

Views1 - Please express any thoughts you have regarding faculty governance at the Board of Regents or university levels.

- About ok now
- shared governance is a sham. BOR/GSU admin create committees, task forces, focus groups ad nauseum to create the illusion of shared governance then do whatever they want. The faculty senate is a debative society every bit as useless as the UN
- a careful comparison should be made between the BOR policies (as shown on their website) and the Provost's interpretation. Faculty have been told certain things were BOR policy when they are not
- how is hiring the only element of governance?
- it is well written and clear and I find it fair in all aspects
- it is too vague to be useful when department & college procedures are followed & subsequently overturned at the U. level e.g. if a college recommends a promotion and the university does not; there are no clear reasons discernable BOR? I didn't think we had any governance here! Ultimately we don't really have an opportunity for self governance if the president can veto or rescind at his pleasure. We are granted a level of governance that is rather unsatisfying.
- I've consulted the handbook for clarification on some issues.
- what is said ≠ what is done
- tenure & promotion from a standpoint of faculty understanding is a mess. No one is sure about anything
- perhaps the provost could send out the web site address at the state of each academic year
- provost has his own unique spin on the interpretation of the written word
- rules seem to change at the provost level
- too authoritative-faculty say "we don't count-they (the administration) do not care about our opinion" to give a dept. one day to decide whether they want to join IT is shameful
- It would be helpful if the univ. & BOR would require participatory governance structures to be established at the college & dept levels
- vague, and misleading as to the understated weight put on student evaluations
- the role of faculty in governance has improved dramatically in the past 3-4 years at the university level. However, the role at the college level is variable & needs further analysis
- not applied at college level

- there is none really, only top down
- lack clarity regarding specifics of tenure
- administrators are able to make decisions that comply with the letter of rules irrespective of the spirit of rules. Minority candidates are able to make final pools but don't get chosen. Internal searches are conducted when the winner has already been decided
- these sources are general in nature but I think provide guidance and gives flexibility to institutions
- there seems to be a significant amt of disagreements between what the handbook says and what administrators do. Almost like they have no regard for the guidelines for t&p. Leads to significant distrust
- would like more publicity about it
- we need faculty generated departmental & college guidelines that are written & published & known and which are approved up-the-line as being congruent with U & Regents policies
- faculty governance is a myth. I perceived a hierarchical structure of governance. Perception or reality?
- not aware of what exists at BOR level; faculty senate an "advisory board" therefore if lacks power to enforce decisions which are at variance with those of administration it's not helpful when upper level administrators don't ensure that the unit heads follow it
- it is very disturbing when univ. administration acts contrary to advice by faculty i.e. on things such as hiring deans
- there appears to be a disconnect between expectations at the college & dept level and the university level
- administrators are not faculty; faculty are not represented by administrators
- fac governance seems weak. GSU still seems like a top down university
- because the provost is so determined that evaluations will not be prescriptive promotion evaluations differ from college to college and departments within colleges and are not clear
- recently a top/down governance model seems to be getting stronger on GSU. Since new president and provost have come there seems to be less concern for faculty input. This attitude extends to and is very apparent in new CLASS dean
- no idea this is my first semester here
- they do not necessarily reflect what happens at the departmental level
- lip service on issues that matter let us do the grunt work on mundane issues
- it appears to be specifically vague
- mostly there are timelines and categories or eligibility

requirements. Practical information (somewhere) with specific expectations would be very helpful

- I think the higher administration at the university is blowing smoke up our butts when they say that the faculty is self governing
- faculty in general do not have much contact with higher level administration. The dean & unit heads do not really believe in shared governance at COST
- it is completely ineffective. Academic decisions (like tenure, promotion, etc) should be made by experts in the field (faculty) not by administrators making arbitrary, unfair, and unjust decisions. BOR policies and GSU handbook policies are routinely ignored by the provost and president

Views2- What is your view of shared governance in your college?

- Strong
- adequate
- acceptable
- many issues are vague; & open to interpretation at a broad level
- it seems to be working okay
- it does not exist @ COST. Solomon is equal to Sadam
- cant really evaluate
- committees seem to include elected representatives from various departments for the most part
- poor
- it is not working
- I think it works but was originally stuffed down our throats by the dean
- lip service on issues that matter we do the committee work on everyday issues
- this questionnaire doesnt ask whether I had input on any of th written policies. It asks whether there are written policies but that doesnt necessarily mean I feel that I participate in the governance
- unsure
- non-existent. just do as we're told
- some faculty can provide input but it is the dean who does what he wants
- I don't think it exists - at least in our college (COST). For the past 7 years what we have witnessed is basically dictatorship in its worst form
- ??
- I am closely associated with governance in my college. Governance needs to be addressed and is being addressed
- It does not exist. The policies and procedures on the web were written by dept chairs and are revised by them. Faculty have had no role in developing them

- I don't honestly know. It often feels as though decisions are made without faculty input
- it's a specious concept fostered by the administration without any grassroots reality
- that faculty governance is of less and less concern to administrators. CLASS dean is a micro-manager and has no concern for faculty governance or meaningful input that does not agree with what she wants
- the department chair who is really an administrator has a great deal of power. New faculty are coming in and being given a lot of power
- non-existent. Dean has only advisory council consisting of chairs. There is no advisory committee consisting of faculty
- what shared governance?
- much lip service is paid to shared governance but little exists in practice
- I do not think the chair should choose the committees, especially when he/she is applying for promotion
- ok
- based on dean's actions I'm not sure she is really interested just going through the motions
- it is abysmal. There is no functioning mechanism for faculty to have a voice in most decisions
- it should happen and is a positive step
- it is good
- works fairly well
- 2nd year here still finding out how things are done
- there is none at least if it involves disagreements with the dean. Unwanted views are simply ignored
- does not exist though there is a committee now charged with making recommendations for some formal structures for faculty governance at college level
- I am very curious to know why evaluations are not done by faculty on our president and provost? Should they not be evaluated? Shouldn't the results of such evaluations be shared?
- poor- it seems to be given mouth honor only. Both in my dept and at the college level the chair & the dean do what they want & one opposes them at one's peril. The policies need to be honored not just followed & certainly not ignored
- good and getting better
- dean makes decisions without any faculty input
- very good
- I don't feel like I have any role in governance! Its all a mystery to me!
- lots of things I do not know
- getting much better with newly approved reorganization. In my opinion communication rather than shared governance is

- the greater issue and concern
- it might be getting better as a result of faculty efforts and service of faculty mainly
- it currently doesn't exist
- it is very good
- not fully qualified to respond
- Byington overruled Williams' tenure approval by both her dept & COBA while granting approval to a similar situated candidate. How dare he! This motivation appeared to be his desire to please the provost. What a sorry state of affairs. This example offers of "shared governance". Furthermore having sat on a faculty grievance committee several years ago I believe that the "appeal process" for that case was a sham. The decision having already been made. Is this typical? Is "grievance" only window dressing?
- excellent
- muddled procedures
- it seems to work very well
- there is very little. It is mainly driven by the dean
- there is none!
- well
- non-existent
- faculty have an active role in governing college
- good
- it's not very shared
- do not have a view as of today!
- I have no problems with it
- there are strong elements of shared governance but room for improvement particularly in the area of curriculum
- fair but not transparent as it could be especially when abnormal circumstances arise
- we have none; although many faculty participate in a 2 year process to develop a governance structure it has not been implemented. The dean has established her own structure
- when dept head has no input something is wrong
- as good as can be expected given the University system and its emphasis on administration
- there is no governance or capable leadership in the college of education; quite frankly this place is a mess
- doesn't exist at college or university level
- I'm very pleased. we have a governance committee for our college
- faculty committees create policies and share with administrators in the implementation
- we as faculty have a faculty approved document. However, the administration is delaying its implementation as long as possible. I don't think either the dean or the provost has read it carefully or they'd see it benefits them and opens

lines of communication of course they may see that as a drawback

- fair
- we need rotating chairs. College faculty meetings need to be focused as much on what is happening in senate as it does on what's important to the dean. Our dean likes meetings to be a dog & pony show; little dissension and healthy discussion. Dean must be right; dean is fragile but dangerous, character
- I don't have a positive feeling about this. The dean largely dictates policy. Faculty have little more than a token voice in the college
- the faculty is fighting for it. The dean is dragging her heels it seem an ongoing battle rather than a shared concern
- it is talked about but not practical
- COBA bylaws are generally excellent and include checks and balances for tenure and promotion
- still developing them it's too early to say
- there are a lot of committee meetings but what is the outcome? Years of work went into a COE governance plan and ignored
- does not exist
- new dean too soon to say for sure looks okay so far though
- very good no prob
- we have a governance document
- fair practice although I'm not as active in its function
- very good

Views3 - What is your view of shared governance in your department?

- its already well covered at the college level
- democratic and largely fair in its function
- we have governance document
- very fine
- director is already more enthusiastic about shared governance than most faculty who simply don't want to be bothered
- excellent
- we're in good shape
- none existent
- fine in the department
- still firming still too early
- well spelled out in COBA bylaws generally very elective
- pretty good
- I think the dept governance is ok!
- department changes in future. Am comfortable with what we have. Suspect future will be different
- in spite of the "no" answers I believe there is a greater

- degree of shared governance in the department than in the college. Especially this is true in hiring. committee assignments are somewhat baffling and teaching assignments are often mysterious
- rotating chairs model is needed. Additionally our chair has overridden the faculty on at least one hiring issue
 - very good
 - we have worked hard on this and have an approved procedure
 - collaborative discussion and decision making among faculty and chair
 - again I'm very pleased
 - department talks over matters. decision is by group consensus. Much better now that we have a new dept chair
 - very little faculty input
 - actually better at department level than at college level
 - need more information circulated about decisions; haven't revised policy manual in 4-5 years
 - we have none
 - fair, adequate faculty input - no real changes needed.
 - excellent
 - I have as much participation as I feel I need
 - too new to make determination
 - somewhat/not totally
 - good
 - very interactive
 - positive-I believe that my dept welcomes faculty input and guidance
 - there is none!
 - it's fairer than at the college level
 - we have significant input into dept decisions
 - excellent!
 - best I've seen in the years here. Byington was lousy. Forstin was incredibly manipulative.
 - seems appropriate
 - good
 - I like it!
 - wonderful! Though we may lack some written documents, my dept operates under shared governance
 - very good. Very democratic. Very shared. Fair. Effective with both prior and interim chair.
 - not all concern at all
 - need more information about it from department
 - limited-we meet in committees & discuss issues, though
 - good
 - bad! We have a handbook but the chair picks & chooses when & how to follow it and he works HARD to squelch open discussion of issues
 - we have enjoyed a history of democratic governance.

Unfortunately the administration has not always honored the decisions of the department

- fair
- it is a complete disaster. The chair listens to flatterers and penalizes those who dissent. The dean supports the chair without regard to complaints coming from my dept's faculty
- very strong
- it is very limited
- generally very good
- informally but generally effective faculty drive decision & dept chairs welcomes & encourages opinion
- ok
- fool before this year
- lacking severely
- we have a committee structure in place but all substantive decisions about dept policy are made by the chair
- better now
- very bad chair appoints committees. Committees rarely meet & rarely bring anything to dept chair will not allow open discussion of issues at meetings unless previously in the agenda but it is almost impossible to put anything on the agenda
- the department chair has too much power
- on paper there is concern for shared governance in reality it is not how policies are created
- its not clear to me that there is shared governance in my dept
- the department just rubber stamps what the administration wants
- it sometimes seems that written policies are loosely interpreted or applied without taking differing circumstances into account
- we have "sheets of paper" with information about some policies and procedures. However there is no manual with policies and procedures to which faculty may refer
- erractic. No departmental handbook exists despite faculty work on it years ago; it went to the chair and died
- there needs to be more faculty consensus on issues such as faculty search candidacy, college committee assignments, etc. all music decisions are made by the chair or not made at all
- too often it seems that major changes in policies or procedures are presented to us on the same day votes are expected time for reflection - for considered deliberation is often unavailable
- ??
- fair
- the department administration gives it lip service only. We

- have an autocratic society here
- shared governance seems to work but not on key issues. On such matters, the dean gives the edict and the department chair is too eager to comply with it
- we have no written policies
- too much micromanagement at all levels-chair up
- I think that I have a voice in department governance. Everyone is a equal
- shared governance doesn't happen at GSU at any level
- better than at higher levels but often irrelevant because our system gives the dept chair so much authority
- it works remarkably well we live in a small democracy here and are fortunate
- its ok
- its not working
- poor
- it is getting better. I was hired under one chair and another was in place before my first day of work. Most of the time the new chair quoted policies to me when I asked questions. The first time the policy was in my favor the chair told me he disagreed with the policy.
- very democratic, lots of faculty input, good leadership, committees are empowered to make decisions
- out dept director is a yes man for Solomon. That is why he has the job considering that he has the lowest credential of all and never made much of a contribution to our programs
- governance document is currently suspended. It does not seem to have affected how things work very much
- dept governance is almost nill- needs a lot of work- set policies need to be adhered to- a faculty handbook is seriously needed (dept level/school of technology)
- acceptable
- we are working on it
- good

Differences - Do you perceive any differences among the university, college, and department policies and procedures for hiring and evaluating faculty? If so, please elaborate here:

- no
- yes top down evaluation but no bottom up evaluation of upper administration ie vps, provost, president
- the provost and president make arbitrary and unfair decisions-ignoring the advice and decisions made at the department and college levels. Department and college policies are irrelevant as the president and provost make up their own each year
- yes we in the SOT can be a tremendous asset to the university...but we are very different when compared to

other disciplines in COST. The values for the SOT vs. COST are both important...but different. A lack of understanding by COST "peers" is a detriment to our faculties' success in promotion and tenure the "playing field" needs to be leveled

- yes "average" times for tenure & promotion listed in faculty handbook are > those for college and dept
- I don't know about other departments and colleges to comment. I do know that I was never treated in 16 years at my previous institution the way I was treated my first 2 years here. It was very frustrating and I considered leaving regularly.
- yes salaries entry level etc.
- none
- not that I actually perceive though there is always the skeptical belief that pocket vetoes can be implemented up the chain of command
- no matter what policies say committees can run quack and administrators can usually do what they want to faculty without effective oversight
- no comments
- unsure prom & tenure should be at faculty level (colleagues) they know. Things going haywire up the chain of command and micromanagement
- you should read the faculty handbook. It dictates the composition at dept level for t&p committees (these were not in your choices) also there is supposed to be a review of probationary faculty each year. You made no mention of that.
- yes between th two units of our departments whereas the required credentials for hiring a new faculty in one unit is higher than those of the other ironically the starting salary is 5 to 10% less
- most important question and so little space to answer. Merit increases are a joke! They are handled like cost of living increases and merit has little to do with it. Recruiting & hiring is different due to very low starting salaries. No system on campus for cost of efficiency improvement suggestions
- issues of research & publication seems to vary greatly. Increased expectations for research does not commensurate with load requirements
- none to matter
- yes the guidelines in the handbook are so general about what "counts" or don't actually even specify what "counts" that it is unclear to faculty and the concept that criteria change before a faculty member's first personnel decision is unacceptable
- it seems as if the provost want to treat all colleges and all departments as if they were exactly the same. But we ARE

NOT all exactly the same nor should we be treated as such. For instance, an article in a publication issuing from a world renowned press (such as Oxford University Press) should count as good scholarship even if it is "only" in an encyclopedia!

- promotion of multiculturalism and international studies are a case of benign neglect
- our department does not have promotion/tenure committees, which seems to be at odds with university policy
- there seems to be a disconnect between written policies and how policies are enacted on the different levels (dept/dean/provost). Written policies are just vague enough for different people to interpret policies in different ways
- ? I feel very ignorant perhaps this is my own fault
- it appears that the criteria for promotion and tenure vary from dept to college-wide to university-wide evaluation entities. It would be helpful to have these better lined up so people don't get ugly surprises. Surely no faculty member intentionally sabotages his/her promotion and tenure chances. Let's do everything possible to allow people to succeed (ie, clarity and consistency of eval. criteria at all levels)
- yes the university disregards professional assessments of situations made in the department for hiring and for evaluating
- yes standards differ from college to college and depart to depart. committee structures also vary widely
- for no apparent reason - or at least no effectively articulated reason- the dean instituted an external review policy for promotion and tenure. there was no way for faculty to vote on this policy - it was simply mandated.
- yes some regard service as purely formal with no real content. unevenness in applying and evaluating other areas
- works best at "lowest" levels; more lip service & less genuine at the university level
- no again this is my 2nd year so I'm pretty sure how the department works but not beyond that
- none it means anything if the administrators are uninterested in enforcing the written rules at least when it is inconvenient for them to do so. as far as I can see the administrators want everything quiet and everybody smiling. Reporting problems in the chain of command merely gets you branded a troublemaker.
- lack of clarity and compatibility especially problematic is the college level
- I think that we have worked very hard at creating by-laws that are uniform with the policies and expectations of the colleges and university. however, we have suffered from a

- history where administrators lacked the "political will" to enforce their own policies and expectations
- a little & it should be ironed out. but we must also have a real functioning not just on paper system for holding administrators accountable for actually honoring the policies and procedures
 - yes
 - not sure-I'm more familiar with college policies than university ones
 - I hope so everybody can't be as bad as we are
 - I'm not certain how helpful this information will be to the committee. how will you interpret 'unsure' responses? Do they mean that the college or dept guidelines/communication is unclear or that individual faculty don't bother to pay attention?
 - evaluation varies greatly among colleges
 - the dept policies are in line w/ college policies and those follow university guidelines
 - they all seem nebulous
 - knowledge on subject is poor. the items have not been discussed with me
 - the university & college could look at the evaluation policies for non-tenured clinical faculty. also the work on online and webct courses needs to be credited in eval procedure
 - neither the annual review process nor the p/t guidelines seem to take into account class sizes or advising responsibilities
 - college and departmental procedures for evaluations are consistent with the university
 - differ expectations at different levels should be more crosstalk
 - university regulations specify that annual evals are required as part of our contract yet we had none in 2001. we all work on things like promotion guidelines but administrators never follow through so that the guidelines become official. I'm applying for promotion this year and no one could give me dept guidelines yet BOR requires dept to have these guidelines
 - this questionnaire does not begin to address the question of problems with governance-procedures not followed in practice or policies not administered even handed are the problems
 - what appears in print is not what actually used at the college level here
 - current policy is being regarded as a "change" when in reality it is simply fair and consistent enforcement of existing policies
 - varies from dept to dept within colleges and between

colleges

- they are congruent. hundreds of hours have been devoted in the college of education related to faculty governance and promotion and tenure criteria. these have been approved by the COE faculty but the dean will not approve them. this place is a sorry rudderless mess.
- what is valued at the department and college level is not valued at the university, provost or president level
- I've heard rumors that in other colleges it is not as good
- I'm new in the dept and I don't know much about other depts
- absolutely - when one faculty have input in a decision on hiring (a unanimous decision) and it is abruptly ignored by the provost - how would you think we perceive this? Faculty opinion is no longer valued at this institution. how can talk of governance when we have a provost who refuses to meet with faculty when he is the next level of the chair and the previous lines are successful in resolving the issue?
- we are a new college and many policies and procedures are up in the air. hopefully many of these unsure areas will be resolved when a new dean is hired and on board
- yes the department should be considered the best judge of ability then the college and last the university level yes decisions are increasingly made at the university level that counter the decisions at c/d levels. if this is the normal course of business then the work at the d/c is unnecessary
- some depts do not get annual evaluations which is highly problematic; some colleges use a point system for evaluating faculty which I believe is wrong (doesn't faculty senate agree?)
- from a "systems perspective" the external environment of GSU is in extraordinarily good shape: lots of regents' and assembly and governor support, decent state budget situation compared to other states, student interest/enrollment increasing, new IT bldg and program, etc. the state of the internal environment is messier more cloudy. our paternalistic conservative university administrators will say that internal environment on college campuses are always in flux, anxious, upset about something. it's the academy after all. but I see a chasm widening between in-the-trenches faculty members and the administration. they have sold out "collegial" for "corporate". I refuse to let them treat me like a subordinate to act paternalistic toward me. We are colleagues of the academy and they must bear my honest opinions as I bear their dehumanized decision making focused on the "big picture".
- we do not have a good idea about tenure and promotion we send basically everyone up but often get shot down always at

- the dean's level
- the categories are the same. the actualization and input at levels above the department are autocratic and shrouded in smoke and mirror
- do not have enough info to give an answer to the question
- the dean has some ideas that are different from those at the university level
- yes am concerned by tales I've heard about inconsistency about processes outside COBA. the COBA by-laws are an excellent model that should be leveraged by other colleges at GSU
- not that I am aware of
- when I applied for tenure and promotion it was said there would be "grandfathering"
- regarding evaluation there is clarity at dept level but not at college or university level it is getting better at university level
- are these the only issues of faculty governance? If so you missed several important issues
- one hear continuing accounts and rumors about CLASS and difficulties with department chairs who treat faculty unfair
- absolutely
- none noted
- no not in my dept nor COBA. I hear rumors especially from CLASS etc of terrible transgressions!
- no
- no
- no