Report on the Shared Governance Survey
Saint Louis University Faculty Senate Governance Committee

Background

In September 2006 the Governance Committee of the Saint Louis University Faculty Senate (FSGC) was given the charge to “monitor and report to the Executive Committee (EC) on the governance aspects of the newly reorganized Health Sciences (DCHS), Public Service (COPS), and Parks Colleges.” As the committee debated the best way to fulfill this charge, it became clear that any attempt to ascertain satisfaction with faculty governance at the reorganized Colleges would be meaningless if we were unable to compare the newly reorganized entities with the rest of the University community. As a result, an e-mail survey of the entire faculty was proposed to the EC. The EC approved the idea of a general survey and the FSGC developed the tool.

The Survey Instrument

The instrument developed by the FSGC (See Appendix A) had three parts and 36 questions. Part 1 was a demographic information section in which data about College/ School/ Library of the respondent’s primary appointment, tenure status, full/ part-time status, length of time on faculty and primary teaching responsibility was collected. In Part 2, the respondents were asked to rate how well informed they were about overall shared governance at Saint Louis University (SLU). In Part 3, respondents were asked about shared governance in their Colleges/ Schools/ Libraries. Questions were asked about governance at the College/ School/ Library level and the academic department level. The section included 12 questions directly derived from the Rights, Powers, Privileges and
Immunities of Faculty Members section of the SLU Faculty Manual (Section III H.) for which respondents were asked to give their perceptions of how evident these powers and privileges were in their College/ School/ Library and academic unit. This section also included five qualitative questions in which respondents were asked to comment on the most positive and negative aspects of shared governance in their College/ School/ Library and academic unit and to offer suggestions about how faculty could be best informed about their authority and responsibilities as a faculty member at SLU.

The instrument went through five drafts before being finalized by the FSGC. It was approved by the EC and announced to the SLU faculty via an e-mail message from Senate President John Griesbach. The link for the survey was sent out via e-mail to all SLU faculty beginning April 16, 2007. The survey was available for two weeks and faculty were reminded about the availability of the survey twice during that period. The survey closed April 27, 2007.

The Sample

The survey was completed by 408 faculty members, 97% of whom indicated that they were full-time faculty. This represents 32% of the full-time faculty according to the 2006-2007 Saint Louis University Fact Book. Forty seven percent (190) of the respondents were tenured, representing 35% of the total tenured faculty at SLU. Eighteen percent (73) of the respondents were tenure-track (36% of the total tenure-track faculty) and 34% (138) were non-tenured (30% of the total non-tenured faculty). Almost half of the respondents (193) had been at the University more than ten years; 12% (50) indicated that they had been at the University two years or less. Two thirds (67%) identified themselves as having primary responsibility in graduate programs and about a third (31%) indicated
they were primarily involved in undergraduate programs. Table 1 gives a breakdown of respondents by College/ School/ Library of their primary appointment.

Table 1. College/ School/ Library of Primary Appointment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/ School/ Library</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Full Time Faculty 2006-2007</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Sciences: Former School of Allied Health</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Sciences: School of Nursing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Public Service: School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Public Service: School of Social Work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Public Service: Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks College</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

Statistical results discussed below were dichotomized to informed/ evident (very well informed/ very evident and well informed/ evident combined) and not informed/ not evident (somewhat informed/ evident and not informed/ evident combined) to facilitate understanding. Qualitative comments were chosen to reflect both the content and weight of faculty responses.
Shared Governance at SLU

Ninety percent of the respondents stated that it was very important (65%) or important (25%) to them that shared governance exists at SLU. When asked about all the entities that participate in shared governance at the University—namely the Board of Trustees, the President of the University, the Provost, and Faculty Senate—the results were mixed. Only 9% indicated that they were informed about the activities of the Board of Trustees (see Table 2). Those indicating that they were informed about the role and activities of the other entities involved in shared governance are as follows: University President 21%, Provost 22%, Faculty Senate 44%. Comments from respondents included:

- We have regular communication from the President, Provost, Dean, Senate and Chairman. Keep it up. More regular discussions with the faculty, surveys etc. to obtain the input from the wide spectrum of the faculty.

- The faculty has almost no real knowledge of the decisions made by the Board or the President regarding major issues, especially financial decisions. Greater transparency is essential if shared governance is to have any meaning at the University level.

- I think that my department, faculty, and the Senate are doing a good job. Those in my unit who are uninformed just aren't paying attention or chose not to participate ... but are always willing to complain subsequently. I do NOT feel that the University administration is genuinely interested in engaging in a dialog. And that’s too bad. They’re missing out on a resource.

When asked about how well informed they were about the authority and powers granted to them in the Faculty Manual, 50% of the respondents said they were somewhat informed, 15% indicated that they were not informed. Only 6% of the respondents indicated that they were very well informed about the authority granted to them in the Faculty Manual. However as one faculty member stated
• Doesn't matter whether we're informed or not, because we don't have any say on certain personnel / budget decisions, no matter what the faculty handbook says. Frankly I've given up on stressing about that -- because I'd rather focus my energies on things I really can affect, like my scholarship & teaching. In so many ways SLU is still in the middle ages -- now that I've resigned myself to that, it doesn't really trouble me anymore.

Table 2. Perception of Degree of Information on Shared Governance Roles (Most informed to least informed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Informed</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not Informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very well informed</td>
<td>Well informed</td>
<td>Somewhat informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/ Director</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Assembly</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Manual</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shared Governance in Individual Colleges/ Schools/ Libraries

Just as respondents indicated that it was important that shared governance existed at SLU, 90% stated that it was important or very important that shared governance existed in their College/ School/ Library and academic unit. Almost one fourth (26%) of the faculty say that shared governance has a major or definite impact on their day-to-day life. A little over one third (37%) say that communication between administration and faculty in their
College/ School/ Library is very effective or effective; 41% say it is somewhat effective, 22% say it is not effective.

When asked about the entities that participate in shared governance at the College/ School/ Library level—Deans, Chairpersons, and Faculty Assemblies—the results were again mixed. Some differences were also noted here between the responses of faculty from the reorganized Colleges (Parks, Health Sciences and Public Service) and those of the faculty from non-reorganized Schools and Colleges.

Overall 49% of the faculty indicated that they were informed about the activities and roles of the Dean of their College/ School/ Library (see Table 2) but only 13% of faculty from Parks College indicated that they were informed ($p<.001$). In regard to their department, 70% of the respondents indicated that they were informed about the activities and roles of their Chairperson/ Director. Comments from faculty included the following:

- Input to my chairman is often available and accepted. On fewer occasions, it is possible to communicate with my Dean.
- Positive -- at our School the shared governance works well, and our Dean is very transparent and open.
- Department chair involves entire faculty in all major decisions that affect the department. Chair maintains a very positive climate in the department which gives us all a tremendous sense of ownership.
- We have essentially NO shared governance. Committees are politically appointed and far too many are dominated by chairs.
- Shared governance appears to be limited to receiving notices and news-letters. It does not involve participating in decision making activities.

Questions were also asked about the Faculty Assemblies in the Colleges/ Schools/ Libraries and how effective they were in influencing decisions. Overall 56% of the respondents were informed about the activities of their Faculty Assembly; 28% felt that the
assembly in their unit was effective in influencing decisions. There were significant differences in attitudes toward the Faculty Assemblies between the reorganized and non-reorganized units. Compared to the overall 56%, only 14% of faculty in the reorganized units indicated that they were informed (p<.001); differences were most apparent in Parks College and the Doisy College of Health Sciences. Furthermore, the faculty at Parks College were significantly more inclined to believe that their Faculty Assembly was *ineffective* in influencing decisions. Comments from all respondents included the following:

- College governance committee meets regularly and is open to all input and suggestions from faculty.

- Shared governance in [my school] is an integral part of its day-to-day activities and reflects its underlying values. For this reason and others, I am very proud to be a part of the School.

- Faculty council in the college does a good job on day to day nuts and bolts things like curriculum.

- Our Department tries to work at shared governance. However, faculty members are never allowed time to really hash out all of the thoughts around an issue. Our meetings are run too tightly and controlled. Sometimes debate is good and sometimes one person will inspire someone else with a good idea and the 2nd person will come up with a great idea. But discussion and time for discussion has to be allowed.

- It has become nearly impossible to make decisions or build consensus with the [department], and as a result hardly anyone really feels like trying anymore. so, we just keep the status quo, so to speak, and avoid substantive discussions about real change.

- There is very little shared governance in practice in my academic department. Responsibilities are shared, but major decisions are very frequently made by the department chair with little or no input from faculty.

*Authorities, Powers and Privileges of Faculty*

Questions in this section were inspired by specific language in the *Faculty Manual*. Faculty were asked to rate how evident the authorities and privileges were in their College/
School/ Library and department. Table 3 provides information on faculty perceptions for each item.

Table 3. Perception of Authorities, Powers and Privileges (Most evident to least evident)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority/ Power</th>
<th>Evident</th>
<th>Not Evident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Evident</td>
<td>Evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine instruction method</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine course content</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic freedom</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in program accreditation</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set degree requirements</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend individuals for degrees</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in promotion criteria</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set admission standards</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Administrator (department)</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Administrator (Coll/ School/ Lib)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input into budget (dept)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input into budget (Coll/School/ Lib)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic freedom is the first right granted to the faculty in the *Faculty Manual* (III. H. 1, p. 27) and 81% of the faculty agree that it is evident in their academic unit. In the Shared Governance section of the *Faculty Manual*, (III. H. 4, p. 28-29), several authorities and privileges are granted, among them determining content of courses and methods of instruction, setting standards for admission and granting of degrees, and participation in the development of budgets. Perception of how evident these privileges were in practice varied widely. More than 81% of the respondents felt that faculty control of course content and methods of instruction was evident in their unit. Sixty-two percent rated setting degree requirements as evident; 51% stated that setting admission standards for students was evident in their unit. The largest disparity between privileges promised and actualized occurred with regard to input into the budget. Ninety-three percent of the respondents stated that input into the budget of their College/ School/ Library was not evident. On the academic department level, only 16% stated that input into the budget was evident. There were not significant differences between reorganized and non-reorganized entities in perception of input into the budget.

Other rights and privileges granted by the *Faculty Manual* include participation in “formal ongoing evaluation of academic administrators” (III. H. 7, p. 30) and participation in program accreditation (III. H. 8, p. 31). While 65% of the faculty surveyed agreed that participation in program accreditation was evident in their academic unit, the response regarding participation in evaluation in administrators was not as favorable. Only 24% of the faculty felt that they had input into evaluation of administrators at the College/ School/ Library level; slightly more (32%) thought they participated in evaluation of administrators at the department level. Faculty at Parks College and at the Doisy College of Health Sciences were significantly more likely (Parks, p< .03; Doisy, p < .001) to indicate that
faculty involvement in evaluation of academic administrators in their Colleges was not evident.

Comments from faculty regarding their familiarity with the rights, privileges and powers described in the Faculty Manual included:

- First and foremost, every faculty member should assume responsibility for being familiar with the Faculty Manual; it’s part of their contract. Second, faculty should participate more (than many do) in University activities so they are more active members of the University community as at large; such participation is itself a great educator. Third, the faculty assemblies—and deans!—could highlight provisions of the Faculty Manual or specific policies at regular meetings. The Senate could be called upon to provide assistance as well.

- Do I really expect the Dean, Chairperson or Division Director to include Faculty in important discussions regarding budget development, admission criteria, course content, student proficiency and salaries? Come on!

- From my perspective the issue is not understanding my faculty rights but understanding how I can exert influence over matters such as school and college mergers which damages one of the academic units.

- I think that faculty are well-informed about their authority and responsibilities. We have little real authority with regard to larger issues, and many responsibilities for day-to-day affairs.

- The issue is not really communication, which is nonetheless terrible, but the routine practice of administrators to ignore any kind of faculty input if it goes against pre-set plans. Shared Governance becomes a complete farce if Administrators do whatever they please anyway, which is the nearly universal practice at SLU.

- First it would be nice if we actually had some (authority and responsibility). In the most significant matters -- matters of budget priority and allocation -- the faculty have had, and continue to have, no real voice. The university guards its finances extremely closely, and seems to think that we are either too stupid or too misguided to be included in these kinds of discussions in any serious, meaningful way.

- Faculty are notoriously reticent about speaking up about issues and problems that exist within SLU. This is because faculty are not encouraged to help set policy (everything that is done below the level of Provost is ‘advisory’), and those who (rarely) critique policy (coming from the upper administration) are regarded as troublemakers.
Respondents did have some suggestions as to how they could be better informed of their authorities and responsibilities as a faculty member at SLU. Many respondents lauded the Faculty Senate President’s newsletters as an excellent source of information. Comments included:

- The newsletter from the Senate president has gone a long way in informing the faculty. I hope this continues.

- The letters from the faculty senate president have often been very informative. I would suggest that instead of a letter that the format be more of a newsletter, so that the reader can quickly apprehend what the major topics of discussion are.

Suggestions for improved communication were also made. Including a more specific orientation to the provisions of the Faculty Manual for newly hired faculty was frequently cited as a need. As one informant stated

- The Faculty Manual is an excellent starting place. Information included in orientation and periodically revisited with new faculty and with continuing faculty is helpful -- like this survey as a reminder of the areas we are to have responsibility for and input into. Perhaps Faculty Senate- and Senator- sponsored discussions periodically.

Another respondent suggested

- Do more than hand out Faculty Manual upon hiring (more significant orientation, organized by college). Explanation of governance organization (every school is different). Encouragement of all to attend Faculty Senate (did not realize just anyone COULD go).

However orientation and knowledge of the Faculty Manual was seen by some faculty as not going far enough

- Rather than have some hit or miss approach, I think that a systematic program where the Dean is part of the education effort would be most effective. That way everyone has the same understanding about the faculty’s authority and responsibility. Otherwise, the implementation of a consistent faculty governance structure will be overly influenced by the vagaries of the individual views and personalities involved. One problem
we have now is that there is no enforcement mechanism for making sure faculty have the authority they are granted in the faculty manual and academic tradition. Education about shared governance should also be part of new faculty orientation.

Beyond the Senate President’s newsletter and an effective orientation, other means of communication were also suggested. Using the Senate web page more effectively and e-mail alerts were offered as ideas to increase faculty knowledge:

- Use the web for periodic updates, explanations, etc. of pertinent sections of the faculty manual.

- Not only should we be provided a *Faculty Manual*, but it may be helpful to be reminded in monthly e-alerts about our roles and responsibilities as well as those of the university administrators (e.g., one item per month with an example). Faculty Senate updates will be helpful as well.

- It might be a good idea to focus on one or two aspects of authority and responsibility through Newslink or some other source that faculty receive on a regular basis.

- Maybe a monthly "did you know" email blast to faculty about a particular area of the faculty manual. That could strike faculty interest to read the manual more closely.

Using Faculty Senate meetings as a vehicle for increasing faculty knowledge about their authorities and responsibilities was also discussed:

- The Faculty Senate should hold regular meetings on issues of governance cited in the *Faculty Manual*. There should be fewer reports at Faculty Senate meetings and more interaction with faculty colleagues.

- My participation on the faculty senate was the best way to become better informed. It might be valuable for new hires to watch a video and be explicitly invited to a faculty senate meeting about the roles and responsibilities of faculty. Since I came from a non-academic environment, I was clueless and would have valued learning about the faculty senate and faculty governance much earlier than I did.
Conclusions

This survey was undertaken to help understand how faculty view shared governance at Saint Louis University. It is clear that faculty think shared governance at every level—University, College/ School/ Library, Department—is important. At the same time, 74% of the faculty think that shared governance has had only some or minimal impact on their day to day life as a faculty member at SLU.

As can be expected, the more local the organizational level, the more informed faculty are about the activities and roles of the entity. For instance, faculty are more likely to say they are informed about the activities of their Department Chairperson than they are about their Dean; they know more about the Dean’s activities than they do about those of the University Provost or President. They are somewhat better informed about the activities of their academic unit’s Faculty Assembly than they are about the Faculty Senate.

Communication between administration and faculty is a major issue. Problems with communication are evident from both quantitative and qualitative survey responses. Sixty-three percent of faculty think that communication between administration and faculty at the college/ school level is either somewhat or not effective. Frequently, text comment supported this view. Faculty complain about a lack of transparency in transactions between administration and faculty. This lack of transparency affects the ability of faculty members to fully exercise the rights, privileges and responsibilities promised to them in the Faculty Manual.

In regard to those rights and privileges, respondents indicted that academic freedom, responsibility for determining course content and setting criteria for admission and graduation were evident aspects of their role as faculty. Other promised powers were
not evident in actuality. Lack of input into evaluation of administrators was cited as a concern. Most glaring was the nearly universal perception of faculty that they had little or no input into the budget of their department or College/ School/ Library. This is an area in which the lack of transparency and communication causes a fundamental problem with the faculty’s ability to exercise promised authority.

The survey was originally undertaken to see if there were differences in shared governance between the reorganized entities (COPS, DCHS and Parks) and the non-reorganized entities. Few differences were seen; the only statistically significant differences were in perceived effectiveness of the Faculty Assemblies and input into evaluation of administrators. The importance of these differences is unclear, especially given the fact that since the survey was done all of the reorganized entities have undergone further reorganization. COPS has been dissolved; the School of Professional Studies has resumed stand alone status and the College of Education and Public Service has been created. The School of Nursing has been taken out of DCHS and has again resumed stand alone status. Parks continues to have departments consolidated and eliminated. It would be interesting to repeat the survey in this new environment. Although faculty input was sought in making the decisions to reconfigure COPS and DCHS, it is unknown whether faculty are satisfied with their role in the process that culminated in those reorganizations.

The survey provided faculty with both a vehicle to express their views on the important issue of shared governance and an instrument to enlighten them about their authorities and responsibilities as faculty members. The next step will be to develop an action plan to address the concerns raised by faculty participating in the survey, particularly in regard to the issues of evaluation of administrators and input into the budget.
It is only by addressing these concerns and by improving communication between faculty and administration that shared governance can become a reality at Saint Louis University.
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Appendix A

Shared Governance Survey Instrument
Governance in higher education should result from cooperation and interdependence between and among the administration, governing board, faculty and (to a lesser degree) other constituents. A shared goal or spirit of collaboration on the part of the administration, governing board, and faculty is vital to healthy governance (AAUP, 1990).

The Governance Committee of the Faculty Senate is requesting your participation in this survey to help us understand how faculty view shared governance at Saint Louis University. Confidentiality will be maintained. Results of this survey will be tabulated and only the summarized results will posted on the Faculty Senate website. Thank you for your help in this important endeavor.

Section A. Demographic Information

1. In what academic unit is your primary appointment?
   - College of Arts and Sciences
   - College of Health Sciences. Please indicate to which smaller academic unit you belong:
     - Former School of Allied Health Professions
     - School of Nursing
   - College of Public Service. Please indicate to which smaller academic unit you belong:
     - School of Professional Studies
     - School of Social Work
     - Other Department
   - Parks College
   - School of Business
   - School of Law
   - School of Medicine
   - School of Public Health
   - University Libraries

2. What best describes you?
   - Full time Faculty
   - Part time faculty
   - Faculty emeritus
   - Other Describe

3. What is your tenure status?
   - Tenured faculty
   - Tenure-track faculty
   - Non-tenure track faculty

4. How long have you been a faculty member at SLU?
   - 0-2 years
   - 3-5 years
   - 6-10 years
   - More than 10 years
5. In which area do you have your **primary** responsibility?
   - Undergraduate programs
   - Graduate programs
   - Other. Describe ____________________________________________________

**Section B. Shared Governance at SLU**

6. How important is it to you that shared governance exists at SLU?
   - Very important
   - Somewhat important
   - Important
   - Not important

7. How well informed are you about the activities and roles of the SLU Board of Trustees?
   - Very well informed
   - Somewhat informed
   - Well informed
   - Not informed

8. How well informed are you about the activities and roles of the President of SLU?
   - Very well informed
   - Somewhat informed
   - Well informed
   - Not informed

9. How well informed are you about the activities and roles of the Provost of SLU?
   - Very well informed
   - Somewhat informed
   - Well informed
   - Not informed

10. How well informed are you about the activities and roles of the Faculty Senate at SLU?
    - Very well informed
    - Somewhat informed
    - Well informed
    - Not informed

11. As a faculty member at SLU, how well informed are you about your authority and the powers granted to you in the *Faculty Manual* regarding shared governance?
    - Very well informed
    - Somewhat informed
    - Well informed
    - Not informed

**Section C. Shared Governance in your Academic Unit**

For this section, **school/college/library** refers to the larger academic unit to which you belong, e.g. College of Arts and Sciences, School of Medicine, College of Health Sciences, College of Public Service, etc. **Academic department** refers to the smaller academic unit to which you belong (if applicable), e.g. Psychology department, Physics department, Physical therapy department, School of Nursing, School of Social Work, School of Professional Studies, etc.

12. How important is it to you that shared governance exists at your **school/college/library**?
    - Very important
    - Somewhat important
    - Important
    - Not important
13. How important is it to you that shared governance exists within your academic department?
   o Very important  o Somewhat important  o Not applicable
   o Important  o Not important

14. How well informed are you about the activities and roles of the Dean of your school/college (or University librarian)?
   o Very well informed  o Somewhat informed
   o Well informed  o Not informed

15. How well informed are you about the activities and roles of the chairperson/director of your academic department?
   o Very well informed  o Somewhat informed  o Not applicable
   o Well informed  o Not informed

16. How well informed are you about the activities and roles of your school/college/library’s faculty assembly or equivalent group?
   o Very well informed  o Somewhat informed
   o Well informed  o Not informed

17. How effective is your faculty assembly or equivalent group in influencing decisions in your school/college/library?
   o Very effective  o Somewhat effective
   o Effective  o Not effective

18. How effective is the communication between administration and faculty in your school/college/library?
   o Very effective  o Somewhat effective
   o Effective  o Not effective

19. What type of impact has shared governance had on your day-to-day life as a faculty member at SLU?
   o A major impact  o Some impact
   o A definite impact  o Minimal impact

20. According to the Faculty Manual of Saint Louis University, all of the following are authorities, powers and privileges of faculty. To what extent, do you think each of these is evident in your experience as a faculty member?
   a. Academic freedom
      o Very evident  o Somewhat evident
      o Evident  o Not evident
   b. Responsibility for setting academic requirements for degrees
      o Very evident  o Somewhat evident  o not applicable to my academic unit
      o Evident  o Not evident
   c. Responsibility for determining content of courses
      o Very evident  o Somewhat evident  o not applicable to my academic unit
      o Evident  o Not evident
d. Responsibility for determining methods of instruction to be used
   o Very evident  o Somewhat evident
   o Evident       o Not evident

e. Responsibility for setting standards for admission of students to your academic unit
   o Very evident  o Somewhat evident  o not applicable to my academic unit
   o Evident       o Not evident

f. Responsibility for recommending specific individuals who will be granted earned degrees
   o Very evident  o Somewhat evident  o not applicable to my academic unit
   o Evident       o Not evident

g. Participation in program accreditation
   o Very evident  o Somewhat evident  o not applicable to my academic unit
   o Evident       o Not evident

h. Involvement in development of the criteria for faculty promotion and evaluation
   o Very evident  o Somewhat evident
   o Evident       o Not evident

i. Input into the development of the budget of your school/college/library
   o Very evident  o Somewhat evident
   o Evident       o Not evident

j. Input into the development of the budget of your academic department
   o Very evident  o Somewhat evident  o not applicable
   o Evident       o Not evident

k. Participation in formal, ongoing evaluation of academic administrators of your school/college/library
   o Very evident  o Somewhat evident
   o Evident       o Not evident

l. Participation in formal, ongoing evaluation of academic administrators of your academic department
   o Very evident  o Somewhat evident  o not applicable
   o Evident       o Not evident

21. In your experience as a faculty member, please identify positive aspects (if any) of shared governance as practiced at your school/college/library. (Limit of 500 words.)

22. In your experience as a faculty member, please identify negative aspects (if any) of shared governance as practiced at your school/college/library. (Limit of 500 words.)
23. In your experience as a faculty member, please identify **positive** aspects (if any) of shared governance as practiced within your *academic department*. (Limit of 500 words.)

24. In your experience as a faculty member, please identify **negative** aspects (if any) of shared governance as practiced within your *academic department*. (Limit of 500 words.)

25. How do you think faculty can best be informed about their authority and responsibility as a faculty member at SLU? (Limit of 500 words.)

**Thank you for participating in this survey!**