Identification of the Theme.

The delineation of roles and responsibilities, inherent in the ideal of shared governance, has been identified as a problematic area at Western University. Previous WASC evaluations (Wolff, 2001) have cited a need to create “a culture of inclusiveness and effective governance structures and processes.” Events since the last accreditation cycle demonstrate the persistence of the problem. Without faculty participation the University Mission Statement was revised to reflect a new emphasis on research. Subsequently the colleges were required to revise their mission statements and to shift goals from a primary teaching mission to a teaching/research mission. Friction between Administration and Faculty Senate led to a proposal for a University Ombudsman. When this was declined by Administration, the Faculty Senate proposed dissolution for itself, a proposal rejected by the Faculty Assembly. Communication has improved markedly with a new Faculty Senate, yet clarification of the roles of faculty, Faculty Senate and Administration has not been addressed. Surveys and focus groups conducted by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) for the current proposal identified several themes including blurred roles and responsibilities, unclear delineation of decision-making authority and a “top-down” style of administration. In the current proposal clarification of the organizational roles and responsibilities in institutional planning and decision-making is recognized as an on-going subject of concern.

Alignment with WASC

The purpose of this section is to accentuate the link between the Organizational Roles and Responsibilities inquiry and WASC’s standards (WASC, 2001) for accreditation. With respect to the WASC criteria for review (CFR), the central focus of the panel’s activities was to investigate Western University’s organizational structure and decision-making processes (CFR 3.8). In doing so, we casted a diagnostic lens over our organizational chart and other published documentation to determine the clarity, appropriateness, consistency, and effectiveness of existing responsibilities and lines of authority (CFR 1.3). Among the specific items of interest in exploring Western University’s policies were grievance procedures outlined for students, faculty, and staff (CFR 1.7 and 1.8) and whether these and other established organizational structures are being followed (CFR 3.10).

Structured surveys, interviews, and focus group sessions with faculty, students, and administrators allowed us insight into the credibility of university leadership and the implementation of shared governance (CFR 3.10). Particular interest was paid in determining whether existing organization structures are aligned with Western University’s as it continues to expand both in size and in prominence. To gauge oversight of institutional operations and integrity, we conducted a focus group with members of the Board of Trustees and the university president and provost (CFR 3.9). Finally, the information obtained throughout this self-study will allow us to assess the association between the Western University planning process and decision making (CFR 4.2).

Literature Review

The literature review was conducted by the committee within several areas including governance models across various contexts, leadership of strategic planning functions, analysis of the effectiveness of various shared governance models, and the roles of various stakeholders in governance. Results on the models of shared governance have been group into categories of the general background, role and responsibility models prevalent in universities comparable to Western; and trends and issues.
A review of the 1966 AAUP position paper on shared governance, along with the Indicators of Sound Governance provided general background on the models of shared governance. More current research reflects the changes over four decades and describes the models currently in use – bureaucratic, shared governance in myriad forms and political (McCauley, 2002). The shift toward research at Western mandated background data on research institution governance processes. The Lombardi, Craig, Gapaldi and Gater study (2002) provides this data in both research and professional schools. He focuses on governing boards and notes there are substantial differences in the degree of delegation of authority. The role of the Board is also emphasized by Duderstadt (2004). Kaplan, in his chapter in Governing Academia (Ehrenberg, 2004) describes the governance activities across multiple settings.

An understanding of the roles and responsibilities in comparable schools is advantageous in evaluating perceived dysfunction. This review section explored the range of participatory governance in similar institutions. The roles of Boards of Trustees has been well defined in Duderstadt (2004) and Lombardi (2002) above, and is reviewed on the oversight and fiduciary roles in the Hermalin chapter of Governing Academia (Ehrenberg, 2004). The Board of Trustees in its interactions with the President is discussed by Freedman in the same text. Neither of these vary much from the Western University experience. Administrative support, or lack thereof, can be a determining factor in the effectiveness of shared governance and faculty participation. Two studies by Miller and Pope (2002) and Miller, McCormack, and Pope (2002) review the effects of President and Provost of faculty participation. In both studies it was demonstrated that faculty participation is limited to the areas defined initially by the AAUP. His review of Presidents is notable in that he found Presidents support faculty decision-making in traditional arenas such as curriculum, but not in larger areas of University decision-making or management. His small study of the Provosts view (n=20) demonstrated a similar perspective on curricular views, but a recognition of the need for “faculty buy-in” (Miller & Pope, 2002). Miller and Pope (2002) comments that Faculty Senates are “under the purview of the Provost” in most universities. The role of the Faculty Senate is remarkably variable among comparable institutions. Western University most closely matched with private research colleges in the Kaplan (2004) chapter How Academic Ships Actually Navigate (Ehrenberg, 2004). In the survey, Kaplan (2004) observed that 25.6 % of faculty senates in such colleges are advisory only, and 2.3 % have actual policy making authority. In his review of the governance of state systems, Hamilton (2004) discusses the role of Faculty Senates and notes that faculty role is becoming more passive and reactive. The recent study on Faculty Senates by Minor and Tierney (2002) is both relevant and practical. He classifies Faculty Senates into traditional, influential, dormant and cultural models, outlining the characteristics of each and noting there is often shift between models as Senate membership changes.

Trends in shared governance can be sorted into some large categories. A major area of concern in the majority of reviewed studies is that there is no clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the participants. Duderstadt (2004) is emphatic about the strengthening of the Board. Miller and Pope (2002) has surveyed Presidents and Provosts as noted above. Of all areas surveyed, the role of midlevel administrators is the least clear and the review by Filan and Seagren (2003) is the only study found in this area to date. This is an important area for Western University. The shift to a “corporate” (aka bureaucratic) administrative style and a perception by administrators that faculty councils compromise their authority have been documented by several sources (Scheurman; Blendinger, Cornelious & McGrath, 2001). The literature overall gives
many reasons for the shift to a more corporate style of governance – chief among these are the need to make decisions quickly, faculty becoming employees and decreased participation from faculty mandating a need for administrators to “step into the breach.” Several authors considered the lack of leadership training or support for faculty to be a major weakness (Filan & Seagren 2003; Hoppe, 2003; Miller, 2000). From the faculty perspective, several studies outlined competing demands on faculty time (Miller, 2000), a lack of trust for administration (Carlisle and Millier, 1998; Del Favero, 2002; Kezar, 2004 and Kaplan, 2004) and faculty apathy (Blendinger et al., 2001; Johnston, 2003; Tierney and Minor, 2004 and Hamilton, 2004) as major issues inhibiting faculty participation in governance. Dissatisfaction with Faculty Senates is a recurring theme in nearly all the articles about faculty participation. The literature is virtually silent in regards to the role of staff in university governance and there is limited research specific to the role of the professional student (Colin & Hearney, 2001; Love & Miller, 2003). Contemporary literature indicates that university governance must work together with student government. The literature recognizes that student involvement in student governance is patchy among institutions. Students have limited perceptions of student government and its role in university governance due to a variety of factors, including cultural expectations, past history where “voice” was ignored, lack of knowledge related to purpose, etc. (Bateson & Taylor, 2004; Love & Miller, 2003). Graduate students have different perceptions and goals related to expectations and involvement (Colin & Hearney, 2001; Love & Miller, 2003). Colin and Hearney (2001) articulate the challenges of providing a democratic environment when there are multi-democracies at work yet cite the importance of the adult-learners involvement and influence in decisions that affect day-day life. When students and student government have been involved in university strategic planning from the point of visioning and beyond, a stronger, more effective university emerged. The positive effect is sustainable when effective processes and relationships remain in place (Bambenek & Sifton, 2003).

Study Planning and Organization

The Organizational Roles and Responsibilities Committee consisted of ten members. Each college contributed two members to the committee. Faculty rank and tenure status was varied within the committee. Governance roles and responsibilities were divided into six categories by the committee: 1. Board of Trustees; 2. President and Provost; 3. Administrators and Deans; 4. Midlevel Administrators; 5. Faculty (including Faculty Senate) and 6. Students. The committee recognizes that there are potential issues in governance for staff, however a decision to focus on the above areas was made based on the preproposal research. Input from each category was solicited via survey, focus group or one-on-one interviews. Each committee member selected an area to investigate. The focus groups and interviews were done by a committee member outside the college under review to reduce bias. Data was kept at the OIR to maintain confidentiality.

Surveys were developed utilizing items developed from literature review as well as published survey items from AAUP and the Governance Panel of University of Wisconsin (Appendix). The Board of Trustees was interviewed as a focus group using a set of items developed by committee consensus. The survey instrument was sent to each Board member prior to the meeting and a mechanism for further comments by Board members was provided. The President, Provost, Vice-president of Student Affairs and the five Deans were interviewed individually with standard interviews developed by consensus and sent to the interviewee prior to the meeting. Midlevel administration, defined as college administrators other than the Dean,
was surveyed via intranet through the Office of Institutional Research to maintain confidentiality. The Faculty Senate was interviewed as a group. The committee determined that confidential surveys and focus group meetings would garner the most information from faculty and students. Each survey covered the following areas: Awareness, Involvement, Effectiveness, Responsiveness and Perception of the faculty role in governance. Focus group items for faculty were developed based on survey results, pre-existing areas of concern and previous WASC reports. Intranet-based surveys were used for faculty and students in all colleges. Faculty participation in the survey was encouraged by a pre-survey notification email, then individual emails as the survey became available. The faculty survey was open for seven weeks. A faculty focus group was held with one college; however participation in other focus groups was very low due to competing meetings. For the student survey, a preparticipation notice was sent to college administrators and students. The student survey was open for six weeks. Response rate from the students was 30%. The Student Government Association (SGA) was interviewed as a group. The committee reviewed the each section of the data as a group and discussed common themes. Problem areas have been identified and recommendations to address these developed.

**Major Findings**

**Surveys** - The goal of the surveys was to explore perceptions of governance by all groups within the governance domain at Western University.

1. The student survey was announced June 26th and closed August 9th, 2007. In total, 2031 students were invited to participate. Of these, 568 responded (response rate = 30.0%).
2. The faculty survey was announced June 26th and closed August 9th, 2007. In total, 141 faculty members (as defined by the university bylaws) were invited to participate. Of these, 91 responded (response rate = 64.5%).
3. The survey of midlevel administrators was announced September 27th and closed October 12th, 2007. These are the section and department chairs. In total, 23 college administrators (assistant deans and department chairs) were invited to participate. Of these, 13 responded (response rate = 56.5%).
4. The survey of university senior administrators was announced September 27th and closed October 12th, 2007. In total, 14 university administrators, including some institutional VP’s and the University Operations group, were invited to participate. Of these, 8 responded (response rate = 57.1%).

Upon comparative review of all surveys, several commonalities are apparent. A clear division is noted between awareness at college and university levels. Possible reasons for this include: college committees provide more opportunities within the college for participation, communication from the Deans to Chairs, faculty and students is more frequent and the faculty or students feel more comfortable discussing concerns with the college-level administration. Of note is that only 40.7 % of the faculty had familiarity with bringing an issue to the Faculty Senate. College administrators other than the Dean and the university administrators demonstrated more awareness (69% and 76% respectively). Although university administrators were very aware of their role in governance, only 50% were aware of the Dean’s Councils decisions and only 42 % were aware of the role of the Faculty Senate. Like faculty students are more familiar with Student Government Association (SGA) roles (51%) than university governance roles (34%).
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Faculty involvement in university governance is infrequent (26%). Committee service is the primary domain available to faculty and the University Handbook describes most committees as advisory. A comment on the college administrator survey reports “For example, WU is erecting new buildings and the faculty committee for environment and safety has not met. Should this have happened before construction?” Over half of surveyed faculty report they have not discussed important faculty senate issues with my senate representative (54%). Student participation is similar, with 52.5% reporting not discussing important issues with the SGA representative.

Perceptions of responsiveness by faculty and students report significantly more opportunity for contribution at the college level versus the university level. Faculty report that only one third or less have an opportunity to evaluate the performance of college administrators, and college administrators do not evaluate the performance of Deans or university administrators. Only 32% felt that the Senate actively participated in policy development at the university level. Only 38% of faculty felt they had a significant role in university governance. Analogous to the above trends, college administrators reported more opportunity to provide input at the college level (84.6%) than university level (30.8%). Of the college administrators, 61% believed they were heard by the Operations Group, which manages budgets and resources. University administrators overwhelmingly felt university governance was effective and that they had significant opportunity to have input. Of interest is that only half have discussed important governance issues with faculty. Students surveys reported that they “have no voice” and that negative comments “are not presented because the University doesn’t want to hear them.”

Effectiveness of university governance is viewed overwhelmingly as poor. Only 22% of the faculty agreed that the Faculty Senate was effective. Some of the comments of faculty include that the “Senate has no authority to act” and that there is a lack of faith that senate action or discussion could result in meaningful change at the institutional level.” Only 37% of student felt that SGA was effective.

The area of organizational roles contributes to dissatisfaction and confusion. Lack of clarity about the domains of responsibility for faculty is a common theme, although these are listed in the University Handbook. Comments repeatedly report administrative infringement into these domains. Administrators at all levels have mixed responses when asked specifically what is within the faculty domain. Only 38.5% of college administrators and 37.5% of university administrators agreed that curriculum development is within the province of the faculty. Outside of curriculum and student instruction, only 23% of college administers agreed that faculty has a significant role in the governance of the university, and 28.6% of university administrators agreed.

**Focus Groups** - The Board of Trustees was interviewed together. The President participated as an ex-officio member. One Board member was unable to attend in person and responded via email. Board members perceive their role in governance to be policy driven, and to deal with specific issues only as needed. They gave the example of tenure, which is placed on the agenda following review by the President. One member stated that grievances may be appealed to the Board, but not decisions related to students such as grades. The Board also stated that final approval of allocation of resources was given by the Board, but not day to day decision-making.

A member of Board of Trustees indicated that their role regarding the President is to hire him let him do his job. The senior administrators report to the Board, but the board remarked that
it is not their role to interfere with what the administrators are doing. Comments were requested regarding Board and Faculty Senate relationships. The board mentioned that not long ago it was very adversarial and suspicious, however the members agreed that the recent changes are improving relationships and cooperation is improved by the clarity of the strategic plan.

The faculty senate was interviewed at their 1st meeting of the academic year using the survey instrument developed by the governance committee. Most input came from the chair and two veteran senators, with some contribution from returning senators. Although it sets its own agenda, the senate acts almost exclusively in an advisory capacity to the administration. There is no release time granted to senators for their service. Perception of the senate and the effectiveness of its activities by the university community at large dominated the discussion. The view was guardedly optimistic to the future effectiveness of the senate, as having a chair and regular meetings was preferable to the period of time spent without a chair or vice chair which proceeded. However, some issues continue to be of serious concern regarding the actual power of the senate, such as the previous denial of the ombudsman proposal, which passed through the senate and the faculty only to be denied by administration. Senate involvement with the new Inter-professional Education project is seen as a test case by which to judge future senate performance by several Senators.

The Student Government Association (SGA) is the official voice of the students at Western University. In the past year, the SGA has become a member the American Student Government Association. Student government representatives acknowledge that students must use the appropriate channels to have their voices heard. Many times the SGA must bring their concerns to the attention of the university and university administration was not viewed as proactive in communication issues. While the university has a formal process in place, the students’ perceptions is that the university just “goes through the motions” and has no real interest in student concerns/needs. The SGA cited barriers to participation when student input is desired, i.e. short notice for meetings where student input is sought, meeting times that conflict with class schedules or student government meetings. When student representatives have been invited to participate, they do not feel they are there to provide input or participate; rather, they were “secondary” and were there to hear the “end result” or decision that had been made. “The decision making process happened around us, but did not include us.” SGA would like a more direct process for input and opinions and to be included earlier in the decision-making process. The Vice-President for Student Affairs confirms what the SGA representatives cited as concerns and barriers. There is a need to improve the university environment to promote and support collaboration and allow for higher levels of student involvement. SGA does state some positive changes has been occurring and feel their relationship to Administration through Student Affairs is improving. The SGA feel that improving communication between students, and college/university administration is vital. The SGA also identified that some challenges have to do with limited participation from the students as a group and the students limited understanding of university process, the role of SGA and time needed for change.

Individual Interviews - Individual interviews of the senior administrators and the five Deans by members of the Committee explored their views on governance in more detail. The committee developed a standardized set of interview items and forwarded these in advance to the interviewee. As indicated by a senior administrator, his view of governance is to listen. He commented that his role is to provide the vision and mission of the university and delegate the management. This administrator pointed out that governance is within the structure, it is the
chain of command. Regarding the role of faculty, he stated faculty determines the curriculum, promotion and tenure and has a voice in strategic planning. Allocation of resources is accomplished through a budgetary process. In his philosophy of university governance, another senior administrator indicated that administration needs to run the arena and faculty needs to do the teaching and have a major role in the curriculum. Promotion and tenure is part of the faculty’s job, to evaluate their own peers and see who should get promoted. The specific role of the faculty in determining the guidelines for promotion and tenure was not asked. The Board of Trustees overlooks the policy, vision and direction of the university. He commented that the students’ role in university committees and organization has increased. Regarding strategic planning, this senior administrator indicated that it was administration’s role but that students and faculty now have increasing roles in strategic planning. He did not elaborate further on student or faculty roles.

The Deans were also interviewed, and the results are reported in aggregate to assure confidentiality. All interviews were conducted by a member of the panel and notes were taken by an Institutional Research staff. The Deans agreed that the vision of the university should be defined by the university administration, although with input from faculty and college administrators. Curriculum development as a faculty domain was unanimous, and the role of administrations should be through faculty development, allocating proper resources and delegation to the appropriate curriculum committee. One Dean reported students are on the curriculum committee, but did not elaborate as to their role. Promotion and tenure is also generally agreed to be within the domain of the faculty, although the degree of control is variable. Most agreed that faculty should have a role in strategic planning, although the degree of input is varied among the Deans. One particularly mentioned that the students should have a voice in strategic planning.

Discussion
Trends and observations from the above data are summarized in the following points:

1. **There is a discrepancy with the definition of shared governance.**
   Shared governance, along with the roles and responsibilities of the participants, is defined differently among those participants. Some university administrators discussed communication about the direction of a “unit” as though it is synonymous with shared governance. A prevalent theme is that governance is “top-down with all real decisions made by the administration.” There is a lack of decision-making power. There is a strong perception among students, faculty, and some administrators that their voice on major decisions is not truly heard. A large proportion of faculty (65.9%), students (49.0%), college (61.5%), and university administrators (50.0%) agreed that the really critical decision are made by university administration before they ever get involved. This sentiment was further substantiated through comments on the student survey. A large number of respondents voiced concern about the true power of the Student Government Association (SGA) ability to initiate change. Opportunities to participate in governance are limited for students. One of the difficulties with participating in governance cited by student SGA representatives was the scheduling of university planning meetings. Though student representatives are often invited to university meetings, it was revealed that the large majority of meetings take place during times when students are in class.
2. Governance within colleges is more responsive and effective than university governance. Some possible reasons for this are that there is more direct access within colleges versus access restrictions via Senate or SGA. There is also more informal communication in the daily interactions and structured meetings within each college. Traditional domains of faculty governance, such as curriculum, are conducted within the college level. The review process for the performance of superiors is more effective at the college level. This opportunity, however, does not extend outside the college to administrators at the Dean’s level or above. Survey results indicate that faculty and students report their concerns are more likely to be heard at the college level.

3. Governance “bridging structures” such as Faculty Senate and the SGA, are viewed as unresponsive and ineffective, with little power to effect change. The current Faculty Handbook lists Faculty Senate and most of its committees as advisory only. There has been limited administrative support for the Senate, a situation which has improved over the past two years. Until recently Senate minutes were not available to the faculty at large. It was clear from conversations with the Board of Trustees and Deans that the Senate has been largely ineffective in the recent past. Among the specific reasons cited by those interviewed was the lack of leadership and a problem with the direction and/or focus of the Senate. This viewpoint is supported further when looking at the results of the online surveys items related to the faculty senate. In the student governance survey, many laid the blame for their perceived ineffectiveness of the SGA on student representatives. Examples of concerns cited by respondents included inadequate communication with the student body, a lack of true concern for the student body, and too large of a focus on club activities. Other respondents questioned the structure of the SGA itself. That is, certain programs believed that they were not well represented, either because they were a small program (e.g., DPT) or their program was unique in some way (e.g., CVM).

4. Trust of the administration has eroded on the part of faculty for governance in areas allotted to them in the Faculty Handbook. The university mission statement was revised without faculty review or discussion. Faculty perceive the grievance process is not respected by administration and grievance committee decisions are overturned without explanation. Information from university administration is filtered prior to dissemination and there are no published minutes available of Board of Trustee meetings or Dean’s Council meetings. When a decision, such as the rejection of the Ombudsman occurs, full explanations are not provided to the faculty assembly, and there is no opportunity for rebuttal.

5. Communication is controlled by administration and largely composed of information dissemination. The style of communication is hierarchical, with little opportunity for a faculty or student input prior to decisions being made. There is no structured mechanism for upwards flow of information. Among other things, our inquiry revealed that plans for the three new colleges, the construction of the new building, and the Interprofessional Education program were not disclosed to faculty or students until after
final decisions were made. There are not appropriate processes in place throughout the planning stages to solicit input from the university community. The primary forum for disclosing information is Administration Town Hall meetings, email and verbal transmittal of information via the Dean or SGA. Among other items related to communication, students revealed (in both the survey and focus group) a sense of hesitation to approach university administration with issues or concerns. Some students indicated they believed administration discouraged or censored opposing opinions.

Recommendations

The committee recognizes that the problems outlined above are not new and will require persistent time and effort to resolve entirely. This long-term commitment must be made by all parties involved to be effective and mandates periodic re-evaluation. With this in mind, the committee makes the following recommendations to address the above weaknesses:

1. Appoint a committee to update and clarify the university handbook section on governance. This committee shall have representation from administration, faculty and students, and be able to implement their recommendations once approved. Approval for these recommendations shall be requested at Faculty Assembly. Approval by the Board of Trustees shall be a prerequisite for any changes to governance and the committee chair shall have direct access to Board meetings to present and clarify any recommendations. The charge of this committee shall be
   a. Specify the governance of the University as Shared Governance and define the subtype clearly within the Handbook.
   b. Review the roles of the administrative officers as listed on pages 7-9 of the Handbook and update as needed. Clarify accountability roles and procedures.
   c. Develop a brief, clear statement of the role of faculty in governance based on the Rights and Responsibilities portion of the handbook as a specific component of the Orientation material for new faculty.
   d. Review the role of students in governance, and develop mechanisms for increased student decision-making.
   e. Review areas of conflict and mediate solutions to these conflicts on an ongoing basis.

2. Although there has been marked improvement in the functioning and communication of the Faculty Senate, the underlying shortcomings need to be addressed. These include the lack of communication of faculty committees with the general faculty, lack of decision-making power for faculty committees and dependence upon a limited number of faculty for leadership. The committee recommends:
   a. The development of a centralized intranet site for the publication of minutes and committee reports.
   b. Faculty Senate to meet with each committee and reassess the tasks and functioning of the committee, with a specific review of areas where the committee can be active decision-makers rather than advisory.
   c. Active development of new leaders through a Leadership Track which
i. is focused on development of junior faculty through an organized mentoring process at the university level
ii. is counted as university service equal to scholarly activity or publication by promotion and tenure committees within each college
iii. grants appropriate release time for university service as outlined in the University Handbook

3. Trust between administration, faculty and students needs to be strengthened. It is acknowledged that efforts have been made to improve communication through the use of Town Hall meetings and email contact. The committee recommends the following:
   a. A central site for publication of minutes and administrative decisions be established. This should include an accessible form whereby the faculty or students can request clarification or further information. This response should be received within a reasonable time and documented.
   b. Decisions affecting faculty or students must be disseminated by the party responsible for that decision. Ample time must be granted to respond to a non-urgent decision affecting faculty or students. This specifically includes Student Conduct Committees and Promotion and Tenure Committees.
   c. Students shall have a mechanism to directly provide information to the administration, with a written or personal response provided within a reasonable time.
   d. The faculty handbook shall be recognized as the basis for roles and responsibilities of administration and faculty. The grievance committee shall be given written rationales for administrative decisions overturning the committee decision, with the appropriate sections of the faculty handbook referenced as indicated.

4. It is acknowledged that there have been efforts on the part of administration to meet with faculty and students by college for dissemination of information. However, the hierarchical style of communication should be expanded to create upward flow of information or opinions on the part of faculty and students.
   a. Faculty committees should be revised to have authority to implement decisions within a guideline to be mutually established by administration and the committee. This guideline shall be included in the faculty handbook.
   b. A representative from administration attends college faculty meetings regularly to solicit faculty concerns directly.
   c. Open-forum question and answer periods need to be established regularly when the majority of faculty can attend.
   d. Student-specific Town hall meetings should be held twice a year during periods when the majority of students can attend.
Continuing Challenges

As noted above, this survey did not include staff. Further research is needed to clarify the role of staff and to expand the role of students in governance. Development of a new faculty orientation needs to include governance participation as an expectation and support for faculty participation developed. Development of new leaders is a very important challenge and mechanisms to identify and train these new leaders will be ongoing.

As the University expands with the three new colleges, it is anticipated that governance issues will become more complex. Addressing the current problems of governance by strengthening the mechanisms of communication, building trust and clarifying roles will concurrently improve the functioning of the University, both in the present and for future growth.
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