance of record-keeping in shared governance bodies. In particular, the committee recommends the Plan state that bodies that engage in financial decision-making should be held to higher standards and should keep records wherever possible, unless overriding concerns prevent records from being kept.

Throughout its review, the ERG Committee noted with interest the level of record-keeping that various bodies engage in. In reviewing the data provided to the committee on bodies that engage in financial decision making, the committee found that there are cases in which these bodies do not keep records. The committee recognizes that record-keeping can in some cases hinder candid deliberation, and recognizes the administrative burden record-keeping can cause, but notes that as a matter of principle, for bodies that engage in financial decision-making, records are a critical part of shared governance. The committee recommends that PORC consider articulating as a principle of shared governance that wherever possible, records of important decisions should be kept.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – ERG Committee Overview of Questionnaire Data

Appendix 2 – Policy on Shared Governance in the University System of Maryland

Appendix 3 – University Senate Executive Committee Charge on Assessment of Shared Governance

APPENDIX 1 - ERG COMMITTEE OVERVIEW OF QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

College	AGNR	ARCH	ARHU	BMGT	BSOS	CMNS	EDUC	ENGR	JOUR	INFO	SPHL	PUAF	LIBR		
Plan of Organization last approved	2009	2000	2004	1995*	2013	2010	2012	2006	2013	2010	2012	2013	2013		
Number of bodies in the Plan designed to provide input on operation of the College?	4	6	1	9	5	8			12		6	5	3	total:	59
Bodies charged with personnel matters?	5	1	0	0	0	0			1		0	1	4	total:	12
Bodies charged with budget matters?	5	2	1	0	0	0			1		1	0	4	total:	14
Number of bodies NOT in Plan but provide input to the Dean?	3	2	2	8	0	1			1		1	0	2	total:	20
Approx. Number of Opportunities:	99	49	47	61	57	22			101		86		123		
Division	UGST	GRAD	Provost	VPAF	DivIT	VPR	VPSA	VPUR							
Number of bodies designed to provide input on operation?	42	3	28	5	5	1	10	2	total:	96					
Bodies charged with personnel matters?	7	0		0	1		0	0	total:	8					
Bodies charged with budget matters?	10	2		2	3	1	6	2	total:	26					
Approx. Number of Elected Opportunities:	0	39		0			68	45							
Approx. Number of Opportunities:	285	67	244	48	296	13	141	109							
Senate	Senate	APAS	Campus Affairs	Com on Com	Ed Affairs	EDI	ERG	FAC	Gen Ed	Nom Com	PCC	SEC	Staff Affairs	Student Affairs	Student Conduct
Number of opportunities to participate:	195	21	21	11	27	23	16	18	21	9	18	18	30	29	11

* Senate approval in 1995, but updated by BMGT in 2000, 2010, 2011.

	Senate	Division	College/Schools	Total
Approximate No. of Opportunities	468	1203	645	2316
Overall No. of Bodies Providing Input	15	96	79	190
Overall No. of Bodies Charged with Personnel Issues	0	8	12	20
Overall No. of Bodies Charged with Budget Issues	0	26	14	40

**APPENDIX 2 - POLICY ON SHARED GOVERNANCE
IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND**



UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

I - 6.00 POLICY ON SHARED GOVERNANCE IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

(Approved by the Board of Regents October 4, 1996; Amended on August 25, 2000)

I. PURPOSE

The University System of Maryland (USM) consists of 13 institutions with distinct but complementary missions. The Board of Regents recognizes the distinct and complementary roles that the Regents, the Chancellor, the Presidents, other administrators, the faculty, the staff, and students have in governing the USM institutions.

Moreover, the Board also recognizes that as higher education changes and evolves, implementation of the fundamental principles of shared governance set forth below must also continue to evolve.

This policy affirms the Board's commitment to these fundamental principles, which shall guide the development of institution-specific shared governance practices consistent with this policy.

II. PRINCIPLES

- A. Final authority and responsibility for the welfare of the USM and its institutions rests with the Board of Regents. The Board may delegate to the Chancellor and the Presidents portions of that authority for the purpose of assuring the effective management of the System and its institutions.
- B. Shared governance procedures and principles apply at all levels within the USM.
- C. Shared governance requires informed participation and collaboration by faculty, students, staff, and administrators.
- D. Faculty, staff, and students shall have opportunities to participate, appropriate to their special knowledge and expertise, in decisions that relate to:
 - 1. Mission and budget priorities for the University System of Maryland and its constituent institutions;
 - 2. Curriculum, course content, and instruction;
 - 3. Research;

4. Appointment, promotion, and tenure of all faculty members and the development of policies that affect faculty welfare generally;
 5. Development of human resources policies and procedures for exempt and non-exempt staff;
 6. Selection and appointment of administrators;
 7. Issues that affect the ability of students to complete their education; and
 8. Other issues that arise from time to time that affect the overall welfare of the USM and/or its institutions.
- E. While some members of shared governance bodies may be appointed, the substantial majority should be elected by their constituencies. Such bodies should elect their own presiding officers.

III. PRACTICE

- A. Each USM institution shall have in place written procedures and formal structures that provide for appropriate collaboration and communication between and among administration, faculty, staff, and students. The structures and procedures shall be developed cooperatively, disseminated widely prior to adoption, and reviewed periodically according to procedures and timelines established in the documents governing institutional practice.
- B. Each constituent institution within the USM shall have either a single shared governance body for the institution as a whole, or separate bodies for faculty, staff, and students. At least 75% of the voting members shall be elected by their constituencies. This percentage shall not apply to paragraph G. below. These bodies shall have written bylaws and shall meet regularly.
- C. Each institution shall define the subject matter appropriate for faculty, staff, and/or student participation in the shared governance process.

The definitions shall recognize:

1. The responsibility of administrators for forming and articulating a vision for the institution, for providing strategic leadership, and for managing its human resources, finances, and operations;
2. The central role of the faculty in the institution's teaching, research, and outreach programs, including the assessment of the quality of these activities through peer review;

3. The essential support provided by staff in facilitating the institution's operations and the legitimate interest of the staff in participating in the development of policies and procedures that affect them and the welfare of their institutions;
 4. That students are the institution's main academic educational focus and that they have a legitimate interest in matters affecting their ability to complete their education, including but not limited to costs, grading, and housing; and
 5. That there is a role for each group in the search for and selection of key institutional administrators.
- D. Institutional structures and procedures for shared governance shall address the role of non-tenured and non-tenure track, part-time, adjunct, and other faculty ranks as established by Regents' policy, as well as other employees on long-term contracts.
- E. The Presidents and other institution-wide administrators shall consult regularly with the institution's elected representative body or bodies. This consultation will be in accordance with accountability plans developed collaboratively by the participants. These accountability plans shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Regents. The Presidents shall report annually to the Chancellor on the implementation of these accountability plans, and the Chancellor in turn shall report to the Board.
- F. The Chancellor and other System administrators shall consult regularly with the legislatively-mandated, System-wide representative bodies. The Chancellor shall report annually to the Board on the status of these consultations.
- G. The Presidents shall assure that shared governance, based upon the principles and practices in this policy, is appropriately implemented in all sub-units, and are accountable for assuring that other administrators follow them in unit-level deliberations.
- H. Effective implementation of shared governance shall be a component of evaluations of the Chancellor, the Presidents, and other administrators as designated by the Chancellor for the USM Office, and by the President for the institutions.
- I. In keeping with Principle II.C., all participants share with their Presidents and the USM leadership responsibility for:
1. Being informed on issues that confront higher education, the USM, and the institutions;
 2. Acting within time constraints that are imposed by external agencies and influences, sometimes with little or no notice;
 3. Sharing appropriate information and providing timely


feedback;

4. Recognizing the specific goals and needs of the institution, and being accountable to the constituencies represented; and
 5. Distinguishing the roles played by various units and individuals in decision making and administration.
- J. Given the dynamic nature of institutional governance, it is understood
1. That there may be occasions when institutional leaders must act in the best interest of the institution on major issues affecting the institutional constituencies without full benefit of the shared governance process. In such cases the representative bodies shall be informed in a timely manner and have an opportunity to comment on the issues.
 2. That administrators shall inform important constituencies in a timely manner if they choose to disregard, in whole or in part, the advice and recommendation of constituencies, and they should provide the reasons for their decision. In these cases, the shared governance body may, if it so chooses, present a written statement of its position and/or any objections to the decision as part of the institution's or unit's record on the issue.
- K. Faculty and staff who do not hold administrative appointments, and all students, may express their opinions freely on all shared governance matters without retaliation. Administrators, including faculty holding administrative appointments, may also express their opinions freely during policy discussions, without retaliation, but once a decision is reached they are expected to support and implement policy as determined by the institutional leadership.
- L. Shared governance requires a commitment of resources and time from the USM institutions. Each institution shall provide a proper level of resources, as determined by the President, to faculty, staff, and students to allow them to carry out their shared governance responsibilities effectively.
- M. While participation in governance by faculty, staff, and students is necessary and important for the well-being of the USM and its institutions, the final responsibility for decision-making rests with institutional Presidents, the Chancellor, or the Board of Regents, who are ultimately held accountable by the public and its elected leaders.

**APPENDIX 3 - SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CHARGE
ON THE ASSESSMENT OF SHARED GOVERNANCE**



**University Senate
CHARGE**

Date:	February 8, 2013
To:	Devin Ellis Chair, Elections, Representation, & Governance (ERG) Committee
From:	Martha Nell Smith  Chair, University Senate
Subject:	Assessment of Shared Governance
Senate Document #:	12-13-39
Deadline:	December 15, 2013

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) requests that the Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee conduct a thorough review of shared governance practices across our campus in order to provide insight for the upcoming Plan of Organization Review process.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Review shared governance bodies at the College and Unit levels across disciplines.
2. Review the implementation of shared governance at other University System of Maryland (USM) institutions.
3. Consider the various shared governance bodies at our institution and how they interact with one another.
4. Consult with the Senate Parliamentarian as necessary.
5. If appropriate, make recommendations to the Plan of Organization Review Committee on how shared governance can be improved on our campus.

We ask that you submit your report and recommendations to the Senate Office no later than December 15, 2013. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.