March 23, 2016

Randolph Moore, Chair
University of Hawaii Board of Regents
210 Bachmann Hall
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, HI 96822

RE: Resolutions Passed by the Manoa Faculty Senate or its Executive Committee (SEC)

Aloha Chair Moore, Regents, and President Lassner,

Today I bring to you two resolutions:

1) SEC resolution in opposition to the proposed reorganization for JABSOM and UHCC into Kaka’ako Health Sciences. Passed by SEC unanimously (6) with one abstention.

Update: Dean Hedges has now informed the SEC that we can have an additional two weeks to review the proposal, until April 8th.

However, it is not clear whether this will be sufficient time for Dean Hedges to resolve the concerns already expressed by the UHCC faculty senate which opposed this resolution, and for the Manoa faculty senate Committee on Administration and Budget (CAB) to consult with the JABSOM faculty senate which has not yet given an opinion on this important issue. The Manoa Faculty Senate takes seriously the guidelines for faculty consultation outlined in Manoa Reorganization Process Policy M3.101, and APM A3.101, as explained in the attached resolution. The SEC will inform the Regents if our decision changes.

2) Resolution calling for a task force to study optimal organization to enhance UH Manoa academic quality and function including possible separation from the UH System. Passed by MFS with 94% majority: 48 in favor, 3 opposed, 0 abstentions.

This resolution resulted from a recent Manoa Faculty Senate discussion on the health of our university and the status of shared governance. Each committee sent 2 representatives to discuss the greatest concerns of faculty.

What became clear as a top priority was a shared sense of alarm at what is currently happening with regard to System - UHM campus reorganization. I bring to you some highlights of the discussion:

1. A need to immediately form a task force to study this important reorganization and to stop
President Lassner's current reorganization plan, which is occurring as we speak even without any formal consultation or approval.

2. A need for real consultation involving administration, regents, and faculty and full disclosure of all plans and decision-making before any actions are implemented. Consultation involves a good-faith effort to resolve all disagreements to mutual satisfaction or to provide strong justification when not possible.

3. A scope that includes not just taking funds and functions away from only Manoa but efficiencies and quality across the entire system. The community colleges must be on the table as well. It is this lop-sided control of the process and resources that lead to references to "the system takeover of Mānoa".

4. Real concern that our current path follows the McDonald’s model of higher education. Faculty are concerned about loss of academic quality and excellence, which our students deserve.

5. With what is being called the "system takeover of Manoa,” faculty members are concerned that a new chancellor will be powerless to direct the business of the campus.

6. Concern that System will be using more of the Mānoa funding, including RTRF, tuition, and g-funds. If System administration wants to take over Mānoa, then they need to talk to the Mānoa faculty.

7. Mānoa faces serious issues ahead that threaten the quality of higher education in the State of Hawai‘i. Senators expressed the notion that in order to make headway on our issues, we must work together to build the strongest possible institution.

We stand ready to work with the regents and any interested parties to build a stronger University.

Aloha,
Marguerite Butler, Vice Chair
Mānoa Faculty Senate

For your convenience the resolutions and supporting document are attached (remaining docs are linked in the resolution).
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MEMORANDUM VIA E-MAIL

TO: Randolph G. Moore, Chair
    Board of Regents
    David Lassner, President
    University of Hawai‘i
    Robert Bley-Vroman, Chancellor
    University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa
    Jerris Hedges
    Dean, John A. Burns School of Medicine
    Interim Director, University of Hawai‘i Cancer Center

FROM: Robert Cooney, Chair
      Mānoa Faculty Senate

RE: Resolution in Opposition to the Proposed Reorganization Proposal for John A. Burns School Of Medicine (JABSOM) and the University Of Hawai‘i Cancer Center (UHCC) into Kaka‘ako Health Sciences

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) of the Mānoa Faculty Senate approved the Resolution in Opposition to the Proposed Reorganization Proposal for John A. Burns School of Medicine (JABSOM) and the University Of Hawai‘i Cancer Center (UHCC) into Kaka‘ako Health Sciences at its March 14, 2016 meeting with 6 votes in favor and 1 abstained. The resolution is attached.

You can access additional information pertaining to this resolution at the following links:

- Minutes Index
  http://www.hawaii.edu/uhmfs/minutes/2015_16/index.html#sec

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need additional information.

Robert Cooney, Ph.D., Mānoa Faculty Senate Chair

Marguerite Butler, Ph.D., Mānoa Faculty Senate Vice Chair
RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL FOR JOHN A. BURNS SCHOOL OF MEDICINE (JABSOM) AND THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI‘I CANCER CENTER (UHCC) INTO KAKA‘AKO HEALTH SCIENCES

WHEREAS, "Regents' Policy, RP 1.210, Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Academic Policy Development", states: “It is the policy of the University to maintain and strengthen organized and systematic involvement by faculty in academic decision-making and policy development.”; and

WHEREAS, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Reorganization Process Policy M3.101 states “The responsible administrator (RA) will prepare proposal in accordance with APM A3.101 and discuss with appropriate parties (faculty, staff, students, etc.) within their school/college/unit. RA will include the concerns/issues raised by affected units/parties and how they were resolved or addressed in the proposal.”; and

WHEREAS, M3.101 further states “RA will provide the amended reorganization proposal by sharing the above web link to unions of affected employees and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) via the chair for appropriate distribution, review, and comments.”; and

WHEREAS, consultation with faculty on any reorganization is essential for the success of the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa; and

WHEREAS, the proposal for the consolidation of JABSOM and the UH Cancer Research Center was received by the MFS SEC on February 10, 2016 and Committee on Administration and Budget on February 12, 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Committee on Administration and Budget found that the faculty senate of the UHCC opposed this reorganization plan and the faculty senate of JABSOM has not voted on the reorganization plan; and

WHEREAS, the Committee on Administration and Budget has received incomplete information in the proposal and requested to meet with JABSOM faculty senate representatives; and

WHEREAS, the SEC requested a customary extension on behalf of CAB to allow completion of the review and their recommendations in order for the Mānoa Faculty Senate to complete the assessment of the plan; and

WHEREAS, there is prima facie evidence that the RA has not complied with the spirit of M3.101 to consult with affected faculty and staff and modify the proposal in accordance with their concerns; and

WHEREAS, the RA, Dean of JABSOM Jerri Hedges, on 3/14/2016 denied the request for an extension; and
WHEREAS, the 45 days of consultation ends on March 26, 2016, precluding completion of CAB’s review, comments, and full senate action prior to this deadline; and

WHEREAS, to implement this reorganization without JABSOM AND UHCC faculty support, and a thorough review by, input from, and recommendation of the Mānoa Faculty Senate would be a clear violation of faculty governance; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the MFS SEC opposes the JABSOM / UHCC reorganization plan and urges the administration to reject it; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that this resolution be transmitted to the Board of Regents, UHM Chancellor (interim) Robert Bley-Vroman, UH System President David Lassner, President of the Hawai‘i State Senate Ron Kouchi, Speaker of the Hawai‘i House of Representatives Joseph Souki, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Higher Education and the Arts Brian Taniguchi, and Chairman of the House Committee on Higher Education Isaac Choy, and Governor of the State of Hawai‘i David Ige.
RESOLUTION CALLING FOR A TASK FORCE TO STUDY OPTIMAL ORGANIZATION TO ENHANCE UH MĀNOA ACADEMIC QUALITY AND FUNCTION INCLUDING POSSIBLE SEPARATION FROM THE UH SYSTEM

WHEREAS, the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM) is the only Carnegie I research-extensive university in the State of Hawai‘i, and therefore its health, vitality, and level of excellence is critical for setting the standards for higher education in the State of Hawai‘i; and

WHEREAS, UHM requires strong leadership and a chancellor separate from the UH system president in order to fulfill its campus mission to enrich the lives of the people of Hawai‘i by providing world-class education, producing cutting-edge research, and innovative environmental and agricultural expertise; and

WHEREAS, the Longanecker report calls for clarification of and distinctions between the roles and responsibilities of the UH Mānoa and UH system administrators in order to achieve efficiency and improved function; and

WHEREAS, the reorganization of UHM vis-a-vis System must not come at the detriment of academic quality of the flagship campus; and

WHEREAS, every administrative job at both UHM and System has some impact on academics by virtue of providing support services for teaching and research, and some of these impacts may not be readily appreciated without rigorous consultation; and

WHEREAS, it is widely recognized that achieving academic excellence requires rigorous consultation of faculty through the duly recognized shared governance organizations, as memorialized in Regents Policy 1.210, as well as being a best practice of research universities; and

WHEREAS, the rationale for a strong shared governance is that faculty are the most specialized, highly trained, and diverse workforce in the state, thereby offering a unique and direct perspective on the primary missions of the university: namely teaching and research; and

WHEREAS, the wholesale and unidirectional movement of functions without faculty consultation, including budget, human resources, facilities, and research compliance, from UHM to the System level provides no apparent improvement in efficiency; and
WHEREAS, the proposed reorganization adds another layer of bureaucracy between the users of services such as for research compliance, most of whom are at UHM; and

WHEREAS, a chancellor is the executive officer of a campus, and a chancellor who is not directly responsible for the function of budget, human resources, facilities, and research compliance is no longer effectively serving campus short- and long-term needs; and

WHEREAS, the diminution of autonomy threatens the regional accreditation of the UHM campus; and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Mānoa Faculty Senate finds that the takeover of critical functions at the Mānoa campus threatens the short- and long-term stability, productivity, and quality of the Mānoa teaching and research functions; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that there be a task force of the Mānoa faculty, Mānoa management, System management, and the Board of Regents to discuss structural solutions to enhance the Mānoa teaching and research functions, while preserving the autonomy, quality, and accreditation of the Mānoa campus within a constrained budget and to include the possible separation of Mānoa from the UH system and its implications; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the optimal reorganization be arrived at through a process of collaborative consultation including faculty, administration, and Regents; and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that this resolution be transmitted to the Board of Regents, UHM Chancellor (interim) Robert Bley-Vroman, UH System President David Lassner, President of the Hawai‘i State Senate Ron Kouchi, Speaker of the Hawai‘i House of Representatives Joseph Souki, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Higher Education and the Arts Brian Taniguchi, and Chairman of the House Committee on Higher Education Isaac Choy, and Governor of the State of Hawai‘i David Ige.

Supporting Documents:

1. "Executive Summary and Study on Shared Governance at the University of California as a model for University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa" by the Mānoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee
2. “2015 Report to the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai‘i System” by David Longanecker and Demaree Michelau
3. February 25, 2015 change in Regents Policy 8.204 calling for budget requests to stem from major units of the university directly to the President as opposed to the UHM Chancellor
4. President Lassner’s plan to reorganize System and Manoa administration to improve efficiencies
Executive Summary - A study of shared governance at University of California as a model for University of Hawai‘i - March 5, 2016

The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM) has faced a number of challenges in recent years. An overarching theme is the clear, growing disconnect between faculty and administration and a lack of institutional commitment to shared governance in which the faculty are strongly involved in the decision-making process. For example, there is very little direct communication between faculty and the Board of Regents (BOR). It is therefore difficult for the BOR to appreciate the extent to which faculty input has been disregarded in most recent decisions by administration. This situation is epitomized by a major structural flaw: at no level of the administrative hierarchy are any executives accountable to faculty. For example, deans alone are consulted by upper administration on most matters involving faculty, yet deans do not report to the faculty! They report to administration and are in fact executives themselves. Thus, all their incentives in pursuing an issue favor the administrative viewpoint, with no incentive to fully consult or faithfully represent faculty. Decision making can therefore happen with very little faculty input but with the dean’s representation to administration, BOR, and legislature of unanimous support, as evidenced in several recent initiatives on campus.

Shared governance is critical for achieving excellence within a university. The rationale for a commitment to strong shared governance is that faculty are the most specialized, diverse workforce in the state. They offer a unique and direct perspective on the primary missions of the university: teaching and research. That is exactly what faculty are hired to provide. Indeed, faculty are the only employees competent to directly serve or guide these missions. Faculty hold sacred the role they play in helping students achieve their goals, and they value open intellectual discourse above all else. The current operative styles at UH Mānoa and UH System pay lip service to shared governance but lead to conflict and poor outcomes when faculty are incompletely consulted or, worse, completely left out of the process.

To find solutions to a lack of effective leadership at UH, the Mānoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee studied the University of California (UC) system, widely regarded as one of the nation’s premier public universities. The UC developed from humble beginnings and was not always the world-class institution that it is today. We therefore viewed the UC system as a potential model for developing functional shared governance at UH. Here we summarize the key decision points in UC’s history that effected this outcome and that we deem necessary for our university system to achieve greatness. These historical decisions were made because the University of California had clearly articulated a number of key areas of focus that reflected core values of the institution:

1. **A clear central mission** emphasizing academic excellence underlying all aspects of the university.
2. **Emphasis on research** A University of California system that includes only research universities (4yr, graduate, and professional schools) allowing a uniformity of academic mission.

3. **Faculty leadership, rather than exclusion, in decision making.** An early president (Benjamin Wheeler, 1899-1919), understood that achieving excellence across the many fields comprising the university cannot be achieved using a top-down management style. Faculty, similar to physicians in a hospital, have the best interests of their clients in mind at all times, and are best informed on how to steer the institution toward excellence. This is their passion and the reason they devote their lives to this profession, when they could attain higher compensation for other skilled work. The Mayo Clinic, as a shining example of a similar transformation, has embraced a physician-run model rather than an administrative model, where every action from top to bottom is focused on serving the patient. The same philosophy was put to work in the UC system to serve students. At UC, President Wheeler integrated greater faculty involvement in setting educational policy and the management and growth of the university, modeling the most prestigious universities of Europe.

4. **Budget transparency and equity** A system of state funding that is proportional to the service provided, with campuses and academic units receiving funding based on a budgetary formula with increasing differentials for lower division, upper division, masters, and PhD enrollment. Importantly, this formula also brought into alignment the teaching and research missions of the university.

5. **A governance structure that maintains campus autonomy and system coordination via clear differentiation of missions, alignment of faculty senate structures, and strong collaboration between administration and faculty, and faculty with the BOR.**

Each of these focus areas embodies critical decisions that fostered excellence within the UC system, and we should model this approach. Similar to Hawai’i, UC is a public university with 42% of undergraduates being first-generation college attendees, and 42% are eligible for Pell Grants. While California is much larger than Hawaii, size alone cannot completely explain the difference in academic achievement between the two systems, as other large public universities exist but do not attain the level of excellence of UC. What sets UC apart is its visionary governance. The development of excellence at UC fostered major economic growth in the state of California: in the semiconductor, biotechnology, agriculture industries, to name a few. By making all decisions based on core values shared by all stakeholders, with a real commitment by the Board, faculty, and administration to execute actions based these values, **the University of Hawai’i has the potential to manage its finances and its personnel in an ethical, transparent manner that breeds the kind of excellence the State of Hawai’i deserves from its flagship educational institution.**

February 25, 2016
Dear Chair Moore and Regents,

The state of shared governance at the University of Hawai‘i and especially with regard to its flagship campus, Mānoa, is a matter of great concern to faculty. As Manoa provides many highly qualified faculty to the other campuses and workers across the state, the quality of UH Mānoa determines the quality of higher education in the state of Hawai‘i. The MFS SEC would like to present for your consideration a study of the University of California System, one of the most highly regarded public universities in the world.

Mahalo,
Marguerite Butler, Vice Chair of MFS SEC

Clarity of Mission at the University of California -- Valuing Excellence

“The University of California improves the lives of people in California and around the world through our world-class educational opportunities, groundbreaking research, top-rated health care and agricultural expertise. We are driven by values of public service in all we do.”

The University of California System¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 campuses (9 UG/GR, 1 Prof/GR)</th>
<th>61 Nobel laureates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 medical centers</td>
<td>20,000 UC extension courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 national laboratories</td>
<td>430,000 jobs supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 academic disciplines</td>
<td>$46.3 billion contributed to California economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 graduate degree programs</td>
<td>Secures $7 in federal and private dollars for every $1 in research funding provided by the state of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238,700 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198,300 employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 million living alumni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research at the University of California has been a major driver of California’s economy, laying the foundation for growth in biotechnology, computing, semiconductors, telecommunication, and agriculture sectors. UC research continues to fuel the next wave of economic growth in nanotechnology, clean energy, neuroscience, genomics, and medicine. But how did they achieve excellence?

History of Shared Governance²

Shared governance at UC formally delegates authority to the Faculty Senate great responsibility for the operation and management of the university, while preserving the authority of the Board of Regents to ultimately set policy, supported by a historical influx of investment by tax dollars to produce “a university enterprise of international distinction and vital service to the people of California”
1850 - A state university is authorized by the first California constitution governed by a lay board (public authority) overseeing activities of faculty and students. (Berkeley)

1868 - Organic Act: Academic senate established by charter, consisting of all faculty and deans, presided over by the president for the purpose of “conducting the general administration of the University.” The organization and relationship to the University President and governing board is determined by the Regents.

1879 - UC is established as a “public trust” at California’s second constitutional convention supported by key Regents who served as delegates. The university “shall be entirely independent of political or sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its regents and in the administration of its affairs”

19th century - Faculty served as both teachers and administrators, but with Regents setting educational policy (e.g., admissions, curriculum). By 1890’s Berkeley campus was “a weak institution with plenty of land, a college of broken-down buildings, [and] beggarly endowments”

1899 - President Wheeler and the “Berkeley Revolution” - Expansion of funding, enrollment, and academic programs.
  ○ Wheeler agreed to Presidency provided with direct powers to manage University Affairs.
  ○ Negotiated expansion of state support based on ENROLLMENT WORKLOAD
  ○ Allowed dramatic expansion of enrollment (almost 4x), new faculty, and programs becoming largest public university by 1910
  ○ Elevated the role of research in the hiring, promotion, and dismissal of faculty
  ○ Integrated greater faculty involvement in management of university affairs (but not codified)
    “Wheeler convinced the Regents that faculty were not simply employees of the state, but members of an academic community engaged in a free-market of teaching and research. They should, he argued and recalling the role of faculty at the University of Heidelberg, be primarily responsible for setting educational policy. Wheeler called on faculty, now growing in numbers, to make major changes in the administrative structure of the university.

Working with faculty and with the general approval of the Regents, Wheeler created some twenty new departments, reorganized the university’s curriculum into lower and upper division courses, created matriculation agreements with the state’s normal schools and with the emerging (and pioneering) system of junior colleges, and adopted a system of peer review for hiring and promotion of faculty. Wheeler also created a faculty committee for the allocation of research funds, and a faculty editorial board to oversee the university press to elevate the quality and quantity of its publications.”

○ Formed a Tripartite system of public higher education, expanding educational opportunity and maintaining excellence: a system of Junior Colleges, the California State University system to support the regional college movement, expand higher education opportunities (and the
nation’s highest college-going rate), while diverting enrollment pressure from the University of California, to maintain a highly selective admissions policy. Model created the public research university.

- **1920 - Standing Orders of The Regents - Delegating powers to faculty** - formalized the role of the president and the relationship to the Regents and the faculty. Powers delegated to the Academic (Faculty) Senate (with approval of Regents):
  - Determine conditions of admissions, for certificates and degrees
  - Advise President on all “appointments, promotions, demotions, and dismissal” of professors, and on the appointment of deans
  - Advise President regarding “changes in the educational policy of the university”
  - Advise President regarding budget issues
  - And to, perhaps most importantly, choose its own committees and organization “in such a manner as it may determine.”

“The agreement was a watershed in the general development of American higher education, creating an organizational structure of governance that would serve as a model for other major public
and private universities. California, however, was not only the first to formalize this structure in the United States, one that had antecedents in British universities, but took it the farthest.\textsuperscript{2}

“The so-called “California Plan” created a “remarkable democratic system of academic government in which California faculty,” once explained historian Walton E. Bean, “acquired a greater influence in the educational aspects of university administration than any other faculty in the United States. Indeed, the faculty virtually became a part of the administration.”\textsuperscript{3}

“From the base of authority granted in 1920, the Regents and the president increasingly came to rely on the Academic Senate to build a university of international recognition. The Senate proved a critical component to maintaining quality academic programs as the university grew in enrollment and faculty, and in the number of campuses.”\textsuperscript{2}

- **Shared governance provides collaborative solutions through times of adversity**: During the great depression, faced with a 26% decrease in state funding, President Sproul called on the Academic Senate committees on budget, educational policy, and others to develop methods to cut costs, raise revenues, and contain the regional college movement.

- **Transition from Central to Local Authority**: 1958 - 1964 President Clark Kerr negotiated the “1960 Master Plan” which fostered a reorganization of administrative structure and the Academic Senate in order to clarify the roles of the multi-campus system versus campuses, create greater local authority, and provide equity in distribution of state funds to the campuses.
  - **Budget equity** -- Kerr and the Regents agreed to a budgetary formula that would provide a steady flow of funds to new campuses while maintaining excellence at flagships (UCLA and Berkeley): Funding apportioned by enrollment, but differentiated by level of instruction with increasing allocations for lower division, upper division, masters’ student, and PhD students, based on the rationale that costs increased with level of instruction. Furthermore, this model tied core funding for research to the teaching mission of the university, and provided an incentive for newer campuses to develop into strong research universities.
  - **Universitywide and Campus Administration** -- President transferred more direct authority to campus Chancellors. Responsibilities and staff needed for day-to-day operations now at campus chancellor’s offices, and president’s office staff cut by 26%. Campus business officers and deans now reported to Chancellor, Chancellor could also approve research grants, contracts, transfer of funds. Campuses now in control of graduate education, etc. President’s office now free to focus on major issues facing the University, and greater collaborative working relationships and proper consultative processes with campus administrators and the academic senate.
Divisional model for the academic senate -- A 1963 reorganization of the Academic Senate to better align with the greater administrative authority of campus chancellors, which remains to present day.

- Divisions of the senate created for each campus, each with its own network of committees. Chair for each campus selected from the faculty, providing clear autonomy from campus and university administration.

- Universitywide Academic Assembly newly established with proportional representation from each campus division. Authority to pass changes in bylaws, regulations of the senate, resolutions and memos to the President. Therefore advisory to the President, but also in “no way override the autonomy of the various campuses or override the authority of the chancellors”. Concerned with matters such as definition of tenure; university admissions, dismissal, transfer policies; membership and voting rights in the senate; and bringing into harmony various conflicting attitudes on different campuses in so far as they threaten the well-being of the statewide university (otherwise respect academic freedoms of campuses).

- Universitywide committees -- continued, but grew in number and with membership now determined by equal representation from each division (campus). These committees of the Academic Senate charged to advise on distinct areas of policy and to report annually to the Academic Assembly.

- Academic Council -- the executive body of the Universitywide senate, study problems of overall concern to the entire university, direct activities of the Assembly and committees. Members include chairs of the new divisions and chairs of the standing universitywide committees

- Formal inclusion onto the Board of Regents of all stakeholders: 1974 -- Faculty and Student representation along with Staff advisors added to the Board of Regents to give “greater credibility with its constituency.”

---

5
The organizational structure of governance at the UC System supported unprecedented growth (for new campuses, not only flagship campuses), while maintaining quality.

“This organizational structure also retained one of the University’s greatest strengths: the two general and at times overlapping spheres of policymaking under the Regents, the Academic Senate and the universitywide and campus administrations. Through this structure, the President, and in turn the Universitywide administration, gained influence regarding the agenda for the Regents, and the process of setting universitywide policy by the Board.”

The Board of Regents

Council of Chancellors

University of California President

Chair and Vice Chair, Academic Council

Chancellors

Universitywide Academic Senate

Vice Chancellors Academic Affairs

Academic Assembly

Academic Council

9 Campus Academic Senate Divisions
Despite his domineering management style, President Robert Gordon Sproul understood that shared governance was crucial in creating effective university leadership. “No function of the university president [or chancellor] is more important than maintaining close relations with the faculty,” he wrote in 1953. The Academic Senate, Sproul remarked, became more important as the university grew in size and in the complexity of its role in society. Without strong faculty input, opinions and advice, “the titular head of the organization often suffers from something like oxygen starvation, with such characteristic symptoms as failing vision, and gait slowed down to a shamble, and weaving from side to side with little forward motion.”

Apart from such direct effects, shared governance also can provide an additional important benefit: the maintenance of a high level of morale within the academic community. “The process of consultation,” wrote John J. Corson in 1941, “strengthens the allegiance to the institution and their individual zeal and satisfaction.”

The Composition of the UC Board of Regents (26 members):
http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/index.html
18 regents appointed by the Governor for 12 year terms
1 student regent appointed by the Regents for 1 year term
7 ex officio regents -- the Governor, Lt. Governor, Speaker of the Assembly (California Legislature), Superintendent of Public Instruction (DOE), UC president, president and vice president of the Alumni Associations of UC
2 faculty representatives to the BoR -- chair and vice chair of the Academic Council (non-voting)
2 staff advisors to the BoR who are appointed by the President in consultation with the BoR chairman

Committees and Meetings:
Meets 6 times per year, every other month in 2 day meetings.

The Missions of the “University” as distinct from the Mission of the President’s Offices:
Sometimes called the “Public Mission of the University”, the University’s fundamental missions are teaching, research, and public service.

"The distinctive mission of the University is to serve society as a center of higher learning, providing long-term societal benefits through transmitting advanced knowledge, discovering new knowledge, and functioning as an active working repository of organized knowledge. That obligation, more specifically, includes undergraduate education, graduate and professional education, research, and other kinds of public service, which are shaped and bounded by the central pervasive mission of discovering and advancing...
knowledge.” — Mission statement from the University of California Academic Plan, 1974-1978
http://www.ucop.edu/uc-mission/index.html

The Office of the President, on the other hand, acts as the facilitator to the vision for the university that is arrived at via shared governance. The offices manage multibillion-dollar fiscal and business operations, establish policy frameworks to aid in carrying out the UC’s academic and research missions across the network of campuses and programs, ensure legal and ethical compliance, manage risk and workforce support, promote university’s interests to the state and national governments, and respond to requests by state policymakers by conducting research and analysis of policies with potential for statewide impact. They work behind the scenes to be more efficient, responsive, and transparent stewards of the public trust.

Shared governance is tripartite between the Regents - Administration - Faculty Senate with strong collaboration at each level of organization.

Academic Senate has 18 standing committees, organized around:
- senate rules and committee composition,
- university planning and resource allocation
Each Campus-level Senate parallels the structure of the Universitywide senate

The interface between the academic senate and administration is described in more detail in7,8. Please also see the concluding section: an assessment of shared governance.

References: