

**UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I
BOARD OF REGENTS COMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL AFFAIRS & BOARD
GOVERNANCE**

Members: Regent Randy Moore (Chair), Regent Eugene Bal (Vice-Chair), and Regents McEnerney, Portnoy, Wilson, and Yuen

Date: Thursday, April 5, 2018

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Place: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
Information Technology Building
1st Floor Conference Room 105A/B
2520 Correa Road
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822

AGENDA

I. Call Meeting to Order

II. Approval of Minutes of January 11, 2018 Meeting

III. Public Comment Period for Agenda Items: All written testimony on agenda items received after posting of this agenda and up to 24 hours in advance of the meeting will be distributed to the board. Late testimony on agenda items will be distributed to the board within 24 hours of receipt. Written testimony may be submitted via US mail, email at bor@hawaii.edu, or facsimile at 956-5156. Individuals submitting written testimony are not automatically signed up for oral testimony. Registration for oral testimony on agenda items will be provided at the meeting location 15 minutes prior to the meeting and closed once the meeting begins. Oral testimony is limited to three (3) minutes. All written testimony submitted are public documents. Therefore, any testimony that is submitted verbally or in writing, electronically or in person, for use in the public meeting process is public information.

IV. Agenda Items

A. For Information & Discussion

1. Shared Governance
2. Review Board of Regents Policy 2.204, Policy on Board Self-Evaluation
3. Review of "Statement of Expectations for Members of the Board of Trustees of Ohio University"
4. Status of Board of Regents Policy Reviews (Chapters 1 to 4)

V. Adjournment

Item IV.A.1.
Shared Governance

MATERIALS



Shared Governance

Since its founding, the AAUP has been ensuring meaningful faculty participation in institutional governance.

The AAUP's Committee on College and University Governance composed its first statement on the subject in 1920, emphasizing the importance of faculty involvement in personnel decisions, selection of administrators, preparation of the budget, and determination of educational policies. Refinements were introduced in subsequent years, culminating in the development of the [1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*](#). This statement, which was jointly formulated with the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, calls for shared responsibility among the different components of institutional government and specifies areas of primary responsibility for governing boards, administrations, and faculties. It remains the Association's central policy document relating to academic governance. It has been supplemented over the years by a series of derivative policy statements, including those on faculty governance and academic freedom, budgetary and salary matters, financial exigency, the selection, evaluation, and retention of administrators, college athletics, governance and collective bargaining, and the faculty status of college and university librarians.

The AAUP staff provides advice and assistance to faculty members throughout the country on matters of academic governance. The staff also receives, on behalf of the [Committee on College and University Governance](#), complaints of departures from the Association's recommended standards in this area. In 1991, the Association's Council made it possible for an AAUP annual meeting to sanction an institution for "substantial noncompliance with standards of academic governance."

See the [list of sanctioned institutions](#).

The AAUP offers [an award](#) to recognize outstanding contributions to shared governance by administrators or trustees.



Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities

The statement that follows is directed to governing board members, administrators, faculty members, students, and other persons in the belief that the colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage calling for appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the components of the academic institution. The statement is intended to foster constructive joint thought and action, both within the institutional structure and in protection of its integrity against improper intrusions.

It is not intended that the statement serve as a blueprint for governance on a specific campus or as a manual for the regulation of controversy among the components of an academic institution, although it is to be hoped that the principles asserted will lead to the correction of existing weaknesses and assist in the establishment of sound structures and procedures. The statement does not attempt to cover relations with those outside agencies that increasingly are controlling the resources and influencing the patterns of education in our institutions of higher learning: for example, the United States government, state legislatures, state commissions, interstate associations or compacts, and other interinstitutional arrangements. However, it is hoped that the statement will be helpful to these agencies in their consideration of educational matters.

Students are referred to in this statement as an institutional component coordinate in importance with trustees, administrators, and faculty. There is, however, no main section on students. The omission has two causes: (1) the changes now occurring in the status of American students have plainly outdistanced the analysis by the educational community, and an attempt to define the situation without thorough study might prove unfair to student interests, and (2) students do not in fact at present have a significant voice in the government of colleges and universities; it would be unseemly to obscure, by superficial equality of length of statement, what may be a serious lag entitled to separate and full confrontation.

The concern for student status felt by the organizations issuing this statement is embodied in a note, "On Student Status," intended to stimulate the educational community to turn its attention to an important need.

This statement was jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). In October 1966, the board of directors of the ACE took action by which its council "recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations," and "commends it to the institutions which are members of the Council." The Council of the AAUP adopted the statement in October 1966, and the Fifty-third Annual Meeting endorsed it in April 1967. In November 1966, the executive committee of the AGB took action by which that organization also "recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations," and "commends it to the governing boards which are members of the Association." (In April 1990, the Council of the AAUP adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.)

1. Introduction

This statement is a call to mutual understanding regarding the government of colleges and universities. Understanding, based on community of interest and producing joint effort, is essential for at least three reasons. First, the academic institution, public or private, often has become less autonomous; buildings, research, and student tuition are supported by funds over which the college or university exercises a diminishing control. Legislative and executive governmental authorities, at all levels, play a part in the making of important decisions in academic policy. If these voices and forces are to be successfully heard and integrated, the academic institution must be in a position to meet them with its own generally unified view. Second, regard for the welfare of the institution remains important despite the mobility and interchange of scholars. Third, a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems.

2. The Academic Institution: Joint Effort

a. *Preliminary Considerations*

The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.

Joint effort in an academic institution will take a variety of forms appropriate to the kinds of situations encountered. In some instances, an initial exploration or recommendation will be made by the president with consideration by the faculty at a later stage; in other instances, a first and essentially definitive recommendation will be made by the faculty, subject to the endorsement of the president and the governing board. In still others, a substantive contribution can be made when student leaders are responsibly involved in the process. Although the variety of such approaches may be wide, at least two general conclusions regarding joint effort seem clearly warranted: (1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand, as developed hereinafter.

b. *Determination of General Educational Policy*

The general educational policy, i.e., the objectives of an institution and the nature, range, and pace of its efforts, is shaped by the institutional charter or by law, by tradition and historical development, by the present needs of the community of the institution, and by the professional aspirations and standards of those directly involved in its work. Every board will wish to go beyond its formal trustee obligation to conserve the accomplishment of the past and to engage seriously with the future; every faculty will seek to conduct an operation worthy of scholarly standards of learning; every administrative officer will strive to meet his or her charge and to attain the goals of the institution. The interests of all are coordinate and related, and unilateral effort can lead to confusion or conflict. Essential to a solution is a reasonably explicit statement on general educational policy. Operating responsibility and authority, and procedures for continuing review, should be clearly defined in official regulations.

When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine the appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction.

Special considerations may require particular accommodations: (1) a publicly supported institution may be regulated by statutory provisions, and (2) a church-controlled institution may be limited by its charter or bylaws. When such external requirements influence course content and the manner of instruction or research, they impair the educational effectiveness of the institution.

Such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis to be given to the various elements of the educational and research program should involve participation of governing board, administration, and faculty prior to final decision.

c. Internal Operations of the Institution

The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community.

Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or university. The channels of communication should be established and maintained by joint endeavor. Distinction should be observed between the institutional system of communication and the system of responsibility for the making of decisions.

A second area calling for joint effort in internal operation is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, president, and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.

A third area is budgeting. The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections. The function of each component in budgetary matters should be understood by all; the allocation of authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions.

Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president. The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon a cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty, taking into consideration the opinions of others who are appropriately interested. The president should be equally qualified to serve both as the executive officer of the governing board and as the chief academic officer of the institution and the faculty. The president's dual role requires an ability to interpret to board and faculty the educational views and concepts of institutional government of the other. The president should have the confidence of the board and the faculty.

The selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of, and in consultation with, the appropriate faculty.

Determinations of faculty status, normally based on the recommendations of the faculty groups involved, are discussed in Part 5 of this statement; but it should here be noted that the building of a strong faculty requires careful joint effort in such actions as staff selection and promotion and the granting of tenure. Joint action should also govern dismissals; the applicable principles and procedures in these matters are well established.¹

d. *External Relations of the Institution*

Anyone—a member of the governing board, the president or other member of the administration, a member of the faculty, or a member of the student body or the alumni—affects the institution when speaking of it in public. An individual who speaks unofficially should so indicate. An individual who speaks officially for the institution, the board, the administration, the faculty, or the student body should be guided by established policy.

It should be noted that only the board speaks legally for the whole institution, although it may delegate responsibility to an agent. The right of a board member, an administrative officer, a faculty member, or a student to speak on general educational questions or about the administration and operations of the individual's own institution is a part of that person's right as a citizen and should not be abridged by the institution.² There exist, of course, legal bounds relating to defamation of character, and there are questions of propriety.

3. The Academic Institution: The Governing Board

The governing board has a special obligation to ensure that the history of the college or university shall serve as a prelude and inspiration to the future. The board helps relate the institution to its chief community: for example, the community college to serve the educational needs of a defined population area or group, the church-controlled college to be cognizant of the announced position of its denomination, and the comprehensive university to discharge the many duties and to accept the appropriate new challenges which are its concern at the several levels of higher education.

The governing board of an institution of higher education in the United States operates, with few exceptions, as the final institutional authority. Private institutions are established by charters; public institutions are established by constitutional or statutory provisions. In private institutions the board is frequently self-perpetuating; in public colleges and universities the present membership of a board may be asked to suggest candidates for appointment. As a whole and individually, when the governing board confronts the problem of succession, serious attention should be given to obtaining properly qualified persons. Where public law calls for election of governing board members, means should be found to ensure the nomination of fully suited persons, and the electorate should be informed of the relevant criteria for board membership.

Since the membership of the board may embrace both individual and collective competence of recognized weight, its advice or help may be sought through established channels by other components of the academic community. The governing board of an institution of higher education, while maintaining a general overview, entrusts the conduct of administration to the administrative officers—the president and the deans—and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty. The board should undertake appropriate self-limitation.

One of the governing board's important tasks is to ensure the publication of codified statements that define the overall policies and procedures of the institution under its jurisdiction.

The board plays a central role in relating the likely needs of the future to predictable resources; it has the responsibility for husbanding the endowment; it is responsible for obtaining needed capital and operating funds; and in the broadest sense of the term it should pay attention to personnel policy. In order to fulfill these duties, the board should be aided by, and may insist upon, the development of long-range planning by the administration and faculty. When ignorance or ill will threatens the institution or any part of it, the governing board must be available for support. In grave crises it will be expected to serve as a champion. Although the action to be taken by it will usually be on behalf of the president, the faculty, or the student body, the board should make clear that the protection it offers to an individual or a group is, in fact, a fundamental defense of the vested interests of society in the educational institution.³

4. The Academic Institution: The President

The president, as the chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, is measured largely by his or her capacity for institutional leadership. The president shares responsibility for the definition and attainment of goals, for administrative action, and for operating the communications system that links the components of the academic community. The president represents the institution to its many publics. The president's leadership role is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty.

As the chief planning officer of an institution, the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate. The degree to which a president can envision new horizons for the institution, and can persuade others to see them and to work toward them, will often constitute the chief measure of the president's administration.

The president must at times, with or without support, infuse new life into a department; relatedly, the president may at times be required, working within the concept of tenure, to solve problems of obsolescence. The president will necessarily utilize the judgments of the faculty but may also, in the interest of academic standards, seek outside evaluations by scholars of acknowledged competence.

It is the duty of the president to see to it that the standards and procedures in operational use within the college or university conform to the policy established by the governing board and to the standards of sound academic practice. It is also incumbent on the president to ensure that faculty views, including dissenting views, are presented to the board in those areas and on those issues where responsibilities are shared. Similarly, the faculty should be informed of the views of the board and the administration on like issues.

The president is largely responsible for the maintenance of existing institutional resources and the creation of new resources; has ultimate managerial responsibility for a large area of nonacademic activities; is responsible for public understanding; and by the nature of the office is the chief person who speaks for the institution. In these and other areas the president's work is to plan, to organize, to direct, and to represent. The presidential function should receive the general support of board and faculty.

5. The Academic Institution: The Faculty

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.⁴ On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board. Budgets, personnel limitations, the time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such

competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

The chair or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and of related departments; appointments should normally be in conformity with department members' judgment. The chair or department head should not have tenure in office; tenure as a faculty member is a matter of separate right. The chair or head should serve for a stated term but without prejudice to reelection or to reappointment by procedures that involve appropriate faculty consultation. Board, administration, and faculty should all bear in mind that the department chair or head has a special obligation to build a department strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.

Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved, and established by joint action of the components of the institution. Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.⁵

The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, college, division, or university system, or may take the form of faculty-elected executive committees in departments and schools and a faculty-elected senate or council for larger divisions or the institution as a whole.

The means of communication among the faculty, administration, and governing board now in use include: (1) circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administration, and faculty committees; (2) joint ad hoc committees; (3) standing liaison committees; (4) membership of faculty members on administrative bodies; and (5) membership of faculty members on governing boards. Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed.

On Student Status

When students in American colleges and universities desire to participate responsibly in the government of the institution they attend, their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university. Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness. The obstacles to such participation are large and should not be minimized: inexperience, untested capacity, a transitory status which means that present action does not carry with it subsequent responsibility, and the inescapable fact that the other components of the institution are in a position of judgment over the students. It is important to recognize that student needs are strongly related to educational experience, both formal and informal.

Students expect, and have a right to expect, that the educational process will be structured, that they will be stimulated by it to become independent adults, and that they will have effectively

transmitted to them the cultural heritage of the larger society. If institutional support is to have its fullest possible meaning, it should incorporate the strength, freshness of view, and idealism of the student body.

The respect of students for their college or university can be enhanced if they are given at least these opportunities: (1) to be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views, (2) freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation, (3) the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations, and (4) the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution.

Notes

1. See the 1940 “[Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure](#),” AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 11th ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), 13–19,, and the 1958 “[Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings](#),” *ibid.*, 91–93. These statements were jointly adopted by the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) and the American Association of University Professors; the 1940 “Statement” has been endorsed by numerous learned and scientific societies and educational associations. [Back to text](#)

2. With respect to faculty members, the 1940 “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure” reads: “College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution” (*ibid.*, 14). [Back to text](#)

3. Traditionally, governing boards developed within the context of single-campus institutions. In more recent times, governing and coordinating boards have increasingly tended to develop at the multi-campus regional, systemwide, or statewide levels. As influential components of the academic community, these supra-campus bodies bear particular responsibility for protecting the autonomy of individual campuses or institutions under their jurisdiction and for implementing policies of shared responsibility. The American Association of University Professors regards the objectives and practices recommended in the “Statement on Government” as constituting equally appropriate guidelines for such supra-campus bodies, and looks toward continued development of practices that will facilitate application of such guidelines in this new context. [Preceding note adopted by the AAUP’s Council in June 1978.] [Back to text](#)

4. With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process. [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 2002.] [Back to text](#)

5. The American Association of University Professors regards collective bargaining, properly used, as another means of achieving sound academic government. Where there is faculty collective bargaining, the parties should seek to ensure appropriate institutional governance structures which will protect the right of all faculty to participate in institutional governance in accordance with the “Statement on Government.” [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 1978.]

THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Exactly What Is 'Shared Governance'?

By Gary A. Olson July 23, 2009

At a recent conference of college administrators, several of us had an impromptu discussion over lunch about the meaning of "shared governance." The consensus? That term is often invoked but much misunderstood by both faculty members and many administrators.

"Some of my faculty believe that shared governance literally means that a committee votes on some new plan or proposal and that's it—it gets implemented," said a seasoned department head. "There is no sense of sharing, of who is sharing what with whom."

A dean chimed in that a faculty leader at her institution actually told her that shared governance means that professors, who are the "heart of the university," delegate the governance of their universities to administrators, whose role is to provide a support network for the faculty. "He said, in all seriousness, that faculty have the primary role of governing the university and that administrators are appointed to spare them from the more distasteful managerial labor," said the dean with incredulity.

That may be a more commonly held notion in academe than it at first appears. I know several faculty senators at one institution who regularly refer to faculty as "governance," as in "You're administration, and we're governance." That expression reveals a deep misunderstanding of the mechanism of shared governance—and presupposes an inherently adversarial relationship.

The phrase shared governance is so hackneyed that it is becoming what some linguists call an "empty" or "floating" signifier, a term so devoid of determinate meaning that it takes on whatever significance a particular speaker gives it at the moment. Once a term arrives at that point, it is essentially useless.

Shared governance is not a simple matter of committee consensus, or the faculty's engaging administrators to take on the dirty work, or any number of other common misconceptions. Shared governance is much more complex; it is a delicate balance between faculty and staff participation in planning and decision-making processes, on the one hand, and administrative accountability on the other.

The truth is that all legal authority in any university originates from one place and one place only: its governing board. Whether it is a private college created by a charter, or a public institution established by law or constitution, the legal right and obligation to exercise authority over an institution is vested in and flows from its board. Typically, the board then formally delegates authority over the day-to-day operation of the institution (often in an official "memorandum of delegation") to the president, who, in turn, may delegate authority over certain parts of university management to other university officials—for example, granting authority over academic personnel and programs to the provost as the chief academic officer, and so on.

Over time, the system of shared governance has evolved to include more and more representation in the decision-making process. The concept really came of age in the 1960s, when colleges began to liberalize many of their processes. In fact, an often-cited document on the subject, "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," was issued jointly by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges in the mid-60s. That statement attempted to affirm the importance of shared governance and state some common principles.

The fact that the primary organization championing faculty concerns, the body devoted to preparing future academic administrators, and the association promoting best practices in serving on governing boards together endorsed the statement illustrates that university governance is a collaborative venture.

"Shared" governance has come to connote two complementary and sometimes overlapping concepts: giving various groups of people a share in key decision-making processes, often through elected representation; and allowing certain groups to exercise primary responsibility for specific areas of decision making.

To illustrate the first notion of how shared governance works, I'd like to revisit a 2007 column, ["But She Was Our Top Choice,"](#) in which I discussed the search process for academic administrators and attempted to explain why hiring committees are commonly asked to forward an unranked list of "acceptable" candidates. I wrote that shared governance, especially in the context of a search for a senior administrator, means that professors, staff members, and sometimes students have an opportunity to participate in the process—unlike the bad old days when a university official often would hire whomever he (and it was invariably a male) wanted, without consulting anyone.

"Shared" means that everyone has a role: The search committee evaluates applications, selects a shortlist of candidates, conducts preliminary interviews, contacts references, chooses a group of finalists to invite to campus, solicits input about the candidates from appropriate stakeholders, and determines which of the finalists are acceptable. Then it's up to the final decision maker, who is responsible for conducting background checks and entering into formal negotiations with the front-runner, and who is ultimately held responsible for the success (or failure) of the appointment.

"Shared" doesn't mean that every constituency gets to participate at every stage. Nor does it mean that any constituency exercises complete control over the process. A search cannot be a simple matter of a popular vote because someone must remain accountable for the final decision, and committees cannot be held accountable. Someone has to exercise due diligence and contact the front-runner's current and former supervisors to discover if there are any known skeletons that are likely to re-emerge. If I am the hiring authority and I appoint someone who embezzled money from a previous institution, I alone am responsible. No committee or group can be held responsible for such a lack of due diligence.

That's a good example of shared governance as it daily plays out in many areas of university decision making. No one person is arbitrarily making important decisions absent the advice of key constituents; nor is decision making simply a function of a group vote. The various stakeholders participate in well-defined parts of the process.

The second common, but overlapping, concept of shared governance is that certain constituencies are given primary responsibility over decision making in certain areas. A student senate, for example, might be given primary (but not total) responsibility for devising policies relevant to student governance. The most obvious example is that faculty members traditionally exercise primary responsibility over the curriculum. Because professors are the experts in their disciplines, they are the best equipped to determine degree requirements and all the intricacies of a complex university curriculum. That is fitting and proper.

But even in this second sense of shared governance—in which faculty members exercise a great deal of latitude over the curriculum—a committee vote is not the final word. In most universities, even curricular changes must be approved by an accountable officer: a dean or the university provost, and sometimes even the president. In still other institutions, the final approval rests with the board itself, as it does for many curricular decisions in my own university and state.

Clearly, when it comes to university governance, "shared" is a much more capacious concept than most people suspect. True shared governance attempts to balance maximum participation in decision making with clear accountability. That is a difficult balance to maintain, which may explain why the concept has become so fraught. Genuine shared governance gives voice (but not necessarily ultimate authority) to concerns common to all constituencies as well as to issues unique to specific groups.

The key to genuine shared governance is broad and unending communication. When various groups of people are kept in the loop and understand what developments are occurring within the university, and when they are invited to participate as true partners, the institution prospers. That, after all, is our common goal.

Gary A. Olson is provost and vice president for academic affairs at Idaho State University. He can be contacted at careers@chronicle.com.

Board of Regents Policy 1.210

Title

Regents' Policy on Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Academic Policy Development

Header

Regents Policy Chapter 1, General Provisions

Regents Policy [RP 1.210](#), Regents' Policy on Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Academic Policy Development

Effective Date: Oct. 18, 2002

Prior Dates Amended: April 12, 1979; Oct. 31, 2014 (recodified)

Review Date: August 2017

I. Purpose

To set forth policy on shared governance in academic decision-making and academic policy development.

II. Definitions

No policy specific or unique definitions apply.

III. Board of Regents Policy

A. Introduction

1. With unanimous agreement and understanding that the faculty of an educational institution contributes to its quality, spirit, aspiration, and effectiveness, the board issues this policy to provide for organized faculty involvement in the development and maintenance of a collegial approach to academic decision-making and policy development. The role of a university faculty governance organization is to advise the administration (primarily at the campus and unit level) on matters impacting and/or relating to the development and maintenance of academic policy and standards to the end that quality education is provided, preserved, and improved.
2. The board has the ultimate responsibility for the governance of the university and the formulation of policies which guide and determine its affairs. In carrying out these ultimate responsibilities, the board entrusts and delegates various functions to members of the university community and various organizational units. Unless specifically delegated or entrusted to others, all governing authority resides with the board.
3. The president is the chief executive officer of the board and the university, and has primary responsibility for recommending and implementing board policies. The interpretation of board policies, however, shall rest exclusively with the board.

4. The chancellors have the leadership responsibility for the immediate operational management and governance of their respective organizational units within board governing and presidential administrative policies.

B. Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making and Academic Policy Development

1. It is the policy of the university to maintain and strengthen organized and systematic involvement by faculty in academic decision-making and policy development. Consistent with this policy, the faculties of the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, the University of Hawai'i at Hilo, the University of Hawai'i at West O'ahu, and the Community Colleges are authorized to develop faculty organizations by which regular and organized faculty involvement may be exercised in carrying out their collective responsibilities with their administrative colleagues in matters of academic policy for the particular campus, major organizational unit headed by a chancellor, and the university, and to make such determinations as set forth herein below.
2. While the primary focus of this responsibility is at the campus level, involvement in university-wide academic policy through normal administrative channels is also important in protecting and strengthening the quality of the university.
3. The following further describes details of this policy.
 - a. Together with and subject to the approval of its chancellor, each campus faculty may:
 - (1) Determine its own organization consistent with this policy and any other applicable university and/or board policies, bylaws, and procedures; and
 - (2) Adopt its own bylaws and rules of procedure for exercising the role and performing the duties outlined in this policy. Once such organization or organizations and charters are approved, the pattern of participation in campus and university matters will be realized in accordance with the charters.
 - b. The duly authorized organization specified by each charter shall have the responsibility to speak for the faculty on academic policy matters such as:
 - (1) Determining the initiation, review, and evaluation of proposed, probationary, or authorized research, instructional, and academic programs;
 - (2) Budget planning and implementation;
 - (3) Student-faculty relations;
 - (4) Evaluation of faculty and campus academic administrators;
 - (5) Establishing a canon of professional ethics and an effective means of professional maintenance of those ethics, including faculty self-discipline; and
 - (6) Other subjects referred to it or them by the chancellor, or by request of the appropriate faculty organization.
 - c. As stated previously by the board, the faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental academic areas as curriculum content, subject matter, and methods of

- instruction and research. On these matters the power of review and concurrence or final decision lodged in the board or delegated to administration officers should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances and for reasons communicated to the faculty.
- d. In cases of academic policy proposals that may be initiated by the board or recommended by the president, the president shall decide the manner by which the advice and full input of duly constituted faculty organizations are obtained. Prior to final board action, such advice, along with the president's recommendations, will be considered.
 - e. The role of the faculty as set forth herein shall not be delegated to any other entity by the faculty organization established pursuant to this policy.
 - f. Each action of the faculty under these provisions shall be consistent with such policy and directives as the board may prescribe. If there is any conflict, the chancellor shall notify the faculty of the conflict and initiate consultation to resolve the problem.
4. The authority for implementing this policy is vested in the president of the university or his/her designee. Each campus is encouraged to develop and submit for approval a system of faculty involvement in academic decision-making and policy development in accordance with this policy.

IV. Delegation of Authority

The board entrusts and delegates various functions to members of the university community and various organizational units. Unless specifically delegated or entrusted to others, all governing authority resides with the board.

The authority for implementing this policy is vested in the president of the university or his/her designee.

Board of Regents Policy 2.204

Title

Regents' Policy on Board Self-Evaluation

Header

Regents Policy Chapter 2, Administration

Regents Policy [RP 2.204](#), Policy on Board Self-Evaluation

Effective Date: Oct. 19, 2006

Prior Dates Amended: Oct. 31, 2014 (recodified)

Review Date: August 2017

I. Purpose

To set forth policy regarding the purposes, policy, responsibility, process and outcomes on board self-evaluation.

II. Definitions

No policy specific or unique definitions apply.

III. Board of Regents Policy

A. Purposes.

1. The purposes of a periodic self-evaluation are to enable the board to strengthen its performance, identify and reach consensus on its goals, ensure that the board has a clear grasp of its responsibilities, strengthen relationships among board members and especially with the president, and clarify expectations among board members and with the president.

B. Policy.

1. The board shall conduct a self-study of its stewardship every two years.

C. Responsibility

1. It shall be the responsibility of the president and the chairperson to plan a special workshop devoted entirely to reviewing the board's work.

D. Process.

1. To allow for necessary planning, a workshop date and meeting site shall be agreed upon by the board at least three months in advance. At least eight hours of meeting

time shall be allotted, preferably split between two consecutive days. Ordinarily, only the regents and the president shall participate.

2. A facilitator not directly connected with the institution may be retained to help plan and conduct the workshop. He/she shall have requisite knowledge of trusteeship, institutional governance, and the conduct of the academic presidency, along with good group-facilitation skills. With his/her assistance, an appropriate written survey may be selected or developed for completion by all board members. A summary of all board member responses to the survey, without attribution, shall be provided to all board members before the workshop. These results shall be the basis for discussion.
3. The board shall not be officially convened to transact university business. Rather, the workshop is intended to explore opportunities to strengthen the board's effective, including its relationships with the president and stakeholders.

E. Outcomes.

1. The workshop shall be planned and conducted in such a way that the board and the president can decide on explicit actions for subsequent considerations. These shall be summarized in writing within a reasonable time and distributed to all board members. The chairperson and the president shall be responsible for ensuring appropriate follow-up.

IV. Delegation of Authority

There is no policy specific delegation of authority.

Statement of Expectations for Members of the Board of Trustees of Ohio University

*Adopted by the Board of Trustees on April 24, 2009
Amended on June 22, 2012*

This Statement of Expectations is intended to provide guidelines and information to assist members of the Board of Trustees in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities in service to Ohio University and the citizens of the State of Ohio.

1. The Role of the Board

- a. The Board of Trustees is the governing body of Ohio University. It is a body politic and corporate under Ohio law and has the right to sue and be sued. The General Assembly has conferred upon the Board the authority to: adopt rules for the governance of the institution; hire and supervise the President, faculty and staff; oversee university finances; and control university property and facilities.
- b. The Board serves the citizens of the State of Ohio. It is responsible for ensuring that the university offers students an educational experience of the highest quality and produces research that provides economic and cultural benefits to the citizens of Ohio. It is also responsible for making efficient and effective use of state resources by working with the Governor, the Board of Regents and the other state universities through the University System of Ohio.
- c. The Board's primary concerns are strategic governance and accountability. It should adopt a strategic plan designed to ensure the long-term fulfillment of the university's teaching, research and service mission, monitor progress in achieving the plan's goals and update the plan as necessary. It should provide oversight to protect the university's fiscal integrity and make sure that the President, faculty and staff comply with all applicable laws and perform their responsibilities ethically and competently.
- d. The Board should adopt a procedure governing the creation and monitoring of corporate entities affiliated with the university.
- e. The Board should govern through the President and should refrain from becoming involved in day-to-day operations.
- f. The Board should recognize the important role that the principle of shared governance plays in institutions of higher education. It should seek input from faculty, staff and students and whenever possible incorporate their views into its decisions.

2. The Role of Individual Trustees

- a. Members of the Board of Trustees are stewards of the public trust. They have a fiduciary obligation to act in the best interests of the university and the State of Ohio. They must adhere to the highest ethical standards and perform their university duties without regard to any personal interests they may have. Trustees should understand and comply with state ethics laws and keep themselves informed of developments in these laws. They should avoid situations that may give rise to even the appearance of a conflict of interest and promptly disclose any conflicts of interest that may occur.
- b. Trustees should understand that they serve the institution as a whole and are not advocates for any particular unit or constituency of the university.
- c. Student Trustees have a unique responsibility to ensure that the views of students are heard in Board deliberations. They should also share with other students the Board's perspectives on University issues. In performing both of these functions, they should keep in mind the needs of all constituencies within the university.
- d. The Chair of the Ohio University Alumni Association Board of Directors is responsible for ensuring that the views of alumni are presented to the Board and for communicating to alumni the Board's perspectives on university issues.
- e. Service on the Board is a time consuming professional commitment. Trustees should attend all meetings of the Board and committees and should give notice to the Chair when they are unable to do so. Trustees should also make an effort to participate in conferences and other programs designed to educate and update Trustees and to attend commencements, convocations and other special events on campus.
- f. Trustees should be attentive during meetings and refrain from multitasking. They should treat the opinions of their colleagues on the Board as well as others participating in Board discussions with civility and respect and should be open to alternative points of view. They should respect and protect the confidentiality of matters discussed in executive sessions and should refrain from publicly or privately criticizing other Trustees or impugning their motives.
- g. Trustees should strive to make informed decisions based on an analysis of objective data. In their deliberations they should rely on the application of sound management principles and prudent business judgment. To ensure thorough consideration of Board decisions, they should review briefing materials and be prepared to actively participate in discussions.
- h. In order to make good decisions, Trustees need to engage in robust and thorough discussions of university issues in public meetings. Disagreements will occur and Trustees should seek productive ways to resolve them. Once a consensus is reached on an issue, all Trustees should respect the final decision of the Board.

- i. Trustees should keep themselves informed about issues and events at the local, state and national level that may affect the university and higher education in general.
- j. Trustees are encouraged to offer financial support to the university in accordance with their means.
- k. Trustees should understand and comply with the Ohio Public Records and Open Meetings Laws and should keep themselves informed of developments in these laws.

3. The Board's Relationship with the President

- a. The Board delegates responsibility for all aspects of institutional management to the President. The Board and individual Trustees should refrain from involvement in operational matters except as necessary to fulfill their fiduciary duties.
- b. The Board and the President should agree on clearly defined institutional goals and strategies for achieving them.
- c. The Board should hold the President accountable for achieving institutional goals. Evaluation of the President should be an ongoing process with the Board offering candid and constructive feedback as necessary. In accordance with Board policy, formal evaluations should be conducted on a regular basis.
- d. The President reports to the Board as a whole and not to individual Trustees. Trustees who have concerns about the President's performance should convey them to the Board Chair who will take appropriate action to address the concern. The Chair will report back to the Trustee who raised the concern in a timely manner.
- e. Individual Trustees should develop a comfortable working relationship with the President. They are encouraged to interact with the President one-on-one as needed to share information, concerns or advice but they should remember that when they do so they are not speaking for the entire Board.

4. The Board's Relationship with Internal Constituencies

- a. Trustees are encouraged to interact informally with administrators, faculty and students, bearing in mind that they do so as individual members of the Board. They should avoid any statements that would give rise to the perception that they speak for the entire Board.
- b. When interacting with faculty, staff and students, Trustees should not disclose matters deemed confidential by the Board in executive session, advocate for their personal position on university issues or criticize other members of the university community.

- c. Trustees should submit requests for information about institutional issues to the Board Secretary who will facilitate a response from the appropriate university official.
- d. Consistent with the principle of shared governance, the faculty, through the Faculty Senate, plays an active advisory role to the administration and the Board of Trustees on all academic matters, including but not limited to academic standards, research, admissions, curriculum and the granting of degrees. The Faculty Senate initiates policies relating to university-wide academic matters, the rights and responsibilities of faculty and faculty grievances. The Board should respect the role of the Senate in these areas and should also consider advice from the Senate on matters of general concern to the university community.
- e. The Board should encourage the President and administrators to involve individual faculty and students in the development of institutional goals and priorities. The active participation of faculty and students in these matters will give them a broader understanding of institutional governance and will enrich the Board's understanding of faculty and student views on university issues.

5. Relationships with External Entities

- a. The Board Chair is the only Trustee authorized to make public statements on behalf of the entire Board.
- b. When asked to comment on Board actions or deliberations, Trustees may defer to the Chair or the President. If Trustees choose to speak publicly on issues relating to the university or higher education in general they should make it clear that they are stating their personal views and are not expressing the formal position of the Board or the university.
- c. When individual Trustees communicate with federal, state or local officials on issues relating to higher education, they should take care not to create the perception that they speak for the Board or the university unless they have been authorized by the Chair or the Board to do so.
- d. When individual Trustees are presented with concerns about university operations, these matters should be communicated to the President and/or the Chair.
- e. While Trustees should seek information and ask questions of others, they should refrain from publicly criticizing the President or other members of the University Community. Criticisms or concerns that Trustees may have about the President or other members of the University Community should be conveyed to the Chair who will determine the appropriate method for the Board to address the issue.

BOARD OF REGENTS POLICY REVIEW SUMMARY (April 5, 2018)

Policy No.	Title	Rec. Action	Notes / Details	Lead on Substance	Other Consult
1-201	Definitions	Minor changes	Eliminate redundancy; update Executive titles (see III.8)	Administration	
1.202	Relationship of the Board to Administration & University	Minor changes		Administration	
1.203	Rules of Practice and Procedure before the Board	Minor changes	HAR amended to adopt new Chapter 1.1; change RP reference to new Chapter number.	Administration Legal Affairs	
1.204	Rights & Responsibilities of the UH Community	Delete after HAR repeal	HAR repeal in final 30 day notification phase. Upon repeal, existing policy will be abolished.	Administration Legal Affairs	
1.205	Policy on Non-Discrimination and Affirmative Action	No change	Policy current with all State and Federal laws and regulations	Legal Affairs	EEO/AA Officers
1.206	University Seal	No change, recommend consolidate with 1.207 and 1.208		Administration	
1.207	University Logo	No change, consolidate with 1.207 and 1.208		Administration	

1.208	Coat of Arms	No change, consolidate with 1.207 and 1.208	Research history shows the coat of arms was adopted in 1954 but so far no color image can be found	Administration	
1.209	Use of University's Name by National or Other Organizations	No change		Administration	
1.210	Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making...	No change	Board is entering into conversations	Board P&BG, Administration	
1.211	Severability	No change		Administration	Legal Affairs
2.201	Officers of the University of Hawaii	Minor changes	Update Executive Titles (III.A)	Administration	
2.202	Duties of the President	No change		Administration	
2.203	Policy on Evaluation of the President	Substantive Review	Added to the list of policies undergoing substantive review	Board P&BG, President	
2.204	Policy on Board Self-Evaluation	Substantive Review	BOR may wish to have a more flexible policy in how it approaches self-evaluation	Board P&BG committee	
2.205	Policy on Whistleblowing and Retaliation	No change	Recently adopted policy, no review necessary	Administration	
2.206	Policy on Regents as Employees	Substantive Review	Board is considering additional new language regarding elective office	Board P&BG committee	
3.201	Major Organizational Units of the University of Hawaii	No change		Administration	
3.202	Reorganizations	No change		Administration	
3.203	Organization Chart	Minor changes		Administration	

4.201	Mission and Purpose of the University	Realignment with other policies to emphasize mission and purpose	Focus on mission and purpose; move implementation and details into other policies	Academic Planning and Policy	
4.202	Strategic Planning	Substantive Review	Bring into line with IAFP and UH strategic plan targets; clarify review/approval procedures. Likely combine 4.202, 4.203, 4.204, and 4.206 into two policies. Drafts currently under review.	Academic Planning and Policy	
4.203	Unit Academic Plans	Substantive Review	Bring into line with IAFP and UH strategic plan targets; clarify review/approval procedures (see above)	Academic Planning and Policy	
4.204	Long-Range Physical Development Plans	Substantive Review	Bring into line with IAFP and P3 initiatives (see above)	Academic Planning and Policy and Administration	
4.205	Institutional Accountability and Performance	No change		Academic Planning and policy	
4.206	Enrollment Planning	Substantive Review	Bring into line with IAFP and P3 initiatives (see above)	Academic Planning and Policy	
4.207	Community College System	No change		Community Colleges	
4.208	Sustainability Policy	No change	Upon further review, RP is current	Administration	