2001 Survey on Higher Education Governance

Sponsored by
The American Association of University Professors
&
The American Conference of Academic Deans



INSTRUCTIONS:

This survey, sponsored by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the American Conference of Academic Deans (ACAD), will record existing governance practices at higher education institutions in the United States. The survey has been distributed to the roughly 1500 colleges and universities accredited to grant four-year bachelor's degrees in the liberal arts. We have contacted both the president of the institution and representatives of the faculty and have asked them to complete the survey. The information provided by your institution will be kept **confidential** and will be released only to authorized scholars who are conducting studies of governance and who agree to promise full confidentiality for all institutional participants. We assure you that the information you file as part of this survey will never be released on an individual or institutional basis. No school will be identifiable nor will it be possible for anyone to review any summary study that would identify a particular institution in the survey.

If you would like a copy of a report that will allow you to compare your institution's governance practices with those of a peer group of institutions, you may indicate this at the end of the questionnaire, and a report will be mailed to you at the conclusion of the survey study.

Reminder: The survey is available online and can be filled out easily and filed electronically by pointing your web browser to (*i.e. type the text below into the location toolbar of your browser*):

http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/2001survey/

<u>Administrators</u>: Please fill out both parts of the survey.

<u>Faculty representatives</u>: You are asked to fill out only Part II of the survey.

RESPONDENT INFORMATION (BEGIN HERE)

Please provide the following information:

	Your Name	
	Your Title	
	Name of the Institution	
	Your E-mail	
	Please enter the survey code provided with your packet	
En	ter your institution's FICE Code in the space provided (<i>Note</i> : you can find your FICE code on the letter provided with your survey page	ket)

If questions arise while filling out this questionnaire, please write, call or email:

Gabriel Kaplan
The Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations
Harvard University
79 JFK St., BT-220B
Cambridge, MA 02138
Phone: (617) 495-4874

Email: gekaplan@fas.harvard.edu



PART I. SURVEY ON GOVERNANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The chief executive of the campus should complete this section of the survey or should designate someone from the executive office who can most accurately and easily provide the requested information. Most generally this will be a senior member of the provost's office or the campus director of the office of institutional research.

1. Please indicate the campus president's highest academic degree (<i>non-honorary</i> , <i>e.g. Ph.D.</i> , <i>M.B.A</i> , <i>J.D.</i> , <i>etc.</i>) and the field in which it was awarded:				
(Degree)	(Field of Degree)			
direct oversight and responsibility for the institu addressed. Even if your campus uses a different	ent will be used to refer to the individual charged with tion/campus, the individual to whom this survey was term or if there is a chief executive of the broader mean the chief executive of this institution/campus.			
 Before entering the administration, did the curre academic department, either at this institution or an ☐ Yes ☐ No 				
3. How many presidents has this institution had in (PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS PROCEED TO				
4. (Answer this question only if this institution is often and most directly on institutional matters with □ a) a statewide governing board with authori □ b) a system-wide board with authority overa □ c) the institution's own campus based board	ty over all public colleges in the state. all public colleges of a particular type.			
NOTE: For all subsequent questions that refer to the board you indicated here.	o the governing board , please answer with regard to			
5. (Answer this question {all parts of #5} only if the	his institution is a <u>public</u> institution)			
 i) Faculty at this institution are considered to be em □ a) the state or commonwealth □ b) the institution 	aployees of:			
ii) Tuition levels are set □ a) by the institution or by the governing boat □ b) by a system board □ c) by a state board or body responsible for at □ d) by the legislature or governor □ e) other	•			

(iii) Revenues from tuition paid by students are:
 □ a) retained by the institution for its use □ b) retained at the state level under the control of a state governing or coordinating board □ c) deposited in separate state tuition accounts from which funds must be appropriated before they can be spent
☐ d) deposited into the state's general funds, with return to higher education only inferred ☐ e) other
 iv) State funding for the institution is distributed to the institution by □ a) the state legislature and governor directly □ b) a state education board or body that passes on funding from the legislature □ c) a system board that passes on money from either the legislature or a state board
6. i) The institution's governing board meets times a year.
ii) The executive committee of the governing board meets times a year (answer only if your board has an executive committee; you may provide an estimate if exec-comm meetings are irregular).
7. Is the campus president a voting member of the governing board? ☐ Yes ☐ No
8. How are voting members of the governing board chosen? (<i>Please select all that apply</i>) a) Selected by the current governing board (self perpetuating) b) Nominated and confirmed by the Governor, other state officials and/or bodies c) Alumni election - a vote among alumni of the institution d) Internal election - members of the institutional community (such as faculty, staff and/or students) vote e) Outside election - a vote among people not directly associated with the institution f) Selected by the president of the institution g) Selected by a church body h) Other
9. i) How many members are currently on the governing board?
ii) Is the total number of board members prescribed in the institutional by-laws or charter?☐ Yes ☐ No
iii) Are there trustees with full voting privileges selected from the faculty, staff and/or student body on the governing board? □ Yes □ No
iv) If yes, how many voting board members are students?
v) If yes , how many voting board members are members of the faculty?
vi) Has the policy regarding faculty or student membership changed in the last 10 years and, if so, in what direction was the change? □ a) A decrease in student and/or faculty representation on the board □ b) No change □ c) An increase in faculty and/or student representation

10. Do the faculty at this institution organize and bargain collectively with the administration or board over employment contracts (e.g. through a union)? ☐ Yes ☐ No IF YOU ANSWERED YES, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS; IF NOT PROCEED TO QUESTION 11.
i) In what year did collective bargaining at this institution start?
ii) With whom does the faculty bargaining agent primarily negotiate on contract matters? ☐ a) The governing board of the institution ☐ b) A state or system level body ☐ c) The campus administration
iii) Are faculty leaders in collective bargaining allowed to serve in leadership positions in internal governance? □ Yes □ No
11. i) Are salary <u>levels</u> of tenured and tenure-track faculty based on a standard schedule or determined or an individual basis? a) standard schedule b) individual cases c) both standard and individual
ii) Are salary <u>increases</u> of tenured and tenure-track faculty awarded across the board according to a schedule or formula, such as a COLA or cost of living increase, or are they determined on an individual, case by case basis? □ a) standard schedule □ b) individual cases □ c) both standard and individual (<i>i.e. both COLA</i> 's and case by case merit)
iii) Does the institution compare the salary levels of its faculty to those of peer institutions? □ Yes □ No
12. i) What is the average number of courses that full time, tenured and tenure track Arts & Sciences faculty are expected to teach each year? (If course loads vary by department and/or discipline or if some faculty teach sections of a course, please provide an estimate of the average number of courses or sections taught)
ii) Does this number vary by more than two courses across faculty members or departments or is it quite uniform? ☐ It varies ☐ It's uniform
13. i) Did faculty members from the institution serve on the most recent presidential search committee? ☐ Yes ☐ No
ii) Did students serve on this committee? □Yes □No

14. i) At your institution, what term describes the highest divisional unit in other words, the unit that reports directly to the president or provost (e.g. college; school; department; or other)?	
ii) How many such divisions (colleges, schools or departments as described above) are there at this institution?	
iii) What term describes the executive head of these units?	
iv) What is the average length, in years, that the heads of these academic units/divisions have served in this position at this institution?	
v) Does each unit have its own faculty governance structure bodies, meetings of the full faculty that participate in decisi making? <i>Do not count department level activities unless you question 16. i) above.</i>	ons or advise administrators on policy-
 15. Further describe the organization of budgetary and adminighest subdivisions (as described above) by selecting the refinancial authority: □ a) Each division has independent budgetary authority exclusively on revenue streams which it generates RCM, or "tubs on their own bottom"). □ b) Each division independently draws up and allocate operating revenues from a stream that is controlle □ c) Each division receives its budget from the central revenues. 	esponse which best describes the allocation of and responsibility, and relies almost is (i.e. Responsibility-Centered Management es its budget, but draws most of its general id by the central administration.
16. What percentage of your institution's endowment would estimate is restricted or, in other words, can be used only fo purposes specified by the donor?	•
17. i) Based on the evidence of the last few years, what percof the junior, tenure-track faculty who become employed at institution are subsequently promoted to tenure? <i>Note: we asking for the percentage of tenured or non-tenured faculty</i>	your are not
ii) How many times within the last 12 months has the presida dean, or the board not approved the tenure recommendation a faculty review/promotions committee and/or department?	

18. Has the president taken part in professional development activities designed for university or colleg presidents since appointment as the head of this institution? (e.g. leadership institutes, CEO trainings) ☐ Yes ☐ No
19. Does the board or administration review the performance of the institution (examine certain benchmarks, compare costs and offerings, consider the management practices) relative to a group of pee institutions? ☐ Yes ☐ No
20. i) Has this institution established a system of merit pay for faculty? ☐ Yes ☐ No
ii) Does the institution award tenure to some faculty members? ☐ Yes ☐ No
iii) Has the institution established a system of post-tenure review? ☐ Yes ☐ No
iv) Has the institution's board adopted a statement concerning academic freedom or incorporated a polic about academic freedom in the faculty handbook? ☐ Yes ☐ No
21. i) Does your institution have a strategic plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No
ii) Does your institution have a mission statement? ☐ Yes ☐ No
iii) If so, what are the three main objectives of your most recently completed strategic plan? If your institution does not have a strategic plan, list the three main objectives in your mission statement if you have one. If you do not have either, leave this blank.
1)
2)
3)



PART II: SURVEY ON HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE

<u>Administrators</u>: The campus chief executive/president or the person designated by the CEO/president to complete Part I should complete this section of the survey.

<u>Faculty representatives</u>: This section should be completed by the head of the faculty governance body or in some cases the head of the AAUP chapter on campus. Faculty may find that some questions go beyond the scope of their knowledge of the institution or require knowledge about parts of the institution with which they are less familiar. For this reason, we invite and encourage faculty respondents to work collaboratively with other faculty members from various parts of the institution to prepare the responses to this survey.

This part of the Year 2001 Survey of Governance is divided into two sections. Section A requests information about the institution's implementation of governance concepts. Section B investigates faculty participation in governance.

SECTION A. QUESTIONS REGARDING THE STRUCTURE OF GOVERNANCE

This part of the survey asks respondents to consider how the institution organizes decision-making and resolves governance issues.

1. In the last 20 years, has the institution taken steps to change the formal roles and authorized powers of the following groups involved in governance (either through a change in the by-laws, charter or handbook) and if so, in what direction was that change? (Answer only for cases where changes in authority were clearly specified by an official statement or policy for the institution.)

Group	More authority	No change	Less authority
Governing board			
President			
Deans and other heads of key divisions			
Department chairs			
Main governance bodies of the faculty			
State coordinating board for higher education			

Main governance bodies of the faculty			
State coordinating board for higher education			
2. Please use the following section to describe the governance:	e various ways facu	ulty at your instituti	on participate in
i) Do faculty members participate in governance faculty from across the campus? ☐ Yes ☐ No	by holding regular a	and formal meeting	s of the full
ii) Do faculty members participate in governance council that represents all faculty (and faculty on council comprised of faculty members, students, \[\subseteq \text{Yes}, \text{ they elect representatives to a facult} \] \[\subseteq \text{Yes}, \text{ they elect representatives to an instance.} \]	ly) at the institution staff, and/or others' ty senate (and facu itution-wide senate	n, or to an institution? ! !ty only)	n-wide senate or
☐ No, there is no institution-wide senate of iii) Are there divisional faculty senates, policy co	•	eetings of the full fa	aculty that serve as

for a College of Law or a School of Business)?

□ Yes □ No

the faculty's voice within a particular school, college or division within your institution (such as a senate

 iv) If your campus is part of a larger system, is there: □ a) a system-wide academic senate composed of faculty representatives drawn from each of the campuses in the system? □ b) a system-wide senate composed of students, staff, and faculty from each of the campuses in the system? □ b) there is no system-wide senate
v) Are there councils or committees whose members include faculty representatives in areas such as academic policy, budget matters, promotions, and/or employment policies that are considered part of the campus governance structure? ☐ Yes ☐ No
3. The main representative body(ies) of the faculty or the institutional community (<i>such as the senate(s)</i> ; or the regular meeting of the full faculty; or a faculty affairs committee) is(are) (Choose the response that best describes the situation in general if influence varies depending on the type of decision involved): □ a) an advisory body to the administration and/or the board that simply conveys faculty opinion a a reference point in decision making □ b) a policy influencing body which recommends and passes on to the administration and/or board policies they may decline or accept □ c) a policy making body which proposes and votes on policies or financial decisions that the
administration and board almost always adopt as a matter of course 4. Do administrators have a vote in meetings of the main representative bodies of the faculty such as a faculty senate? (if the institution has a number of divisions and administrators' roles vary across them, please answer according to the most common situation among the institution's divisions) □ Yes □ No
5. Does the president or a member of the administration (<i>e.g. a dean</i>) serve as the chair of the faculty governance body? ☐ Yes, the president chairs meetings of the faculty governance body ☐ Yes, an administrator chairs meetings of the faculty governance body ☐ No
 6. The primary means by which faculty members participate in governance, express their views to the administration, and/or shape policy is: □ a) At the departmental level through meetings and communication with departmental chairs □ b) At the division level through governance structures operating at the level of the school/college □ c) At the institutional level through institution-wide bodies of governance □ d) Through the faculty bargaining unit □ e) None of the above
7. How are faculty members who serve as representatives in institutional governance chosen? (<i>Please answer for the most significant representative body of the faculty. If the answer varies across divisions at the institution, indicate the most common situation among divisions.</i>) □ a) By the central administration □ b) By a vote of the full faculty at the institution □ c) By college or division faculty vote □ d) By the departmental chair □ e) By departmental vote □ f) Other/selection methods vary too much at our institution to give a general response

 8. Full voting rights in governance (either for deciding matters or electing representatives to all faculty: a) above a certain rank b) who have tenure c) who are tenure track or have tenure d) who are full time e) who are in the bargaining unit (for institutions with collective bargaining) f) all instructional faculty have full voting rights in governance 	s) are accorded
9. i) Would your institution pursue and try to hire an outside faculty member even if it measure faculty member would earn significantly more than colleagues in the department? \[\sum \text{Yes, we regularly do that} \] \[\sum \text{Occasionally, we will do that from time to time} \] \[\sum \text{No, we rarely do that} \]	ant that the
ii) Would there be significant pressure to raise salaries of the other faculty members in the ☐ Yes ☐ No	e department?
iii) If yes, would the institution respond by raising the salaries of other faculty in the depart of this pressure? □ a) very likely □ b) somewhat likely □ c) hard to say □ d) somewhat unlikely □ e) not likely at all	rtment because
10. i) In the last 5 years, has your institution closed an academic department or an academ ☐ Yes ☐ No	ic program?
ii) In the last 5 years, how many departments or academic programs have been closed or restructured so that they were merged into other departments?	
IF YOU ANSWERED YES TO QUESTION 10. i) ABOVE, ANSWER THESE TWO ADDIT QUESTIONS, OTHERWISE PROCEED TO QUESTION 11: iii) Please select the two factors that made the closure decision most difficult: □ a) Institution-wide faculty concerns about the closure □ b) Faculty resistance in that department □ c) Student concerns about the closure □ d) Alumni concerns about the closure □ e) Concerns that closure might violate tenure or academic freedom provisions □ f) Concerns about the public perception of this closure and damage to the institut	
iv) Please select the two factors that made the closure decision <u>most necessary</u> : a) Enrollment levels in the years preceding the decision b) Direction from the Board or an Administrator that the institution should re-oric c) Other institutions had closed or scaled back activities in this area d) Declining numbers of department faculty members and a deficiency of replace e) Faculty demands for resources in other fields and departments f) Student demands for resources in other areas of the institution	

11. Most major institutional changes that reare most frequently undertaken (<i>please ans</i> □ a) in response to decisions of the s □ b) in response to protests or organi □ c) in response to student demands □ d) none of the above	wer for the period s tudent representative zed petitions by act	ince 1985): ye body tivist students or stu	udent groups	es
12. In establishing budgets and making allohow deeply and actively?	ocations across depa	artments, the follow	ring parties participate)
Group	A great deal	Somewhat	Not at all	
Governing board				
President				
Deans and other heads of key divisions				
Department chairs				
Faculty at department level				
Faculty at institutional level				
Students				
13. Please rate the level to which faculty participate in governation across the institution take an interest and the properties of the pr	indicating that most nee and 5 indicating and participate in go the faculty groups in	st faculty ignore g that many faculty overnance. most involved in go		
 institution. Choose from the three options below to indicate your sense of the relations with the administration and board and the role played by faculty in governance: □ a) Cooperative – faculty work with the administration and board to resolve the tough choices facing the institution. □ b) Some conflict but collegial – faculty rarely see eye to eye on matters with the administration and board, but together they work towards policies all sides can live with. □ c) Generally suspicious & adversarial—the faculty see their governance function as a veto point over unpopular administrative action. 				

SECTION B: OUESTIONS REGARDING FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNANCE

Section B replicates questions from a 1970 survey on faculty participation in governance. We are interested in assessing how faculty participation has changed since that time.

The 1970 survey categorized five decision-making styles or approaches to governance in higher education, ranging from **faculty authority and determination** over an issue to **no faculty participation** in governance. It recognized that on some campuses some of the faculty might be in departments characterized by a good deal of faculty participation while in other divisions of the campus faculty would have little say in governance matters. For instance, faculty in a division of arts and science might participate a great deal in selecting department chairs but faculty in a school of business might participate only a little. The survey then asked institutions to estimate the percentage of faculty whose participation in governance could be categorized by these governance forms in each of a number of critical decision areas. The five decision types are briefly described below, however, a glossary defining these forms is included at the end of this survey. (See glossary note for a clarification on classifying joint committees)

Below you will find 15 items describing decisions regularly made on a campus. For each of the decisions listed, please indicate in the relevant box the percentage of faculty whose participation in the decision takes the form indicated. For each question, focus on the practice of the last 5 years. *Note* that the sum of the figures in each <u>row</u> should be 100% for questions 1-15.

Example: If in the selection of the department chair, 25% of the institution's faculty are in departments or divisions in which they elect the chair, 60% in departments or divisions with chairs appointed by the administration after consultation with faculty, and 15% in departments or divisions which have chairs appointed unilaterally by the administration, then the responses to this question would appear as follows:

	Determination	Joint Action	Consultation	Discussion	None
	Faculty	Between	Administration	Administration	No faculty
	authority and	faculty and	consults with	explains decisions	participation
	determination	administration	the faculty	to faculty	
10: Selection of department chair	25		60		15

For the purposes of this questionnaire, it is important that all respondents have the same understanding of the terms being used. Generally, department chairs should be counted as members of the administration rather than as faculty, especially for question 12. Even if these definitions do not agree with your own usage, please observe them faithfully. Although the order of the forms of participation listed here and on the questionnaire is in descending degree of faculty participation, it is not meant to imply that determination is considered more desirable than joint action or consultation.

	Faculty Status	Paculty authority and determination	Joint Action Between faculty and administration	Consultation Administration consults with the faculty	Discussion Administration explains policies taken to faculty	None No faculty participation
1	Appointments of full-time faculty					
2	Tenure promotions for faculty					
	Academic operation	Determination	Joint Action	Consultation	Discussion	None
3	Decisions about the content of the curriculum					
4	Setting degree requirements					

		Determination	Joint Action	Consultation	Discussion	None
		Faculty	Between	Administration	Administration	No faculty
		authority and	faculty and	consults with	explains	participation
	Academic planning and	determination	administration	the faculty	policies taken	participation
	Policy	4000		une meanty	to faculty	
5	Types of degrees offered					
	Relative sizes of the					
6	faculty of various					
	disciplines Construction programs for					
7	buildings and other					
′	facilities					
8	Setting of the average					
8	teaching loads					
	Selection of					
	Administrators and	D	T *	G 14 4*	D: .	N T
	Department Chair	Determination	Joint Action	Consultation	Discussion	None
9	Appointing the academic dean					
10	Appointing department					
10	chairs or heads					
	Einensiel Dleusius and					
	Financial Planning and Policy	Determination	Joint Action	Consultation	Discussion	None
	Setting faculty salary					- 1,0-10
11	scales					
	Decisions about individual					
12	faculty salaries (<i>refer to</i>					
12	dept. chairs in glossary)					
	Short range budgetary					
13	planning					
	Organization of faculty					
	agencies	Determination	Joint Action	Consultation	Discussion	None
	Decisions that establish					
14	the authority of faculty in					
	campus governance					
	Selecting members for					
15	institution-wide					
	committees, senate, and					
	similar agencies]				

Please feel free to elaborate on any responses you have given here or to submit any comments or clarifications you may have. You may attach additional sheets to this survey. Providing additional commentary is entirely optional. (**Note**: *The electronic version of the survey online facilitates this process by launching an email you can send with additional commentary to our survey facilitators*)

Please indicate if you would like to have a copy of a report allowing your institution to compare its
practices in these areas to those of a peer group upon the completion of this study.
☐ Yes, I would like a report ☐ No thank you

regarding your responses to this survey or if you wish to elaborate on any reply you have given. You may attach additional sheets if necessary. Feel free to provide comments on this survey so that we may				
improve future efforts in this area. (This step is entirely optional)				

Glossary of Terms Used

For reference purposes only

Determination: Determination means that the faculty of an academic unit or its duly authorized representatives have final legislative or operational authority with respect to the policy or action, and any other technically required approvals or concurrences are only pro forma.

Joint Action: Joint action means that formal agreement by both the faculty and other components of the institution is required for confirmatory action or policy determination. Negative action can be accomplished by a veto by either faculty or administration & the board. The separate components need not act simultaneously but should act within a reasonable time interval. In no case should the interval be longer than an academic year.

Consultation: Consultation means that there is a formal procedure or established practice which provides a means for the faculty (as a whole or through authorized representatives) to present its judgment in the form of a recommendation, vote or other expression sufficiently explicit to record the position or positions taken by the faculty. This explicit expression of faculty judgment must take place prior to the actual making of the decision in question. Initiative for the expression of faculty judgment may come from the faculty, the administration, or the board.

Discussion: Discussion means that there is only an informal expression of opinion from the faculty or from individual faculty members; or that there is formally expressed opinion only from administratively selected committees.

None: None means that there is no faculty participation. In cases where the specific item is lacking, e.g. there is no long-range budgetary planning or where the item is mandated say by the state legislature, e.g. admission requirements for some state schools, then the form of faculty participation is none.

A note on the role of the department chair or head: The department chair or head is not to be considered the faculty's authorized representative of the department, regardless of whether the position is an elected one, except in the instances when the chair acts as a spokesperson at higher levels of administration for decisions or recommendations made by faculty authorized representatives or a full faculty vote of the department (or unit). The chair may be instructed to appoint a committee or other authorized representatives by the faculty or their authorized representatives and such appointees are authorized representatives. The chair may be elected a faculty-authorized representative along with others. If the department chair is elected as the sole representative in the areas covered by the questions on faculty status, faculty salary scales, and individual faculty salaries, this shall not count as faculty participation unless the department has five (5) or less members.

Alternatively the above forms of participation may be accomplished by joint committees.

The forms of faculty participation described in this survey may be accomplished by Joint Committees or by committees comprised of faculty members who play some role in a specified aspect of university administration, such as promotion.

Joint Committees: A joint committee composed of faculty and others such as administrators, students, and trustees may qualify as a form of faculty participation if, and only if, the following conditions are met:

- 1. The committee's actions are by formal vote; and
- 2. The faculty members are chosen as authorized faculty representatives by their appropriate units; and
- 3. The faculty representatives form a significant number of the total; more specifically, the following percentages must be met:
 - a. To qualify for determination the faculty must comprise at least 75% of the voting members, and the chair must be elected.
 - b. To qualify for joint action the faculty must comprise at least 50% of the voting members, and the chairman must be elected.

- c. To qualify for consultation the faculty must comprise at least 40% of the voting members if there are two groups such as administrators and faculty; if there are three or more groups, none shall have a plurality greater than the faculty's but in no case shall the faculty comprise less than 35%.
- d. Other forms of joint committee should be labeled none.

Faculty Committees: On some campuses committees (such as promotion or tenure committees) possess the faculty's authority or express the faculty role in particular areas. Hence, the questions asking you to estimate the percent of faculty who belong to academic units in which faculty participation takes a particular form may seem inappropriate. In such cases, you should consider the powers of such committees rather than focus attention on the percent of faculty who exercise actual authority. Take the case of faculty promotion committees as an example.

- 1. If all of those and only those faculty recommended by the committee for promotion are promoted, then the form of faculty participation is *determination*.
- 2. If the committee recommendations for promotion are only affirmed or denied but not added to by the administration, then the form is *joint action*.
- 3. If the administration makes some promotions contrary to faculty recommendation but only from those individuals considered by the committee, then the form is *consultation*.
- 4. If an individual is promoted who is not considered by the committee, then the form for the whole college is *discussion* or *none*. It is *discussion* only if, for every such individual, informal opinion from faculty or formal advice from an administratively selected committee has been sought; without such participation, the form would be *none*.

The term **president** refers to the chief executive of the institution. On some campuses this might be the chancellor; on others the term president is used. Occasionally, campuses refer to the chief executive as a Dean or a Director. The use of the word president here refers to any of these positions and is meant to specify the individual charged with direct oversight and responsibility for the institution and the campus at large. If one individual is charged with oversight of a system or an institution with many campuses, while there is another individual charged with oversight of the campus receiving this survey, we refer here to this second person. This definition applies to all uses of the term chief executive or president in the survey, regardless of the terms used at your campus.

The **governing board** or **board** refers to the highest governing board at the institution with ultimate authority at that site. On some campuses this might be termed the board of trustees, on others it might be the board of governors or board of overseers. Some institutions that are part of state systems might find that several boards are involved in the operation of the institution. The term board used here is intended to describe the board with the most direct involvement in campus governance and with the highest authority at that location.

Merit Pay is a method of awarding compensation to faculty on the basis of administrative or peer assessment of their contributions to the institution in that year. Merit pay can be a bonus which is awarded after payment of a base salary and on top of any increases in salary arising from renegotiation of an employment contract, from a cost of living increase, or from an across the board salary increase for all faculty. Merit pay can describe the process by which a pool of salary funds or additional salary funds are distributed to faculty. Merit pay is also understood to be in place if the institution uses an evaluation process to award salary increases for the year.

For the purposes of this survey, **post-tenure review** is distinct from the concept of merit pay. Post-tenure review describes any process of periodic and formal evaluation of tenured faculty members conducted after they have been awarded tenure. The evaluation can be of the faculty member's teaching, research, or service to the institution. It can be used in merit pay systems, but the adoption of a merit pay system does not by itself represent a post-tenure review system. Post-tenure review can be with or without employment sanction and the records of review may or may not be included in the individual's employment file. All that is required is a formalized process of review of a tenured faculty member's work by the institution.