AAUP Shared Governance Assessment Tool

Instructions

The purpose of this assessment tool is to facilitate a comparison of an individual institution to national findings regarding the relative levels of faculty and administrative authority in twenty-nine areas of academic decision-making. National findings are reported in "The 2021 AAUP Shared Governance Survey: Findings on Faculty Roles by Decision-Making Areas" in the *AAUP Bulletin*. Those findings are based on responses of senate chairs and similar faculty governance leaders from a representative sample of four-year institutions; they are broken down by Carnegie classification (bachelor's, master's, and doctoral) and whether the faculty are represented by a union, which may facilitate more appropriate comparisons for particular areas.

In 1994, Professor Keetjie Ramo, a member of the AAUP's Committee on College and University Governance, provided instructions for a governance survey instrument she had created that bear repeating here. She stressed that

> using the instrument as a satisfaction survey will render the results meaningless. The questions are intended to reflect observable conditions at colleges and universities. It is not designed to measure the faculty's opinion of or satisfaction with those conditions. For that reason, the ratings should come from those faculty members who have had fairly intensive experience in governance. This usually means faculty leadership, senate experience, and regular formal contacts with academic officers [and] the governing board. I recommend that a small group of faculty members with such experience fill out the questionnaire by consensus to improve reliability.

Along the lines of Professor Ramo's recommendation, this questionnaire is best completed by a group of four to six faculty members with significant experience in governance. Ideally, the members of the group should agree on the level of relative authority for each area of decision-making. If there are disagreements about the level of authority in particular areas, it would be helpful to explore how each member of the group arrived at their respective assessment and to attempt to reconcile differences of opinion.

Definitions

Scale: For each of the twenty-nine areas, please assess the level of authority using the following scale. The terms employed in the scale are defined below.

1. Faculty dominance
2. Faculty primacy
3. Joint authority
4. Administrative primacy
5. Administrative dominance

Dominance: This level of participation means that a group is making decisions in an area essentially unilaterally. The other group is informed of the decision or consulted in a pro forma fashion but generally has no influence on the outcome.

Primacy: This level of participation means that a group has primary authority for an area but that the other group has an opportunity to participate meaningfully in the final decision. If there is disagreement between the two groups, the group that has primacy normally prevails.

Joint Authority: This level of participation means that both groups exercise equal influence in making decisions in an area. If an area is subject to collective bargaining between a union and the administration or board, the level of faculty participation should presumably be "joint authority."

Faculty: If decisions in a particular area are made by the department chair or head, they should be considered as being made by the faculty if heads or chairs are chosen by departmental election on a regular schedule. Otherwise, faculty participation needs to occur through an elected senate or council, or else through the general faculty.

Administration: Deans, associate deans, provosts, associate provosts, etc. should be regarded as administration, regardless of whether they may hold faculty rank. Department chairs or heads that are not chosen by departmental election on a regular schedule should be regarded as administration.

Other Instructions

Order of Forms of Participation: Although the order of the forms of participation listed here are in descending degree of faculty participation, it is not meant to imply that "faculty dominance" is considered more desirable than the other categories for all questions listed.

Institutional Governance: If the faculty participates in governance at the level of a statewide system, please restrict your responses to the institutional level.

Differences between Units: In some areas, there may be differences in the level of faculty participation between colleges, schools, or departments. In that case, please respond with what you believe is the most common level of faculty participation among units.

Actual Practice vs. Institutional Regulations: In judging the level of faculty participation, please assess the actual practice as employed on campus rather than how the level of faculty participation is specified in institutional regulations or bylaws.

Assessment Tool

For each of the following areas of decision making, please provide your assessment of the level of faculty participation.

A. Personnel Decisions

1. Searches for tenure-track faculty members.

   Faculty dominance

   Faculty primacy

   Joint authority

   Administrative primacy

   Administrative dominance

2. Evaluation of tenure-track faculty members for reappointment prior to the tenure decision.

Faculty dominance

Faculty primacy

Joint authority

Administrative primacy

Administrative dominance

3. Setting standards for promotions of tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Note: If the faculty is represented by a union and promotion standards are subject to bargaining, the answer should reflect the role of the faculty union.

Faculty dominance

Faculty primacy

Joint authority

Administrative primacy

Administrative dominance

4. Individual promotion decisions for tenured and tenure-track faculty members.

Faculty dominance

Faculty primacy

Joint authority

Administrative primacy

Administrative dominance

5. Setting standards for awarding of tenure. Note: If the faculty is represented by a union and tenure standards are subject to bargaining, the answer should reflect the role of the faculty union.

Faculty dominance

Faculty primacy

Joint authority

Administrative primacy

Administrative dominance

6. Individual tenure decisions.

Faculty dominance

Faculty primacy

Joint authority

Administrative primacy

Administrative dominance

7. Searches for part-time faculty members (such as adjunct faculty).

Faculty dominance

Faculty primacy

Joint authority

Administrative primacy

Administrative dominance

8. Evaluation of part-time faculty members (such as adjunct faculty) for reappointment.

    Faculty dominance

    Faculty primacy

    Joint authority

    Administrative primacy

    Administrative dominance

9. Searches for full-time non-tenure-track faculty members (such as lecturers and clinical, research or teaching faculty).

    Faculty dominance

    Faculty primacy

    Joint authority

    Administrative primacy

    Administrative dominance

10. Evaluation of full-time non-tenure-track faculty members (such as lecturers and clinical, research or teaching faculty) for reappointment.

    Faculty dominance

    Faculty primacy

    Joint authority

    Administrative primacy

    Administrative dominance

11. Setting standards for promotions of full-time non-tenure-track faculty members (such as lecturers and clinical, research or teaching faculty). *Note: If the faculty is represented by a union and promotion standards are subject to bargaining, the answer should reflect the role of the faculty union.*

Faculty dominance

Faculty primacy

Joint authority

Administrative primacy

Administrative dominance

12. Individual promotion decisions for full-time non-tenure-track faculty members (such as lecturers and clinical, research or teaching faculty).

Faculty dominance

Faculty primacy

Joint authority

Administrative primacy

Administrative dominance

13. Faculty salary policies. Note: If the faculty is represented by a union and salary policies are subject to bargaining, the answer should reflect the role of the faculty union.

Faculty dominance

Faculty primacy

Joint authority

Administrative primacy

Administrative dominance

B. Academic Decisions

14. Program-level curricular decisions, including the approval of individual courses and major/minor requirements.

    Faculty dominance

    Faculty primacy

    Joint authority

    Administrative primacy

    Administrative dominance

15. Establishment of new academic programs.

    Faculty dominance

    Faculty primacy

    Joint authority

    Administrative primacy

    Administrative dominance

16. Institutional curricular decisions (general education/distribution requirements, etc).

    Faculty dominance

    Faculty primacy

    Joint authority

    Administrative primacy

    Administrative dominance

17. Grade assignments to individual students.

     Faculty dominance

     Faculty primacy

     Joint authority

     Administrative primacy

     Administrative dominance

18. Undergraduate admission requirements.

     Faculty dominance

     Faculty primacy

     Joint authority

     Administrative primacy

     Administrative dominance

19. Teaching assignments of individual faculty members.

     Faculty dominance

     Faculty primacy

     Joint authority

     Administrative primacy

     Administrative dominance

20. Institutional policies concerning intellectual property.

Faculty dominance

Faculty primacy

Joint authority

Administrative primacy

Administrative dominance

21. Institutional policies concerning mode of course delivery, including online learning.

Faculty dominance

Faculty primacy

Joint authority

Administrative primacy

Administrative dominance

C. Administrative Decisions

22. Allocation of faculty positions to departments or programs.

Faculty dominance

Faculty primacy

Joint authority

Administrative primacy

Administrative dominance

23. Decisions about facilities and buildings (such as demolitions, new constructions, renovations, etc.).

 Faculty dominance

 Faculty primacy

 Joint authority

 Administrative primacy

 Administrative dominance

24. Selection of vice president for academic affairs, provost, or equivalent.

 Faculty dominance

 Faculty primacy

 Joint authority

 Administrative primacy

 Administrative dominance

25. Selection of academic deans, division directors, or equivalent.

 Faculty dominance

 Faculty primacy

 Joint authority

 Administrative primacy

 Administrative dominance

26. Selection of department chairs or heads.

    Faculty dominance

    Faculty primacy

    Joint authority

    Administrative primacy

    Administrative dominance

27. Policies regarding teaching loads. Note: If the faculty is represented by a union and teaching load policies are subject to bargaining, the answer should reflect the role of the faculty union.

    Faculty dominance

    Faculty primacy

    Joint authority

    Administrative primacy

    Administrative dominance

28. Institutional budgetary planning.

    Faculty dominance

    Faculty primacy

    Joint authority

    Administrative primacy

    Administrative dominance

29. Institutional strategic planning.

    Faculty dominance

    Faculty primacy

    Joint authority

    Administrative primacy

    Administrative dominance