



Academic Senate
senate.ucsf.edu

Shared Governance Gaps and Solutions

Joint Dean's Council/Faculty Council Retreat

School of Nursing

Notes

Thursday, August 22, 2013

9:00am – 1:00pm, Room CL 215 & 216

Attendance: Brad Aouizerat, Janine Cataldo, Angel Chen, Kit Chesla, Shari L. Dworkin, Yoshimi Fukuoka, Kylie Grenier, Lynda Jacobsen, Kathy Lee, Ruth Malone, Wendy Max, Christine Miaskowski, Carmen Portillo, Suzan Stringari-Murray, David Vlahov, Margaret Wallhagen

GOALS FOR THE MEETING

1. Review the University of California's shared governance processes and purpose. Discuss the expectations of faculty and administration in the decision-making process.
2. Review existing mechanisms for communication and decision-making.
3. Review and discuss perceived gaps in shared governance and decision-making processes.
4. Review potential solutions and brainstorm alternatives to current communication and faculty governance mechanisms in order to improve upon the process of shared governance.
5. Promote collaboration and trust between the Faculty Council and the Deans' Council and – ultimately – the faculty and administration.
6. Commit to principles of shared governance and agree upon solutions to improve faculty/administration communication and decision-making processes.

MEETING OUTCOMES AND COMMITMENTS

- **Culture Shift:** Administration and the Faculty Council have each agreed to improvements that will bolster shared governance. Changes in role clarity, communication and decision-making, cycles of feedback, and transparency are detailed below. Faculty Council will do more to help develop the culture of shared governance on campus. This includes the development of junior faculty, increased interaction with standing committee chairs and the education of faculty on the role of the Academic Senate.
- **Communication:** The Dean agreed to increase the frequency/regularity of Fireside Chats. He and faculty will also work to improve Dean-to-faculty communication by exploring a more interactive framework. The Faculty Council will also begin Faculty Council Fireside Chats this year.

- Cycle of Decision-Making: If faculty are asked to provide the Dean or Associate Deans with assistance or input, the faculty will receive feedback concerning how input was weighed and what was the final decision. The important factors in a cycle of feedback are: soliciting early input, weighing it, following up with faculty on what was taken into account, and following up on final decisions. The same cycle of decision-making will be followed when faculty make requests of the Dean or administration for information, assistance, or input.
- Full Disclosure: Administrators and faculty will be up front when they do not have complete information. Sharing what is known and unknown is key to this outcome.
- Roles and Responsibility: For any given task, the Dean's Council and the Faculty Council will, at the outset of the decision-making process, articulate the roles of administration and faculty. In particular, articulating who is the lead and who plays a consultative role is important. Who has the final say should be clearly underscored.
- Transparency: The Dean and Dean's Council will continue to work to improve transparency in the decision-making process. To accomplish this, the cycle of decision-making (above) should be followed. In addition, the available information will be shared with faculty clearly outlining what is known and what is not known as clearly as is possible. Finally, faculty will collaborate with administration to develop processes and mechanisms to ensure that faculty members have necessary information (see communication resources below).
- Two-way Communication: While communication needs to improve from administration to faculty, faculty members need to communicate more effectively as well, particularly faculty to faculty. While not a problem in all departments, faculty members agreed that there needs to be an improvement in the consistency of relaying information between committees and departments. In addition, the Faculty Council will ask chairs of all standing committees to report the goals and objectives of a committee at the start of the school year. At the end of the year, the Faculty Council will request a final report. Faculty Council will check-in on progress at least once a year.
- Use of Existing Committee Structure: When faculty consultation is needed, the Dean will first contact the Faculty Council to distribute information and form the needed working groups. Ad hoc committees and task forces will be assembled as necessary through existing committee structures. On work items pertaining to the curriculum, the Faculty Council will take the lead to form the necessary work groups in conjunction with MPC, MEPN Program Council and DNP working groups.
- Use of Communication Resources: When the new communications coordinator is hired, the faculty and the administration will work with this individual to seek the best ways to collect and distribute information and create dialogue.

NOTES

Best Practices in Shared Governance

Faculty Council Chair Shari Dworkin reviewed a list of best practices in shared governance.

1. Clear Roles
According to the Standing Order of the Regents 105.2 Duties, Powers, and Privileges of the Academic Senate (<http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/standing-orders/so1052.html>) faculty have full authority over admissions and curriculum, and a consultative role on budget and administrative decisions. Members agreed that there has been a misunderstanding of the definition of "consultative role" in the decision-making process. In the future, Dean's Council and Faculty Council members agreed to do a better job in setting expectations and defining roles in the decision-making process.

2. Transparency with faculty
For faculty to participate in shared governance and provide administration with feedback, there must be timely disclosure of information. Faculty can only make the best decisions if they have the best information at the time. For example, when the administration requests feedback on fiscal items, all known financial information should be made available. Faculty are aware that over the past year, the administration has worked hard to increase transparency but more improvement is still needed. The Dean agreed overall, but noted there are instances when an immediate decision is needed and not all information will be available. He believes that a mechanism for faculty feedback should also be developed for these types of situations. Group members discussed and determined that if administration does not have complete information, then this should be openly stated before asking faculty for a response/input.
3. Cycle of decision making
The ideal cycle of decision making starts with the administration requesting input from the faculty; second, information is then shared between both parties; third, faculty prepare a response; fourth, a decision is made by the administration or in collaboration with faculty; and finally, the faculty receive a report back that discusses how their input was taken into account (or not) and what the final decision was on the matter. At the Hot Topic meeting in November, faculty members noted that this cycle goes in the opposite direction as well. For example, when faculty are considering degree program changes, they need accurate and timely cost information from administration before they are able to make a decision.
4. Shared agreement on clear outcomes
When participating in the governance process, both faculty and administration should have a shared agreement on the expectations, timeline and potential range of outcomes of a decision item. After being asked to comment on this issue, faculty noted that when working with administration, expectations and deadlines were not clear and that this brought on unnecessary frustration and confusion. Group members agreed that work needed to be done in this area and that the Dean's office, Associate Deans, and Dean's Council would work to improve this.
5. Allowance for open debate and criticism
When working to make a decision, an adequate amount of time should be given for faculty to debate and consider/reconsider their position. When a final decision has been reached, dissent should not derail the action that has been agreed upon across faculty and administration. Group members added that after decisions are made, mechanisms for gathering data should be established so that faculty and administration can evaluate the decision and make improvements.
6. Work together early
The Assessment of Shared Governance document that was discussed during the meeting outlines the benefit of including faculty early in the decision-making process. All group members agreed that working together early is an admirable goal, but there is a challenge of deciding when to share information with faculty. Often information is incomplete and without all of the facts, rumors may start which might be detrimental to building trust. This especially becomes an issue when a decision needs to be made on a short time-table or even immediately. A mechanism needs to be developed to share information with faculty with the understanding that data may be incomplete. In addition, the idea of deciding something "immediately" could be reconsidered to ensure that there has been adequate collaboration and input on the matter at hand.
7. Work together often
Numbers 6 and 7 were discussed together.
8. Method of accountability to understand when things are not going that well
The faculty and administration need a metric for accountability. When decision-making, communication or collaborative processes are not functioning well, there needs to be a way to determine what is not going well so that this can be corrected. The evaluation of shared

governance processes should not end with a new Chair of the Faculty Council (or new Department Chairs), but rather should be institutionalized through a method of accountability so that new members can reference this and pick up where the previous members left off.

9. A belief in the importance of shared governance

In order for shared governance to be effective, both administration and faculty should believe in and value its importance. Many faculty members expressed in previous shared governance conversations that they perceive the school as having lost the culture of shared decision-making. They also perceive that both administration and faculty don't fully value or understand shared governance like they did in previous years. Having the administration follow-through on the principles of shared governance detailed above (clearly articulating roles, offering available information, articulating what information is not available, discussing clear timelines, laying out clear tasks, requesting input early and often, follow-up on the input and what the final decision is) will go a long way in building trust, collaboration, and effective decision-making. To bolster the culture of shared governance further, Faculty Council will play a role in the development of junior faculty by reaching out and encouraging them to participate in our available governance mechanisms. The Council will also work to ensure that the outgoing chairs of the standing committees will meet with new chairs to discuss past practices/issues and help the new committee chairs understand what work needs to be carried forward. Each committee chair and committee member should review the bylaws. The Faculty Council will also explore the option of allowing more faculty to attend the Academic Senate's Leadership Retreat to help faculty learn more about the business and role of the Senate. Other ideas need to be brainstormed.

REVIEW OF GAPS AND POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

After discussing the basic principles of shared governance, the group reviewed gaps and agreed on solutions.

Faculty Consultation and Transparency

In all meetings on the subject, faculty members voiced concern over a perceived gap between faculty expectations for involvement in the decision-making process and the actions taken by the Dean's Council and Dean's Office. Many feel as if the administration is making top-down decisions without faculty input. There is a belief that there needs to be more transparency and collaboration from administration in terms of shared decision-making. Faculty feel their feedback should be solicited early on in the decision-making process on all issues that pertain to education and faculty welfare, including fiscal issues. Early involvement will allow faculty to be more informed, participate in the decision-making process and communicate accurate information to colleagues.

Some potential solutions laid out prior to the joint meeting:

- Dean's Office can involve faculty early in the decision-making process
- Continue and/or expand the use of the Dean's fireside chat emails and communications.
- Brainstorm alternative methods for the Dean's Council to solicit feedback. Possibly send out a survey to determine the top mediums of communication used by faculty, or discuss with IT.

Notes from the Discussion:

First, to address faculty concerns that the Dean's Council is making top-down decisions, group members asked for clarification on the role and authority of the Dean's Council. The Dean and other Council members explained that the group has a consultative role to the Dean's Office and that decisions ultimately rest with the Dean. Dean's Council members also explained that they believe it is their role to facilitate communication between the Dean and the departments to ensure decisions are not made in a "top-down" style. The faculty perceive that the Dean's Council is an arm of the administration so the tension between these two facts needs to be discussed and reconciled in some way.

To respond to faculty concerns regarding transparency and faculty consultation regarding fiscal issues, Associate Dean of Finance Lynda Jacobsen informed the group that she understands it is her

responsibility to provide information to faculty. She attends Faculty Council meetings and is open to receiving questions from faculty. To improve communication and address faculty concerns, she would like ask faculty for feedback on different tactics to make fiscal information as transparent as possible.

Faculty Council Chair Dworkin then reviewed some examples of when shared governance worked and when it did not work.

- Recently, Associate Dean Judy Martin-Holland developed a proposal to redesign the MS program. While this report was ambitious and included the work of previous task forces, some faculty members were troubled because they perceived that not all of the recommendations were included. In addition, while the opposite of Judy's intentions, faculty were concerned that the new proposal was an administrator-led effort in an area where faculty have decision-making authority. In response, the Faculty Council took the lead and formed an MS program redesign task force to set up a process where the faculty could take the lead and vote on various program redesign options in early October.
- In response to the details of the MS program redesign case, group members discussed the role of Associate Dean Judy Martin-Holland, and other administrators, when it comes to governance. When reform is needed, should an Associate Dean be the one to make the recommendation, or should they fully synthesize faculty feedback and have faculty lead on matters of the curriculum? While the discussion of roles (above) makes clear that faculty have decision-making authority on matters of the curriculum, in the case of Associate Dean Martin-Holland, she is a content expert with the unique ability to have a bird's eye view of the MS Program, accreditation regulations, and education at the School of Nursing. After discussing the roles of administration, group members felt that Associate Dean Martin-Holland should potentially serve more than a consultative role to the task force if they agree. Chair Dworkin discussed the recent lack of clear roles and miscommunication across Faculty Council, MPC, and Associate Dean Martin-Holland and explained that she asked Judy to step back so that the re-design committee could re-establish itself as a decision-making body which will bring options for redesign to the faculty for their consideration and then a vote will occur in November. Faculty Council Chair Dworkin agreed to discuss with the MS program re-design task force what their current collaborative relationship is with Associate Dean Martin-Holland is, underscoring that faculty have final decision-making on matters related to the curriculum and reiterating that Associate Dean Martin-Holland's collaborative input is important.
- Chair Dworkin noted that when the administration is seeking to consult with the faculty on matters where faculty have primary decision making, the Faculty Council should be responsible for the formation of needed work groups.
- Chair Dworkin also highlighted the effectiveness of the recently formed APU task force. In this case, faculty members were given responsibility to make a recommendation within a tight timeline. This faculty-led effort was open, collaborative and allowed for debate. In the end, the group was able to develop a recommendation and gain buy-in from a majority of faculty. The lesson here is that when faculty are empowered to make decisions, they will engage intensively and work hard to make a recommendation.

Lack of Follow-up to Faculty Work and Faculty Input

Faculty are not clear on if and when their voice matters to administration. Individuals expressed that when they provide input, work, or feedback for the Dean's office, they do not know whether their input is taken into account or ignored. Faculty stated that there is not enough follow through from administration to faculty after decisions are made. For example, they do not know when a final decision was made, what the final decision was, and what faculty input was taken into account (and what was not, and why)?

Some potential solutions laid out prior to the joint meeting:

- The Dean's Office can increase their level of follow up on work items that faculty produce for the office.
- When faculty are asked to assist on a work item, clear timelines should be established for the due date and when a response will be given from the Dean's office.

- To maximize effective collaboration between Faculty and the Dean's Office, the Dean's Office can make it clear to the faculty what the specific goals behind a request are and by when the task will be needed. Faculty also would like to know more transparently why we are doing certain things; in short, they want to have a better understand of on our vision/tasks/deadlines.

Notes on Discussion:

The group openly described the concern regarding a lack of follow-up and the frustration it causes. Dean Vlahov acknowledged concerns and committed to work on providing feedback to faculty in the future. The communication and decision-making process that was agreed upon includes the basic steps of "transparency" and the "cycle of decision-making" above.

Consistency in Communication

With the University of California in the midst of a fiscal crisis, there is a general understanding that difficult decisions need to be made to ensure the school can retain its excellence in education, research, and practice. With limited resources and budget cuts, fiscal decisions may need to be made quickly and without all the desired data. While the faculty understood this dilemma, they expressed that they have become confused and frustrated with changing decisions and multiple shifts in direction within administration. Conflicting information on important decisions, such as changes to enrollment and the consolidation of specialties, has led to anxiety and has strained the faculty relationship with administration. This makes trust more difficult.

Some potential solutions laid out prior to the joint meeting:

- Faculty need to be involved earlier in the decision-making process. If there is better communication with the Faculty from the beginning, members can communicate with others and collaborate more regarding potential decisions.
- The Dean's Council can find new ways to communicate with faculty on whether a decision has been made or an option is simply being considered.

Discussion Notes:

Group members agreed that expectations should be managed in the beginning of tasks/decision-making processes. There is a basic conundrum where faculty want full and rapid information but then information can change and can be overwhelming in quantity. It is frustrating when decision-making processes and solutions suddenly change. The Dean and administrators should make it clear when information is incomplete or is just in the proposal phase. Members agreed that it is better to involve faculty early and often with the understanding that compromises do need to be made at times. If immediate feedback is needed, the Faculty Council will be contacted to discuss how to best handle these situations. The Chairs of departments and the Faculty Council representatives can act as "air-traffic control" on information. New communication mechanisms will be explored when the new staff member will join the school to help to improve communication between faculty, staff, and administration.

Understanding of the Principles of Shared Governance

Not all members of the School, faculty and administrators, completely understand the principles and practices of shared governance.

Some potential solutions laid out prior to the joint meeting:

- The Faculty Council and Dean's Council should make an effort to educate all members of the School about UC's principles of shared governance and how all can use these to ensure the best possible outcome or decision.
- The Faculty Council Chair can reiterate that the Faculty play a consultative role on administrative and financial matters but they play a primary decision-making role on matters related to the curriculum.
- The joint Dean's Council/Faculty Council meeting will assist with a start of what will need to be an ongoing dialogue on these issues.

Discussion Notes:

Group members skipped this section because of time constraints and because best practices and principles of shared governance were covered in the first 45 minutes of the joint meeting. Group members agreed to do a better job in educating members of the School of Nursing about the roles of faculty and administrations in shared governance.

Committee Participation

Although faculty want to be included in most if not all major decisions in the School, they repeatedly stated that they are being given too many working group and/or committee responsibilities. Furthermore, they are feeling frustrated when administrators voice concern that existing committees don't work fast enough and thus are not considered "nimble." Faculty are confident that they can perform the work within a reasonable amount of time, but expectations need to be clear and also managed depending on existing workloads.

Some potential solutions laid out prior to the joint meeting:

- Additional documentation of faculty committee load may be necessary to manage faculty workload. For example, the School of Nursing retains a Standing Committee list, but this may not include all task forces or working groups. Additional documents, such as a docket of work items can be created so that faculty, Chairs, and administration can quickly gauge current committee workloads before adding more work.
- Be clear in terms of setting expectations for what is considered fast and efficient work.
- Ensure that there will be a Dean's Office follow-up on the results of a committee, task force, or working group. This will help to ensure that faculty feel acknowledged by their work and can encourage faculty to become involved in other issues in the future.

Discussion Notes:

The Dean acknowledged faculty concerns and he committed to using the existing committee structure to collaborate with faculty in the future. The Faculty Council and Dean's Council will work to develop clear tasks, goals, and timelines.

Flow of Communication

From the perspective of the faculty, communication is too slow from the Faculty Council to faculty (through representatives) or from Dean's Council to Chairs to faculty. And, there may be some unevenness in terms of what is presented to faculty across Departments. The school needs more forums for meaningful input and discussion and new communication mechanisms to discuss issues and garner faculty input more quickly not just within department, but across departments. Many faculty expressed that the best collaborative efforts have been across departments, where faculty learn from people outside of their Department.

Some potential solutions laid out prior to the joint meeting:

- The faculty could hold more Hot Topic meetings and/or launch a Faculty Council fireside chat (and/or blog?).
- Continue having a Faculty Council representative on the Dean's Council in the future.
- The Faculty Council and Dean's Council can hold ad hoc meetings to quickly bring faculty together to distribute information or solicit feedback.
- Look back and analyze what is not being communicated and try to determine why.
- Brainstorm new communication mechanisms with IT.

Discussion Notes:

Group members discussed the potential solutions and agreed that a multi-pronged approach should be taken to ensure effective communication. Currently faculty perceive that current mechanisms for communication are too slow and that they often receive conflicting reports/information. To resolve these problems the group discussed multiple solutions. These include:

- Continue the Dean's Fireside Chats and Improve the Format
 - Faculty request more Fireside Chats

- Important items should be bolded
- Faculty suggested that there should be a method to provide feedback to the Dean. While Fireside chats have been useful, faculty feel like it is a one-way communication. A blog could be set up so faculty could post their responses and questions.
- Flow of Information
 - Faculty Council representatives will do a better job at distributing information and soliciting feedback from colleagues in the department.
 - Faculty Council members agreed to hold more information sessions with faculty. Fireside Chats, emails, and Hot Topics could be utilized for better communication. New communication mechanisms will be brainstormed with the new communications hire.
 - Dean's Council representatives need to be asked to do a consistent job at distributing information and soliciting feedback from their respective departments.
- Meetings
 - The Dean suggested that the administration could hold more meetings to provide faculty with information. These meetings would be open for community members to attend at their convenience. This is a model Dean Vlahov learned works at other Nursing schools around the country.
- Communications Coordinator
 - A new staff member will be hired to help distribute communications to the School of Nursing community. Faculty can work with this person to ensure that they provide information in the way that works for greatest number of people.
- Technological Tools and Changing the Culture
 - The previous School of Nursing Technology Director Kylie Grenier noted that there are multiple collaboration and communication tools available to faculty and administrators. The challenge is obtaining the necessary buy-in to post and check-in on the site on a daily basis. In order to use these powerful communication tools, there will need to be a shift in the culture. Perhaps assistance can be sought from the new communications hire.

Timing of Work

From the perspective of faculty, fast decisions and labor-intensive work seem to be requested right before a significant campus presentation or report for the Chancellor. Members feel that this work needs to occur on a more structured and scheduled basis, or at least with notice in advance, rather than in the current ad hoc manner.

A potential solution laid out prior to the joint meeting:

- The Dean's Office can work with the faculty to schedule work in advance of expected deadlines with clear timelines and expectations.

Discussion Notes:

The Dean will use the existing standing committee structure to request feedback. Faculty Council Chair Dworkin will take on the responsibility of coordinating faculty and developing ad hoc groups.

Faculty Decision-making

From the perspective of the faculty and the administration: some feel that faculty talk too much without making decisions. Some faculty and administration also think that faculty will decide something but undo it later, as evidenced by the Full Faculty meeting in May 2012.

Some potential solutions laid out prior to the joint meeting:

- Faculty need to work on a clear vision, goals and timeline.
- Faculty Council can look back and analyze faculty decision-making process and work to develop solutions that will improve the process.
- Faculty Council Chairs and Faculty Council need to strategize as to how to best foster feedback and/or buy-in from faculty on some of the important changes that might take place now in the future

- Faculty Council Chairs need to be socialized into strong leadership to maximize the effectiveness and outcomes achieved at Full Faculty meetings
- Dean's Council can offer/reiterate clear communication to faculty about the importance of various decisions and the timelines involved

Discussion Notes:

Group members were not able to get to this item specifically, but much of its content (gaps, discussion, solutions) is integrated throughout this document.

Use of Existing Committee Structure:

Faculty perceived that shared governance was undermined through the creation of working groups that stood outside of Academic Senate structures. The faculty think that the current standing committees can be nimble and responsive by honoring the existing mechanisms that we have for urgent items—ad hoc working groups that are formed within the standing committee structure.

A potential solution aid out prior to the joint meeting:

- More information and collaborative input from faculty to Dean's Council

Discussion Notes:

The Dean acknowledged faculty concerns and agreed that when faculty consultation is needed, he will first contact the Faculty Council to utilize the existing standing committee structure. Ad hoc and task forces will be assembled as needed. Faculty Council Chair Dworkin agreed to clearly communicate the life cycle of the existing task forces to the Faculty in the new academic year (2013-2014). Many existing task forces will sunset, but some will maintain a dual structure (e.g. the Research Committee).

Discussion items/Questions that remain:

- **What does shared governance mean when self-sustaining programs are involved (e.g. return to shared governance documents and discuss)**
- **What does the basic understanding of shared governance e.g. "faculty have control over curriculum" mean? What about when it comes to a self-sustaining program?**
- **What does it mean for shared governance when a self-sustaining program gets pulled into the Dean's Office instead of remaining in a Department**
- **Does our understanding of shared governance change in difficult fiscal times as compared to flush economic times? If so, how and why?**
- **What does it mean for faculty to have a "consultative" role on matters related to administration and finance? How can we garner more faculty input and collaboration in the spirit of a consultative role?**

These discussion items can be brought up in upcoming Dean's Council meetings where time allows