What is shared governance today at the University?

- Mutifaceted it: occurs locally at the college level and occurs broadly across the university in a variety of governance structures, such as SGA and faculty senate.
- Is more geared toward faculty input. Staff and untenured faculty are more of a buy-in situation.
- Collaboration between faculty, UP and USS senates, along with PET and any specific stakeholders to make various decision.
- Academic processes embrace SG at dept/college level with participation from faculty. Non-academic decisions are often made centrally with little communication – this reduces trust. Affected parties that can help are not always committed.
- Reaching out to the senates for policy reviews and seeing that all decisions affect many, not individuals.
- Clear cut expectations to be met by all at the President’s direction.
- Unclear but seems to include admin and faculty.
- If it means who makes decisions, I think it is department heads, Asst/Assoc VPs, VPs, PET.
- Collaboration in decision making b/w leadership/faculty/staff.
- Solicitation of input/recommendations from relevant stakeholders to inform decision making.
- Unclear at this time what shared governance is at WSU.
- Currently feel there is very little to no shared governance. Decisions about the university seem to be made by higher-ups-executive team, then shared – sometimes – with the rest of the university.
- The senates and SGA recommendations to executive team who also gets input from other administrative leads.
- USS, UP and faculty senates.
- 1-information sharing (transparency), 2- input on key policy decision, 3- decisions made by faculty related to curriculum/program, 4- decision made by admin on operations/policy with input from staff/faculty.
- Shared governance at WSU has - by necessity – changed from a Laise’ Faire’ paradigm to one that is more (?) I.E.-crucial decisions going at a faster pace – too fast for relaxed contemplation.
- Administration seeking input on how decisions may impact the university. Input is sought out depending on topic (not all groups always involved). Group asked for feedback/input is Faculty Senate, UP Senate, USS Senate, Student Gov, legal counsel.

Is it clear who makes decisions?

- Clear – president and his leadership/executive team.
- PET makes decisions.
- Senates make recommendations and PET makes decisions.
- Not really, at what level outside of faculty decisions should be?
- Yes, but not always the person(s) who should be make these decisions.
- No, not on all issues. Not always sure who gets the final say.
- It is clear to some but very unclear to others.
- Yes, it is pretty clear that admin makes most decisions. This is different from asking who ought to make decisions.
- Yes, mid-level administration.
- President and PET.
- Yes. Faculty – related to curriculum/program. Adm-related to operations/budget.
- Appears to be clear. President does and faculty and staff are to follow thru.
- The “perception” is clear- a small group surrounding the president. Prior to our current president, the perception was different, but the reality was the same.
- No, it is not clear.
- Yes, as it goes up the list of Dir-> Assoc/Asst VP ->VP ->PET. Each step can veto.
- Not always, feel most times a certain (1 individual) is making the decisions.
- No
- No exactly.
- Clear approval.
Is it clear who is consulted on decisions?
- No, I have often been surprised when decisions are communicated.
- It is not always clear who should be consulted. This should be those who are impacted.
- No
- Yes, but not always, followed through on consultation (i.e. adm->others).
- No, and I don’t believe it is consistent.
- No, it is not or only specific people have a say in the matter.
- No
- Not clear on who makes decisions.
- Yes
- No it is not clear.
- Faculty is consulted via the senate.
- No, not in all situations, not sure how it is identified on who should be consulted.
- It varies based on the decision.
- No. Consulted outside of faculty decisions – don’t know. Outside of my VP’s area – don’t know.
- No, it is not clear. Even though there is more consultation than before.
- Sometimes, such as on policies for employment, but not for all other decisions.
- It is not clear who is asked for input on decisions.
- Fuzzy. Decisions made but when vetoed not sure upper mgt consult who brought idea.
- No, not who is consulted.
- Yes, but not everyone.

Is it clear who must approve decisions?
- Yes, final PET.
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes, it is clear.
- PET
- Yes, clear. President and PET and appropriate leadership.
- No not clear who must approve.
- No
- It is not clear who must approve the decisions.
- No
- President, all goes thru him.
- Yes, if not clear, easy to find out.
- Admin-Pres-generally.
- Approval in my area-yes; other areas-no.
- No, I think it may be different depending on topic...but maybe not.
- This is the fuzziest of these questions. It is not clear who has final authority to make decisions, particularly on devisive issues where consensus is not present.
- No
- Yes, General Council and Executive Team.

How do you participate in shared governance at the university?
- I participate more than I used to, but not as much as I would like to.
- Involved in leadership role requires me to communicate up and down-do my best to accomplish this.
- Fac – curriculum/programs.
- Only in the last 6 mo. – new mgmt have I been able to join dept meetings. I speak up and give my opinion. Prior to now, I felt I wasn’t supposed to speak up.
- I facilitate shared governance participation in my current role.
- When asked as HR, UP Senate.
- Participate when asked by someone.
- I don’t as I see it. Just within my department.
• UP Senate.
• Yes, on committees, open forums, send emails, look at news.
• USS Senate President-facilitate recommendations and input from USS Staff/Senators.
• Don’t feel as if most USS employees have a chance to participate.
• I read and respond to what my UP Senator sends me. I try to attend open meetings and be informed. I help draft policy changes that go thru shared gov. I try to encourage others to attend.
• Participate, discussions w/admin team.
• Regularly solicit input from dept leaders, faculty and staff via regularly scheduled mtgs. Student voices are generally heard by hosting events where they interact with college leaders.
• Varies depending on who is leading the project. Sometimes no input is requested.
• Voice for UP staff, voice for First Gen students, help evaluate policy decisions.
• My role is to seek input/feedback before making decisions, and to provide useful information to those who are giving input so they understand the issue on the table.
• Through appropriate senate and expressing opinions to my leadership.

Shared governance statement from each group:
• Shared governance at WSU is dialogue reflecting the professional and formal authority of a diverse/variety group of univ stakeholders. Shared governance recognizes our responsibility to raise the univ. while at the same time protect it.
• Creating a consistent culture of trust through a process of transparent, proactive, inclusive, and two-way communication.
• Opportunity to provide informed input on issues that impact your unit for the betterment of the institution. Decisions made in a transparent manner.
• Partnership/participation, accountability/responsibility, ownership – acceptance of responsibility. Aim for consensus with backup plan, inclusion of input, facilitative not directive, flexibility within boundaries.
• Most important: input, recommendations, best outcome/decision, informed perspectives, transparency.

Shared governance statement from full group discussion:
• Creating a consistent culture of trust through a process of transparent, proactive, inclusive, and two-way communication.

Discussion included following points:
  o Stakeholders share a responsibility
  o Discretion/confidentiality
  o Trust / culture of trust
  o Transparency
  o Consistency
  o Candid
  o Fear of retaliation
  o Ownership / responsibility
  o Formal and informal opportunity to share input that affect stakeholder
  o Expertise needed relevant to topic discussed
  o Information-sharing
  o Visibility of input in outcomes

Suggestions/requests by participants:
• Follow-up climate survey in 6 months/1 year to check on gaps being addressed, positive change, and transition.
• In addition to the discussion groups, provide a website with an option for employees to submit additional input. Have the option to leave comments anonymously but viewable by public.
• Provide a process or additional discussion groups focused more on which processes are problematic, issues on campus, ideas for improvement, include specific details – who, when, etc.