Executive Summary

Shared governance, as described in the American Association of University Professors’ 1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, refers to “shared responsibility and cooperative action” among governing boards, administrators, and faculties. The statement also assigns areas of primary responsibility—authority—for decisions to these groups based on their expertise. The idea of shared governance is that faculty not only has the right to be heard in institutional decision-making; they have primary responsibility for reaching decisions in academic matters. The Faculty Senate Rights and Responsibilities Committee reviewed the status of shared governance at Eastern Kentucky University through the Shared Governance Survey1 (Appendix A).

Results of qualitative data provided specific examples of perceived lack of shared governance or where faculty feels their perceptions of shared governance at EKU are negatively affected. This included specific reference to the Board of Regents and other leadership positions within the organization and administration of the university. A clear correlation between qualitative data (Lack of decision making, Communication/ Transparency, and No Trust between faculty and administration) and quantitative data with regards to facilities and budgeting exists. Responses indicated that faculty are concerned about the lack of shared governance relating to these themes specifically. A complete description of data collection, results, analysis, and recommendations follow.

Description of Data Collection and Respondents

Facilitated by EKU Institutional Research, a survey consisting of four demographic questions, thirty Likert-scale questions, and one open response question was sent electronically to all full-time EKU Faculty on May 5, 2015. For full-time EKU Faculty who had not responded in May, the survey was sent again on August 24, 2015. The total response rate for these two offerings was 35%.

Demographic results can be found in Tables 1-4. Comparatively, the highest percentages of respondents were from the College of Arts & Sciences (42.23%), in the rank of Associate Professor (38.55%), tenured (67.74%), and with a full-time 9-month appointment (84.46%).

**Table 1: Percent of respondents by college**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>42.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Technology</td>
<td>12.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>20.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice &amp; Safety</td>
<td>8.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Percent of respondents by faculty rank**

Shared Governance Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>29.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>38.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>22.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Percent of respondents by tenure status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>67.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not tenured, but on a tenure-track appointment</td>
<td>21.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not tenured, and not on a tenure-track appointment</td>
<td>10.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Percent of respondents by full-time job status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time (9 months)</td>
<td>84.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time (12 months)</td>
<td>15.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantitative Results

* N=248 faculty completed the thirty Likert-scale questions. Questions were framed in the positive. Results from the five point Likert-scale were condensed into Strongly Disagree + Disagree, Neutral, Strongly Agree + Agree. The results of data analysis of the thirty Likert-scale questions suggest:

- For 18 of 30 questions, the majority of respondents believe that shared governance is shown in these 18 areas (Table 5, the percentages of SA + A options are significantly greater than the percentages of SD + D options).
- For 9 of 30 questions, the respondents have opposite views regarding the shared governance in these 9 areas (Table 6, the percentages of SA + A options are not significantly different from the percentages of SD + D options). That is, some of the respondents feel EKU is doing well in these areas while other respondents think the concerns presented in these areas should be addressed accordingly.
- For 3 of 30 questions, the majority of respondents believe these three areas should receive immediate attention (Table 7, the percentages of SD + D options are significantly greater than the percentages of SA + A options).

Table 5: Favorable items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SD+D</th>
<th>SA+A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Board of Regents and administrators exhibit collegiality, respect, tolerance, and civility toward other members of the EKU community and each other.</td>
<td>17.41%</td>
<td>63.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members exhibit collegiality, respect, tolerance, and civility toward other members of the EKU community and each other.</td>
<td>11.29%</td>
<td>73.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Faculty is afforded an appropriate degree of autonomy with regard to its areas of responsibility by administrators and the Board of Regents.</td>
<td>30.74%</td>
<td>52.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKU recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making as it pertains to hiring, tenure, and promotion.</td>
<td>18.14%</td>
<td>61.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The structures and processes that allow for faculty collaboration in governance are clearly defined in EKU faculty policies.</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>51.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Faculty Senate effectively supports faculty collaboration in university</td>
<td>15.11%</td>
<td>63.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The dean of my college effectively advocates the principles of shared governance to administrators. 21.90% 58.57%

The dean of my college models the principles of shared governance in interactions with department chairs and faculty members. 20.61% 62.72%

The dean of my college seeks department input on issues (such as budgeting) in which the department has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility. 29.09% 52.27%

My college meetings are regular, effective, and open to faculty leadership and participation. 28.94% 51.06%

The chair of my department effectively advocates the principles of shared governance to the dean of the college. 22.02% 67.43%

The chair of my department models the principles of shared governance in interactions with faculty members. 21.28% 70.21%

The chair of my department seeks faculty input on issues (such as budgeting) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest but no primary responsibility. 25.74% 66.24%

My department meetings are regular, effective, and open to faculty leadership and participation. 20.08% 68.20%

Colleagues in my department understand the responsibilities of faculty in shared governance and participate effectively at the department level. 21.43% 65.97%

Only on rare occasions are faculty recommendations overturned in hiring, promotion, or tenure decisions. 21.43% 68.10%

Procedures for the hiring/appointment of regular positions are clearly understood and followed. 26.29% 57.76%

Overall, EKU as an institution reflects a commitment to shared governance. 27.54% 44.49%

SD = Strongly disagree, D = Disagree, SA= Strongly agree, A = Agree

### Table 6: Controversial items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SD+D</th>
<th>SA+A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications between faculty members and administrators are open and carried out in good faith and an atmosphere of trust.</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>40.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation by the administration with faculty leadership allows time and a mechanism for leadership to consult with their constituents before offering recommendations.</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td>41.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members have timely access to information necessary to give input into governance processes.</td>
<td>38.24%</td>
<td>37.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The President seeks meaningful faculty input on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the Faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.</td>
<td>39.55%</td>
<td>33.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The President advocates the principles of shared governance to the Board of Regents.</td>
<td>28.03%</td>
<td>39.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKU recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making as it pertains to long-range planning.</td>
<td>37.77%</td>
<td>41.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty representation on joint committees reflects the appropriate degree of the faculty’s stake in the committee’s area or charge.</td>
<td>33.03%</td>
<td>42.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedures for the hiring/appointment of interim positions are clearly understood and followed.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD+D</th>
<th>SA+A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over the last ten years, the effectiveness of shared governance at EKU has improved.</td>
<td>37.04%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = Strongly disagree, D = Disagree, SA= Strongly agree, A = Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Unfavorable items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SD+D</th>
<th>SA+A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Board of Regents respects and supports the Faculty’s traditional role in institutional governance.</td>
<td>45.27%</td>
<td>28.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKU recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making as it pertains to facilities.</td>
<td>52.21%</td>
<td>24.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKU recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making as it pertains to budgeting.</td>
<td>56.76%</td>
<td>18.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD = Strongly disagree, D = Disagree, SA= Strongly agree, A = Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Results

The open response question, ‘Please use this space to make additional comments on the atmosphere of trust or the status of shared governance at EKU’ was completed by N=61 (24%) of survey participants. In order to comply with the best practices of qualitative content analysis, committee members employed the constant comparison method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985\(^2\)) and open coding (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002\(^3\)). Obtaining triangulation through independent and group collaboration, the committee identified ten distinct themes (similar words expressing same ideas) that were organized, coded, reviewed, and placed into thematic categories (Figure 2). Those comments that pertained to the ‘Existence of Shared Governance at EKU’ (Figure 1) were assigned to one of seven categories that described the degree of shared governance to which the response related (Good, Improving, Declining, Mixed, Poor, Non-existent, Response does not address shared governance). A frequency count was completed based on the number of times a comment referred to a specific theme and/or category and converted to a percentage\(^4\).

The most frequent responses (greatest percentage) referred to the themes, Lack of decision making/No input/Faculty not involved, Communication/Transparency, No trust between faculty and administration. The least frequently (smallest percentage) referenced themes included responses about Unreasonable faculty expectations, Academic calendar, and Non-academics. The majority of responses referred to more than one theme.

\(^4\) Percentages do not equal 100% due to rounding
Figure 1: Degree of Existence of Shared Governance

- Poor: 26%
- Non-existent: 25%
- Mixed: 20%
- Declining: 10%
- Response did not include shared governance: 13%
- Improving: 3%
- Good: 3%

Figure 2: Frequency of Response Themes
• **Existence of shared governance at EKU**
  All responses were categorized into one of the following descriptors that identified faculty’s perceptions of shared governance at EKU. The greatest percentage of responses, 26% indicated that they perceived shared governance at EKU as, Poor. Thereafter, 25% perceived shared governance to be Non-existent, 20% had Mixed perceptions of shared governance, and 13% did not include reference to shared governance in their response. Only 10% of responses indicated that they perceived shared governance to be Declining. Responses that indicated Good or Improving shared governance included 3% each, respectively.

• **No trust between faculty and administration**
  Responses in this category represented both faculty and administrator’s lack of trust. The Board was identified as one of the primary reasons for the lack of trust between faculty and administration as well as the President, Provost Council, Deans, and Department Chairs. Comments categorized within this theme represented 13% (n=8) of all open responses.

• **Salary/Equity/Workload**
  Responses in this category cited resentment for the increase in administration salaries and continued concern about internal equity. Mixed responses regarding workload included positive and negative feedback of administration’s expectations of faculty workload as well as references to the Board of Regents as a contributing element to the lack of trust within this theme. Comments categorized within this theme represented 7% (n=4.2) of all
open responses.

- **Budget/Construction/Facilities**
  Responses made a clear connection between Budget/Construction/Facilities and Communication/Transparency. This is further validated by the quantitative data that reported these two themes (Facilities and Budget) to be of greatest concern with regards to shared governance. Comments categorized within this theme represented 9% (n=5.4) of all open responses.

- **Academic calendar**
  The second least frequently represented theme of responses all made reference to the change of semester length from 17 to 16 weeks and/or the change of spring break dates. Comments categorized within this theme represented 4% (n=2.4) of all open responses.

- **Non-academics**
  This theme represented the lower third of responses with regard to frequency count. The dominant reference within this theme related to athletics, branding, as well as other issues unrelated to academics. Comments categorized within this theme represented 5% (n=3) of all open responses.

- **Communication/Transparency**
  Responses made a clear connection between the lack of Communication/Transparency and the Lack of decision making with regards to policies, committees, deans and chairs evaluations. Comments categorized within this theme represented 13% (n=8) of all open responses.

- **Lack of decision making/No input/Faculty not involved**
  This theme represents the most frequently referenced responses. Reasons for participant’s comments included the lack of faculty representation on committees, merit pay, declining faculty support and suggestions for improvement including lecturer representation on Faculty Senate, and part time faculty inclusion in departmental meetings. Comments categorized within this theme represented 27% (n=16.4) of all open responses.

- **Unreasonable faculty expectations**
  The least frequently cited theme. Responses included faculty expectations from the administrator’s perspective. Comments categorized within this theme represented 2% (n=1.2) of all open responses.

- **Retaliation/Lack of tolerance/Favoritism/Civility**
  Examples included retaliation due to contrary opinions of faculty and questions regarding the qualifications of the Board of Regents. References were made to nepotism, cronyism, and dictatorships. Comments categorized within this theme represented 9% (n=5.4) of all open responses.

- **Hiring/Evaluation/Retiring**
  This theme represented the top third of responses and provided suggestions, examples, and/or inquiries about interim hires, tenure track vs. adjuncts/lecturers, dismissal and
hiring procedures. Comments categorized within this theme represented 12% (\(n=7.3\)) of all open responses.

B in the table contains a complete list of all qualitative responses. All identifying and inflammatory text was removed to secure the anonymity of the responses except those referencing bodies within the organization and administration of the university. The 2015-2016 EKU Faculty Handbook\(^5\) identifies the following groups within the organization and administration of the university including Board of Regents, Faculty Senate, University Councils (President’s Council, Provost’s Council, Council on Academic Affairs, The Graduate Council), and University Committees.

**Recommendations**

Based on the results of the 2015 Shared Governance Survey completed by 35% of all full-time faculty at EKU, the Faculty Senate Rights and Responsibilities Committee provides the following recommendations:

1. The university administration considers the establishment of a university Ombuds, a confidential, impartial, independent resource to mediate and discuss issues in response to faculty’s expressed concerns in the interest of promoting civility, mutual respect, and ethical conduct.

2. Shared governance at EKU as it relates to all areas including facilities, budget, academics, non-academics, hiring, and evaluations should be clearly defined and posted on the Faculty Senate website.

3. As consistent application of policies are key to building trust, administrators and faculty should institute and employ clear policies on shared governance that are publicly posted and easy to access for all employees in an academic unit (e.g. college and/or department policies on hiring new faculty and chairs, administrator evaluation policies, etc.). These should be consistently applied at all relevant academic levels.

4. In order to encourage increased trust between faculty and administrators, all faculty within an academic unit (e.g. department, college) should be informed of the results of the annual administrator evaluation of their Chair/department head/Dean at the end of each Spring semester. This notification should include general information on the results of the evaluation (i.e. the assessed strengths/weaknesses of the evaluated performance).

5. As faculty voices are vital to shared governance, all university committees (regular, ad hoc, policy drafting, hiring, and advisory) should include a variety of faculty, and their numbers should be fairly balanced with administrator membership.

6. Faculty perceptions of shared governance should continue to be documented and analyzed using empirical evidence. The Shared Governance Survey should be administered to all full-time faculty every three years by the Rights and Responsibilities Committee and results presented to Faculty Senate and the President’s Council within the same academic year.

---

Appendix A: Shared Governance Survey

Demographic questions:
1. In which college do you work? (Please check only the box corresponding to the college in which you hold your primary assignment).
   a. Arts & Sciences
   b. Business & Technology
   c. Education
   d. Health Sciences
   e. Justice & Safety
   f. Other
2. What is your rank?
   a. Professor
   b. Associate Professor
   c. Assistant Professor
   d. Instructor
   e. Other
3. Are you tenured?
   a. Yes
   b. No, but I have a tenure-track appointment
   c. No, and I do not have a tenure-track appointment
4. What is your job status?
   a. Full-time (9 months)
   b. Full-time (12 months)

Likert scale questions (Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree)
1. The Board of Regents and administrators exhibit collegiality, respect, tolerance, and civility toward other members of the EKU community and each other.
2. Faculty members exhibit collegiality, respect, tolerance, and civility toward other members of the EKU community and each other.
3. Communications between faculty members and administrators are open and carried out in good faith and an atmosphere of trust.
4. Consultation by the administration with faculty leadership allows time and a mechanism for leadership to consult with their constituents before offering recommendations.
5. Faculty members have timely access to information necessary to give input into governance processes.
6. The Board of Regents respects and supports the Faculty’s traditional role in institutional governance.
7. The President seeks meaningful faculty input on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the Faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.
8. The President advocates the principles of shared governance to the Board of Regents.
9. The Faculty is afforded an appropriate degree of autonomy with regard to its areas of responsibility by administrators and the Board of Regents.
10. EKU recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making as it pertains to long-range planning.
11. EKU recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making as it pertains to facilities.
12. EKU recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making as it pertains to budgeting.
13. EKU recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making as it pertains to hiring, tenure, and promotion.
14. The structures and processes that allow for faculty collaboration in governance are clearly defined in EKU faculty policies.
15. The Faculty Senate effectively supports faculty collaboration in university governance.
16. Faculty representation on joint committees reflects the appropriate degree of the faculty’s stake in the committee’s area or charge.
17. The dean of my college effectively advocates the principles of shared governance to administrators.
18. The dean of my college models the principles of shared governance in interactions with department chairs and faculty members.
19. The dean of my college seeks department input on issues (such as budgeting) in which the department has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.
20. My college meetings are regular, effective, and open to faculty leadership and participation.
21. The chair of my department effectively advocates the principles of shared governance to the dean of the college.
22. The chair of my department models the principles of shared governance in interactions with faculty members.
23. The chair of my department seeks faculty input on issues (such as budgeting) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.
24. My department meetings are regular, effective, and open to faculty leadership and participation.
25. Colleagues in my department understand the responsibilities of faculty in shared governance and participate effectively at the department level.
26. Only on rare occasions are faculty recommendations overturned in hiring, promotion, or tenure decisions.
27. Procedures for the hiring/appointment of interim positions are clearly understood and followed.
28. Procedures for the hiring/appointment of regular positions are clearly understood and followed.
29. Overall, EKU as an institution reflects a commitment to shared governance.
30. Over the last ten years, the effectiveness of shared governance at EKU has improved.

Open-ended question:
1. Please use this space to make additional comments on the atmosphere of trust or the status of shared governance at EKU.
### Appendix B: Qualitative Responses

Since there are fewer and fewer tenured faculty, we have less and less of a voice and yet more and more paperwork and committee work to do in addition to our teaching and research. We MUST start hiring more tenure track and fewer adjuncts and lecturers. We MUST stop hiring more administrators when we cannot afford to hire enough tenure-track faculty. Our focus has shifted from education to less important matters. The majority now seems to be administration, and the majority rules.

The real problem on this front is the upper administration - particularly the Board, the President (to a lesser extent), and the non-academic support services (the budget office, e.g.). The Provost and our Dean consistently demonstrate a strong commitment to shared governance.

I believe EKU works hard at promoting trust and shared governance.

Hard to trust board or administration when we are losing the best faculty and staff to better paying institutions. It is even more difficult to trust them when administrators are multiplying and receiving salaries so high they are ridiculous. Faculty and staff are the ones who interact with students on a daily basis and make this place run. If you want to attract and keep the best students and build a better reputation as an institution of higher learning then start with attracting and keeping the best faculty.

I work at Model, so I am not fully aware of everything that goes on with EKU faculty.

Many important issues are decided upon by administrators, without faculty input, and then made to look like faculty had input when the changes are implemented. I think we have way too many administrators, and just keep adding more and more every day. I don't feel a connection to administrators. For example, I feel my pay is very low - on campus and especially compared to what it would have been if I taught in the public schools. There, they have a FAIR pay scale based on clear criteria (years of experience, rank, education). We need that at EKU, but there is no way a faculty member such as myself can address such an issue with the administration. This issue, like many, seems to be one of those things that is dictated by those whose salary is too high to be of concern. ….

Shared governance is a joke when the department chairman dictates the outcome. Retaliation for expression of a contrary opinion is harsh.

There are many times that the Administration needs to make tough decisions and while considering faculty input, the decision has to be made. Faculty at time, overstep their bounds and want to push an agenda that may not be in the best interest of the Institution as a whole, but for them. Shared governance has its place, but EKU allows it to go too far in many cases. As for faculty members exhibiting collegiality, respect, tolerance, and civility toward other members of the EKU community and each other. This is the case ONLY whey you agree with their point of view. Too many times faculty believe it is their responsibility to make everyone see things their way. I am always amazed at those who advocate “tolerance,” but have none for other points of view. I can be tolerant, but I do not have to agree.

There is no real shared governance at EKU. The administration seem oblivious to how their decisions about buildings and facilities and administrativehirings and reorganizations affect academic quality.

We have not had shared governance in the [College]…

Last question: I have been here since August 2007--not last ten years. Answer reflects time at EKU.
There is no trust between administrators and faculty.

Many decisions are made and pushed down to faculty. Morale is low. We are spread thin. On paper it may look like shared governance, but the general feeling among faculty is that we really never know what is coming at us and nor do we expect that our voice will be heard.

Limited opportunities for newer faculty to be involved with committees at the college and university level.

I have no beef at the university level. My college and school levels are horrid.

Faculty don't trust administration, especially when incorrect information is used to determine IPEP and the recommendations of deans and chairs for IPEP aren't approved by administration beyond them. The internal equity issue has not been solved.

At present, shared governance is a concept better adopted at the university level; less so at the college/department level. Efforts are underway to bring colleges into alignment with those principles. This made it difficult to answer questions where “Administration” is viewed as a singular unit. I wanted to say, at the university - yes; at the college - no. It also caused me to agree, rather than strongly agree in several places. There is a clear effort to sustain faculty authority in academic matters at the university level...and I suspect, most but not all colleges. Information on the development of the facilities, and the budget is less open. It remains to be seen if added faculty sitting on the Administrative Council will cure this situation. The central campus revitalization revealed a tactical mindset as well. With the exception of public information, the focus of administrative efforts was solely on students. There seemed to be a planned effort to delay vetting the issue through faculty until the students approved a fee to support the effort.

Eastern does well, I think, with shared governance. But like MANY faculty, we're concerned over the push for bigger football. Students, staff, and faculty are united against this terrible and costly idea, and we worry that upper administration isn't heeding our concerns.

I've seen administrators tear down faculty in policy discussions that left me chilled and scared to speak up. Provost Council continuously overrides Faculty Senate recommendations for policies that relate to faculty evaluation and retention. Administration and faculty leaders confuse shared governance with a stakeholder mentality (stakeholders provide input, but don't make the final decision; in shared governance, faculty are responsible for final academic decisions, such as curriculum, methods of instruction, faculty status, etc.). Decisions involving the length of a semester or when to hold spring break are not brought to Faculty Senate for discussion. It was made by administration and just handed down. Hiring processes are not transparent, or the decision about why a search is internal or external, or why a search is not done at all. Administration is not listening to faculty or the full student body when it comes to spending money on athletics or sports facilities. The membership of policy drafting committees is not transparent; nor is the method used to determine who is on these committees.

I feel the current direction of this University has taken a very paternalistic perspective, ensuring faculty that their concerns and opinions are extremely important, but in reality, taking deliberate steps to weaken the structure of faculty hires and the institution of tenure.

Policies are written and pushed through without regard to faculty. Decisions are made by administrators and then faculty are told what they are to do and when; even when it involves teaching classes and students. The faculty senate is an ADVISORY board. It has No power. Items and policies are discussed and voted on but the decisions have already been made.

Where the university committee structure is in place, shared governance is working quite well. There are several committees that ought to exist and since they do not exist, senior administrators can freely dictate
academic policy with reckless disregard and/or ignorance of long-term impacts on retention and graduation rates for the sake of meeting this year's budget versus long-term implications. Most universities have some type of calendar and/or academic progress committee involved in the setting of the university calendar (graduation dates, add/drop dates, incentives/disincentives for adding/dropping courses, Spring Break dates, etc.) - we currently let the registrar and associate provost make these decisions with little to no input of faculty in a structured environment. *We do have a commencement committee with no faculty. Secondly, we should have a sitting ‘fiscal affairs’ committee that studies the pros and cons of fees like the add/drop fee, international student fee, etc. If there are fees with impacts on the academic mission of the university, the faculty should be dictating this policy in consultation with the university financial managers - and an appropriate committee with financial personnel/administrators and faculty should discuss and deliberate upon these matters of MOST critical importance rather than just embracing shared governance in more politically safe arenas of the university. *It is a sad state of affairs with the Provost of the university says that her hands are tied when it comes to discussing add/drop fees. *We desperately need a Fiscal Affairs or Finance Committee and I think the faculty would also like to have more say on how the university calendar is structured.

Dean … runs one-sided meetings where information only flows down from above as directives usually with incorrect and partial information. There is rarely a conversation or an effort to pass information up the line. Rude responses to questions are often used to shut chairs down. Evaluation of deans and chairs are never fully completed. Comments are solicited from faculty but are rarely given to the administrator under review. An ineffective dean or chair can remain in their position indefinitely with no term limit.

A lot has been done in recent years to promote shared governance at the university level. More attention need to be turned to the department level. In my department, we have a set of rules but nowadays it is often ignored and there is a small group of people who seem to informally talk to each other and make decisions while others feel left out or sometimes even ostracized. We have committees but most of them don't do much except give people a chance to add to their merit pay records. It has not always been that way. While the university is moving somewhat more in the direction of shared governance, at least some departments seem to be moving the other way—easy to do because less in the spotlight.

Faculty are not respected by the dean or president. The dean shows favoritism to certain employees and doesn't even acknowledge others. [He/she] doesn't provide equal opportunity for all employees. When a position is created or vacated, [he/she] just appoints whomever [he/she] wants in that position—does not open up the interview process to all employees. There is a culture of bullying in the college. Ex-does not want to hear any different opinions. Employees who are “yes” people to the dean receive favor by being promoted and getting better work assignments.

Shared govt is a joke …. The committees are now “advisory.”

Understand: The Board of Regents is a bunch of people who got Bachelor's degrees from EKU and mostly got lucky in their occupations. They don't know how to run a university; they basically rubber-stamp an overpaid President, who seems to be doing very little in seeking input from anyone but his chosen administrators and a few close faculty.

At times there has been little or no non-administrative faculty on some committees. Faculty leadership is getting better at pointing out such lacunae and pushing to rectify such situations, and the administration has, when pushed, usually accommodated that need.

The part time faculty need to be included in meetings at the departmental and college level as well. There needs to be more than a single part time faculty representative in the Faculty Senate. Not inviting the part time faculty to the table diminishes the voice of the faculty as a whole.
Shared governance at EKU is a load of crap. Unless there are consequences for administrators and chairs who do not comply with faculty decisions or follow faculty recommendations or who violate department/school policies, “shared governance” will be nothing more than empty rhetoric. If the faculty cannot remove a chair from office, then “shared governance” has no real meaning.

While understanding the need for agenda items to have as much time as necessary to come forward for CAA or Senate meetings, they often give only a few days to read and then discuss the matter with the representatives on the Senate and elsewhere. A couple more days between publication of agendas and the actual meetings, for faculty to bring issues to their senators, or at least a clearer summary of major policy changes, so they don't have to be pulled from the dozens of pages that usually accompany policy changes, would be appreciated.

Collegiality within the [College] is intermittent at best. While shared governance is discussed as valuable, it is not lived out in experience as some departments dictate to others what will and will not be.

Many of my responses are based on my experiences ... this past year. Depressing and dismal. ... I now see how critical it is to have clear policies in place. I am most concerned at the University's approach to hiring faculty, which now is determined by bargaining among the Deans. Chairs and program area faculty have little/no input. The University is moving closer and closer to fewer full time and more part time and temporary, non-tenured faculty, with more and more full time, non-academic staff. Classrooms are based on a 19th century teaching model and the use of computers and doc cameras that are little more than overhead projectors. We have a beautiful campus and a few very nice buildings, but we aren't focusing on our core “product” - instruction.

I have high hopes for the current administration. We have had times when shared governance has suffered. I think things are looking up!

From the perspective of at least my department, the chain of governance breaks down when continued negative reviews of the chair by the faculty are not just ignored, but blatantly lied about. There is no clear structure to our internal governance, and our view of external governance is almost completely and deliberately obscured by an ineffective chair, and a collusive dean. Our faculty meetings have devolved into short sessions of announcements from the chair, and long sessions of unproductive discussion without any leadership or direction from the chair. We need help, and this survey isn't going to do it.

Faculty are the number one resource in student success, yet the emphasis on faculty support and empowerment has become less and less in the years I have been at EKU. We are losing many good faculty -- excellent new recruits, not just retiring faculty who choose not to endure the anti-academic, anti-faculty climate that prevails at the university.

Exactly what “shared governance” is, apparently, is open to question. See Chronicle article: http://chronicle.com/article/Exactly-What-Is-Shared/47065/

My responses with regard to “Procedures for the hiring/appointment of interim positions are clearly understood and followed” and “Procedures for the hiring/appointment of regular positions are clearly understood and followed” pertain to the university in general and not my department. It is very clear to me that sometimes regular positions are created and people are appointed without any formal process at all; I have firsthand knowledge of a situation in which a full-time position (*not* an interim position) was created and a person was appointed without any announcements or advertising. I also think that, if the Provost wants a particular thing done, she sometimes puts pressure on the entities involved.
When the Chair of the Board of Regents has undue influence over hiring and budget decisions, it diminishes my trust in the university/Board of Regents to make objective, informed decisions (based on data and sound practices) in every other area of university governance. Nepotism and cronyism at EKU still seem to have a strong foothold, and that is not good for morale or for building trust. Likewise, to learn that department budgets (for those who have been frugal over the course of the academic year and do the bulk of their spending in May and June) are being grabbed by upper administration (in what can only mean that they have been irresponsible for their own budgeting and frugality) further erodes trust and confidence in our university leadership.

The term “administrators” is ambiguous. Questions that ask participants to rate colleagues’ “understanding” requires speculation.

The Dean … and the current Chair of my department have no regard for governance. … The fact that faculty are diminished in stature in links on the University homepage (coming after staff, the now burgeoning ranks of vice presidents, administrators, assistant Deans, etc. etc.) is telling. Other universities have faculty links from the homepage for the university prominently placed. The Dean apparently is being given dictatorial powers (financial exigencies? Give me a break!) in future iterations under the ruse of increased SACS requirements. The only way to stanch the proletarianization of the faculty by the Administration is for the faculty members to unionize, but there are enough faculty members who have been coopted so that this will never happen. Governance is a ruse.

Shared governance---what a joke! We are closer to a mini-dictatorship here at EKU...or maybe it is just our college.

Faculty representation on Faculty Senate is closed to lecturer positions. In the past lecturers could participate, but we were informed that it has been determined that only tenure and tenure-track faculty are now eligible. So the great unanswered question remains: why are lecturers (a large segment of EKU faculty) with no direct representation in shared governance?

I think everyone's intentions are good. I do think there is a tendency, at the top, to seek input at times but then follow their own ideas regardless.

A large reason for many of the negative comments above is because of the financial sweep that the administration is making of departmental M&O funds this year in earliest May. The sweep is unnecessary and dishonest - the administration is STEALING from departmental units. I would have much more tolerance for administration high jinks if they were honest about the expenditure of funds. These sweeps undermine the capability of departments to plan and spend their budgetary funds effectively. Departments are being punished for trying to spend funds responsibly and with forethought. Our department wants to support students with field trips, conference attendance, and independent research projects. Many of the latter take place in the summer and are funded by our department during the close of the fiscal year. During the first 80+% of the fiscal year, we pinch pennies so we can fund our students in their projects. By sweeping funds, our largest method in teaching students true critical thinking - research projects - is severely undermined. Moreover, we are also in need of classroom equipment and other educational supplies, and we take stock of our needs at the end of the Spring semester. Again, we pinch pennies in order to make these expenditures. Our reward to have monies stolen from us. To make amends and to DEMONSTRATE a bottom-up approach to administration of the university - and not merely give lip service - the administration should do 2 things. Money talks, bullshit walks. (1) Allow departments to carry-over funds from one fiscal year to the next. This will allow departments to plan for larger budgetary items (2) If #1 cannot be accomplished (and I don't know why it can't), these foolish and crippling fund sweeps should be curtailed until the end of the fiscal year. Please trust
us to spend the funds wisely. That is the essence of shared governance. To close, allowing departments freedom in fund expenditures is necessary to our educational mission. - need I refer to the quip above again? And I consider these sweeps to be dishonest and underhanded that act to sow distrust among faculty and their departmental units. The administration is charged with assuring that funds are spend responsibly, and they certainly should do so. I posit that the administration take this oversight responsibility seriously and start to punish those budgetary entities that spend monies foolishly rather than punish those who are acting responsibly and in best faith. Lastly, this act of sweeping M&O has certainly poisoned my well - think of how much better the survey may have turned out in the absence of this administrative injustice - the epitome of sowing seeds of mistrust.

I think the university, [College], and the department do not support nor actively involve faculty in governance. Therefore, I do not think there is shared governance at EKU. There is a lack of transparency at each level. There is a lack of meaningful communication at each level. It seems one way for the most part: top down. I am very disappointed in the university, college, and department.

At this University, the same small cadre of people are invited to participate in all University planning. It's the same people over and over again on the important University committees. In addition, the administration seems immune to faculty input regarding the function and direction of the University. They ask for input they just don't put any of it into practice. The debacle regarding the 16 vs 17 week term is a perfect example of how disfunctional and even laughable the decision making process at this University has become.

A good example of lack of trust and shared governance is the different lengths of fall and spring semester. Nobody saw that coming and it was never vetted as an option among constituent groups, but when the decision was delivered the statement was made that it was vetted. I would venture to guess that over 95% of faculty would oppose the different lengths for the two semesters. It appears clear that the administration did this based on limitations of the registrars office to resolve issues related to different needs of on-campus versus on-line course offerings, and that they have failed to make a reasonable decision, primarily due to the lack of shared governance. There are plenty of other examples. There often is an appearance of open dialog on some issues, but not others, and, either way, most decisions seem to defy faculty input and often basic common sense. This has become much worse in the last 3-4 years. It appears administrators are anxious to do things, particularly NEW things, to improve some measure of success without looking at areas where there is already success and trying to support those things. Watering what is green is usually much more efficient than watering brown areas to make them come back or putting resources into planting seeds at the expense of improving resources for what is already growing, with no real guarantee that the seeds are even viable. All new faces in an administration may seem like it's fresh and exciting, but when the words coming from those faces sound exactly like what we heard from the last set of fresh faces (because nothing changed the first time), there is a sense of hopelessness rather than hope. Other than that, everything is fine.

Shared governance was excellent a few years ago--it has slowly disintegrated the last two years. Faculty have very little say in what is happening at EKU. Administrators, who do not teach, are guiding academic principles--such as when Spring Break should occur. It was a nightmare for scheduling class topics, assignments, projects, and exams. Nobody asked the faculty.

I absolutely love working at EKU. I believe the administration and faculty do care about the direction the institution is heading. I am concerned about budgeting and worry about overspending. I would really like to see long-range planning of facilities take into consideration more classrooms and office spaces. That should be the priority above all.

You need to get rid of the good ole boy and girl network and bring in experienced, open-minded, intelligent, forward-thinking individuals with few political ties to the area. Until you do, EKU will never reach its potential.
I believe that the atmosphere and attitudes related to shared governance have improved over the past few years.

This is a tough issue. As a former member of the Faculty Senate, I saw many faculty members who were holding back progress at EKU and refusing to acknowledge the post-recession climate in higher education. So, I understand the need that administration has to sometimes just make decisions that are in the best interest of the university. But, this creates the feeling that faculty are not being heard by the administration. I'm honestly not sure how to address this situation. My experience with administrators through the level of the Provost is very positive in that there seems to be an understanding of faculty workload through this level. This seems to be completely lost at the level of the Board of Regents, however. This is a big problem.

While lip service is given to shared governance, policy development and transparency, the truth is these are not priorities. The administration, and especially President Benson, only seek input after decisions have been made. Information and people are manipulated to guarantee the outcomes the administration/Regent Turner seek. Policies are not followed if administrators oppose them. Interim hirings are made regularly without searches with the excuse given that there was not enough time. … Thousands of dollars are spent on searches for VPs of branding and other administrative areas but only an “internal” search (read-decision made before search began) for the second person in charge of academics on campus. What does that say about priorities? Why is the administration surprised that most faculty do not believe their opinions matter?

There is no true shared governance at EKU. The administration determines the budgets and what the money will be spent on. I've never had an administrator ask for my input, but they do readily dictate what we the faculty should be doing and it is more than what can be possibly done.

It is wrong to transfer numerous staff members into a … department to teach when they are not qualified to teach there …. The faculty who are qualified end up having to carry the load although they have spoken out to several administrators.

The best example of the lack of transparency and shared governance can be demonstrated in the modification of the Spring 16 semester back to 16 weeks along with the addition of a winter term. EKU is the only State school still at 17 weeks. EKU’s traditional constituency needs to work to finance their education. Having two additional weeks of school reduces their opportunity to generate revenue. Faculty were expected to work an additional week without compensation last summer before the fall started due to the addition of the winter semester. The Provost and Registrar make decisions without consulting faculty. The addition of the drop/add fee has hurt students, something sprung on the whole University by the registrar. Additional burdens keep being placed on the faculty without additional compensation. Faculty are told to place their information in digital measures, but the information is not available for the development of reports. I hope the requirements of post tenure revue are kept to a minimum for hard working faculty while placing the burden of underperforming individuals.

I think administrators try very hard to communicate in good faith, but are not trusted by faculty. Ulterior motives are always assumed. Faculty do not seem to be substantively involved in most budget decisions. Academics, in general, does not appear to be considered a high budget priority.