

FACULTY COUNCIL OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES -- SHARED GOVERNANCE RUBRIC

The attached rubric is intended to serve as a diagnostic tool for campuses to use and adapt when conducting a self-assessment of the effectiveness of their shared governance processes. The rubric is the result of several years of research and collaboration conducted by the Faculty Council of Community Colleges' Governance Committee and based primarily on established, published and widely accepted literature, as well as the experiences of Council and committee members. It does not nor is it meant to represent or address any one campus, governance system, or individual opinion about shared governance, but, rather, represents well-documented best practices in shared campus governance.

The rubric is rooted primarily in the criteria set forth by the Association of American University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). However, the Governance Committee added two significant considerations to the rubric not fully covered by either organization:

1. The Governance Committee, in keeping with SUNY's philosophy that insists on the inclusion of student governance within the shared governance system, has included criteria related to the students' role;
2. The Governance Committee thought it was important to consider the complexity of the authority of the local Boards of Trustees in relation to that of the SUNY Board of Trustees, which is a structure unique to our community colleges within the SUNY System.

The design of the rubric is premised on the theories surrounding assessment of the ineffable. Thus, the best application of the rubric will likely come from those who have already had experience with the day to day functioning of shared governance on a campus, have a practical feel for what is good governance and what is not, and are familiar with the literature related to standards and best practices in shared governance. The rubric does NOT provide a checklist for shared governance. Instead it works on an indicator model through which those with appropriate awareness and experience can infer the degree to which shared governance is working on the campus and areas that could need extra attention.

The FCCC expects that a president, faculty governance leaders, and other potential partners, such as students or trustees for example, would come together in a spirit of collegial cooperation to best apply this rubric to their campus setting. It is hoped that the use of the rubric in assessing shared governance might become an integral part of a system of continuous self-improvement for a campus, maintaining areas of strength while also identifying areas of concern and opportunities for growth and improvement. The Faculty Council is happy to work with campuses in administering the rubric or assisting with the interpretation of the results. We hope that this document serves as a useful resource for our community colleges in their continuing efforts to participate in an effective, collegial, and sustainable shared governance system.

I. Climate for Shared Governance

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<i>I. Climate for Shared Governance</i>	1. The trustees, administration and faculty model collegiality, respect, tolerance and civility towards other members of the campus community and each other.	1. Rather than collegial, the relationships among the constituencies are poorly established, adversarial or divisive; decisions are often made arbitrarily or without a clear, formalized process for input agreed upon by constituent groups; faculty representation in decision-making processes is not always faculty/campus-governance determined.	1. Constituencies work respectfully and collegially through formalized, transparent decision-making processes to achieve institutional goals.	1. Constituencies work respectfully and collegially through formalized, transparent decision-making processes to achieve institutional goals; administration readily seeks and includes both formal and informal recommendations from constituent groups in decision-making processes.
	2. Negotiations and communications among college constituencies are open and carried out in good faith and in an atmosphere of trust	2. Decision-making processes and their related communications are not always open and clear, leading to perceptions of arbitrariness, personal deal-making, and distrust.	2. Constituency groups engage in formalized, collaborative decision-making processes; opportunities exist for vertical as well as horizontal communications.	2. All constituency groups engage in thoughtful deliberation and respectful communications and processes aimed at achieving institutional mission and goals; faculty/campus governance leadership is welcomed and provided a reasonable opportunity to report to the president, cabinet and Board of Trustees and engage in matters of shared governance and decision-making.

II. Institutional Communication

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<p>II. Institutional Communication</p>	<p>1. Collaboration by the administration with faculty/campus governance leadership allows for a reasonable amount of time for deliberation and a mechanism for leadership to consult with their constituents before offering recommendations</p>	<p>1. Timelines are often arbitrary and insufficient for thoughtful input or widespread participation by constituents; the mechanism for consultation and development of recommendations is lacking, unclear or unreasonably difficult; requests for input and their deadlines are frequently timed for non-academic periods of the year, when faculty participation would be limited. Important information necessary for deliberation is difficult to access. Communication among constituent groups is mostly for the purpose of delivering information about decisions already made.</p>	<p>1. Timelines and processes for decision-making are reasonable and clearly articulated and easily accessible so governance leaders can consult with their constituents before offering recommendations. Communication among constituent groups is not merely an information update or a report on decisions already made.</p>	<p>1. Timelines and processes anticipate upcoming decisions and provide clear means of consultation and reasonable time frames for thoughtful review through established processes prior to the finalization of recommendations; in the face of insufficient time, the constituents consider flexibility in favor of better information and decisions rather than less effective recommendations solely to meet a deadline.</p>

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
II. Institutional Communication continued	2. The faculty as a whole, in addition to faculty representatives, has timely access to information necessary for faculty members to give meaningful input into governance processes.	2. Not all faculty members have sufficient time to access and digest information in order to engage meaningfully in the decision-making processes; information is difficult to access or is incomplete.	2. Faculty members have reasonable time to access information necessary to effectively engage in the decision-making processes; information is easily accessible.	2. All faculty members have both reasonable time and can easily access all information pertinent to the decision-making processes; faculty actively seek the information, thoughtfully process it, and reference such information as they engage in the decision-making processes; requests for further information are honored.

III. The Board's Role in Shared Governance

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<p><i>III. The Board's Role in Shared Governance</i></p>	<p>1. The local board of trustees understands its role as a policy-making body and is not inappropriately involved in the day-to-day operations of the institution.</p>	<p>1. The board inappropriately engages in the day-to-day operations of the institution; the board exceeds its policy-approving authority and attempts to administer or determine processes and procedures for operational functions of the college under the purview of administration or faculty; the board is unduly influenced by outside entities which affects its ability to form policies in the best interest of the college; trustees do not understand their authority lies within the board as a collective body and instead wield authority as individuals.</p>	<p>1. The board focuses on developing necessary policies that are in the best interest of the college, the faculty, and the students and does not get involved in day-to-day operations beyond holding the president accountable for the smooth functioning of the college; trustees work together as a collective body and do not claim to have authority as individuals.</p>	<p>1. The board functions effectively as a collective body to approve policy recommendations for the institution; the board directs administration to develop procedures for implementing policy; the board approves and implements policy in the best interest of achieving the institution's stated mission and goals and has a good relationship with the president, senior administration, and faculty and student leadership so they have multiple avenues of receiving information to better understand the policy and financial needs of the college.</p>

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<p>III. The Board's Role in Shared Governance continued</p>	<p>2. Local board members inform themselves on governance issues by keeping up with the literature and participating in training opportunities and meetings of the NYCCT and national college trustee organizations such as ACCT and AGB. The local board has a clear understanding of its responsibility for conducting business in an open and transparent manner.</p>	<p>2. Local board members are not well informed on current governance issues at the local, state or national level; board members do not actively engage in training opportunities and meetings at the local, state or national levels; the board seems insular and/or unengaged in issues concerning higher education and, specifically, concerning community colleges; local board meetings are regularly or systematically held in violation of the mandates or the spirit of the open meetings law; the board is not sufficiently responsive to SUNY or governmental mandates; the board is not sufficiently consultative or collaborative with administration and faculty/campus governance.</p>	<p>2. The local board is familiar with and function within the parameters of open meetings law, responds to SUNY Board and other governmental mandates, collaborates with the college president on policy-making decisions and budgets, and provides for reasonable interaction and consultation with faculty governance leadership in open meetings; board members take advantage of orientations, trainings, meetings and conferences provided by such organizations as NYCCT, ACCT, and AGB.</p>	<p>2. Local board members are actively engaged in their roles as board members at the local, state and national levels, participating and/or presenting at conferences; board members are well informed about upcoming initiatives and issues impacting the college and its ability to achieve its mission and goals; the local board is well versed in and abides by open meetings law, honoring not only the mandates of the law but also the spirit of the law; the board is well versed in and abides by state education law and SUNY policies; local board members advocate for change when state law or SUNY policies impede the college's ability to achieve its mission; the local board welcomes faculty/campus governance as a reporting item on their meeting agendas.</p>

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
III. The Board's Role in Shared Governance continued	3. The local board respects and supports the faculty's traditional role in institutional governance.	3. The board does not support faculty/campus governance participation in decision-making, especially in matters of curriculum and academic standards and policy (which includes class size); the board attempts to impose programs or curricula without appropriate faculty/campus governance processes or input; the board often impedes faculty rights to academic freedom and to engage in shared governance at the college.	3. The board approves curriculum and academic standards that have been forwarded through the appropriate faculty/campus governance processes, recognizing that curriculum and assessment, as well as academic standards, are the purview of the faculty; the board respects the academic freedom of faculty and their right to engage in shared governance.	3. The board willingly seeks faculty/campus governance input when considering curricular or program proposals advanced by external or internal interests, recognizing the expertise of the faculty in academic matters; the board approves curriculum and academic standards and policies that have been forwarded by faculty/campus governance upon completion of the appropriate faculty/campus governance process; the board respects and encourages the academic freedom of faculty and their right to engage in shared governance and clearly respects and incorporates faculty/campus governance recommendations into their final decision-making processes.

IV. The President's Role in Shared Governance

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<p>IV. The President's Role in Shared Governance</p>	<p>1. The president accepts, and only on rare occasions overturns, faculty/campus governance decisions and recommendations, especially in the areas in which faculty has primary responsibility (e.g., curriculum and academic standards).</p>	<p>1. The president frequently and arbitrarily overturns faculty/campus governance decisions and recommendations in the areas in which faculty have the primary responsibility; the president bypasses faculty/campus governance decision-making processes in areas of faculty responsibility; the president does not communicate clearly and in a timely manner, his or her rationale for the rejection of or changes to faculty/campus governance decisions or recommendations; the president does not meet regularly with faculty/campus governance leaders or include them in ceremonial events.</p>	<p>1. Faculty/campus governance decisions and recommendations arising from established governance processes and structures are taken seriously and respected; with rare exception, the president accepts and implements faculty/campus governance recommendations pertaining to curriculum and academic standards; when necessary, the president provides timely and clearly written rationale for changes to or rejection of such decisions or recommendations; the president regularly meets with faculty/campus governance leaders and includes them in ceremonial events.</p>	<p>1. The president clearly respects the decisions or recommendations arising from established faculty/campus governance processes and procedures and implements faculty/campus governance recommendations pertaining to curriculum and academic standards; when necessary, the president opens a dialogue with faculty governance leaders and affected faculty when he/she has concerns regarding faculty/campus governance recommendations in an attempt to solve problems collaboratively rather than simply reject the recommendations; when necessary, the president communicates in writing and in person the rationale for any changes or rejections of such recommendations; the president encourages faculty engagement in the process and facilitates the resources for faculty/campus governance processes to work effectively and efficiently; faculty governance leaders are a part of the president's cabinet and are included in ceremonial events.</p>

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<p>IV. The President's Role in Shared Governance continued</p>	<p>2. The president seeks meaningful faculty/campus governance input on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.</p>	<p>2. Decisions in which faculty have a serious and appropriate interest but not primary responsibility are made without sufficient consultation or input from faculty/campus governance; faculty/campus governance is not sufficiently involved in planning and budgeting, even though these affect achievement of institutional goals and educational priorities; the president does not routinely accept the recommendations of faculty/campus governance, especially regarding curriculum and academic standards; and the president fails to systematically respond to recommendations in writing or in a timely manner.</p>	<p>2. The president regularly and systematically seeks and takes into serious consideration the input of faculty/campus governance on non-academic matters which impact the institution and achievement of its mission as an institution of higher education; mutually agreed upon systematic and transparent shared governance processes are followed in the creation and update of institutional strategic plans and assessments and establishment of budgeting priorities.</p>	<p>2. The president encourages shared governance processes, for budgeting, planning and other institutional areas that are inclusive of all constituencies and that provide clear direction for institutional priorities that help the institution achieve its educational mission and goals. The shared governance processes are systematic, transparent, timely, and are agreed to by all constituencies.</p>

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
IV. The President's Role in Shared Governance continued	3. The president effectively advocates the principles of shared governance to the local board.	3. The president discourages board knowledge or recognition of shared governance within the institution; the president does not advocate for faculty/campus governance leaders' attendance at or report to the board; the president often makes promises to the board about decisions that have not gone through a faculty/campus governance process.	3. The president provides opportunities for shared governance orientations and workshops for local board members; the president supports inclusion of faculty/campus governance leaders' reports on board meeting agendas; the president regularly advocates for faculty/campus recommendations on major initiatives and policies prior to board adoption.	3. The president routinely includes shared governance in orientations and workshops for new and continuing board members; the president includes the faculty/campus governance leaders in cabinet meetings; the president encourages regular inclusion of faculty/campus governance leaders' reports on board meeting agendas; the president advocates for faculty/campus recommendations on major initiatives and policies prior to board consideration.

V. The Faculty's Role in Shared Governance

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<p><i>V. The Faculty's Role in Shared Governance</i></p>	<p>1. The faculty have access to and participate in faculty / campus governance processes. Faculty understand and value the purpose of shared governance.</p>	<p>1. Faculty/campus governance is discouraged or non-existent; participation by faculty is limited by schedule, location or other means of access; faculty/campus governance representatives are not regularly selected by fair and open processes; representatives do not report regularly to or seek input from constituencies; faculty rarely engage in faculty/campus governance issues and view faculty/campus governance as ineffective; faculty and faculty/campus governance regularly fail to protect and promote the principles of academic freedom and the right to participate in shared governance and at times misuse or abuse those rights.</p>	<p>1. Faculty/campus governance representatives are selected by fair and open processes; faculty/campus governance meetings are scheduled to allow for maximum attendance and participation; representatives regularly seek and convey input from constituencies; faculty engage in conversations concerning issues under consideration by faculty/campus governance; the principles and responsibilities of academic freedom and the right to participate in shared governance are protected and promoted by faculty and faculty/campus governance, but not misused or abused; faculty/campus governance has a clear relationship with the FCCC and responds to FCCC issues when necessary.</p>	<p>1. Participation in faculty/campus governance is both encouraged and expected; faculty/campus governance representatives are selected by fair and open processes; representation is broad across disciplines; faculty/campus governance meetings are scheduled during specifically designated time blocks to allow for maximum attendance and participation; the faculty/campus governance system includes an established process for representatives to report to and seek input from constituencies; faculty engage in conversations concerning issues under consideration by faculty/campus governance as well as propose initiatives that would benefit the college and their students rather than only reacting to issues brought to them; the principles and responsibilities of academic freedom and the right to participate in shared governance are protected and promoted by faculty and faculty/campus governance, and a system of checks and balances exists to prevent misuse or abuse of shared governance by an individual or small group of faculty not responsive to the body of the whole; faculty/campus governance actively engages with the FCCC and they work together to support the needs of the college and all of SUNY's community colleges.</p>

<p>V. The Faculty's Role in Shared Governance continued</p>	<p>2. Faculty /campus governance processes are clear and transparent to faculty and include bylaws, committee charges, membership expectations, clearly defined roles, a standard parliamentary rule, and procedures for changes, etc.</p>	<p>2. Faculty, including new faculty, are not sufficiently familiar with or have not been informed about faculty/campus governance; bylaws, committee charges and membership, meeting schedules and minutes are not readily accessible or communicated clearly to all faculty; faculty express confusion over what shared governance is and its value; faculty often do not know their faculty/campus governance leaders or means of communicating with representatives.</p>	<p>2. New faculty are oriented to faculty/campus governance structure and processes; bylaws, committee charges, membership expectations and flow of information are clearly articulated and readily accessible to faculty.</p>	<p>2. All faculty are familiar with the basic structure and processes of faculty/campus governance; bylaws, committee charges, membership expectations, meeting schedules and locations, and flow of information are clearly articulated and easily accessible to faculty; members are familiar with and respect parliamentary procedure; agendas and minutes of meetings are easily accessible to faculty.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p>V. The Faculty's Role in Shared Governance continued</p>	<p>3. Faculty accept their responsibility in curriculum development and academic standards by participating in related faculty/campus governance processes.</p>	<p>3. Faculty are reluctant or unlikely to participate in faculty/campus governance processes related to curriculum development, curriculum approval, academic standards and academic policy development and approval; faculty have inadequate means for participation in decision-making related to areas of faculty purview.</p>	<p>3. Faculty participate on faculty/shared governance committees related to curriculum and academic standards; faculty representatives communicate proposals under consideration to, and seek input from, their constituencies in a timely manner, allowing for due consideration; faculty actively participate in votes on recommendations related to these areas; proposal and approval processes facilitate collaborative and collegial opportunities with administration but are not unduly bureaucratic.</p>	<p>3. Faculty recognize and readily accept their responsibility over curriculum and academic standards and policy by active engagement on faculty/campus governance committees related to those areas; representatives clearly communicate proposals and actively seek input from their constituencies in a timely manner allowing for thoughtful consideration; significant numbers of faculty participate in thoughtful deliberations and votes related to these areas; proposal and approval processes facilitate collaborative and collegial opportunities with administration but are not unduly bureaucratic; when conflicts arise among the faculty or with administration, processes are in place that will ameliorate those conflicts, and in so doing, improve the proposal.</p>
--	---	--	--	--

<p>V. The Faculty's Role in Shared Governance continued</p>	<p>4. Faculty interact respectfully with the president, the board of trustees, administration, student governance, fellow faculty members and other constituents of the college community.</p>	<p>4. Faculty often lack knowledge of the organizational structure of the institution and the areas of authority of the board, the president, and the faculty; faculty often do not follow protocol when engaging with the board or the president; the faculty, the president and the board regularly do not interact collegially; mechanisms for resolving conflict are inadequate or non-existent.</p>	<p>4. Faculty are knowledgeable of the organizational structure of the institution and the authority of the president, the board and the faculty; faculty follow the protocols and the policies of the institution; faculty/campus governance leaders engage in collegial and reasoned dialog with each other, the board, administration, student governance, and other college constituencies in considering what is best for the college and the students; faculty/campus governance leaders engage in good faith efforts to ameliorate conflict when necessary.</p>	<p>4. Faculty are knowledgeable and respectful of the organizational structure of the institution and the authority of the president, the board and the faculty; faculty follow the protocols and policies of the institution; faculty/campus governance leaders have established a respectful and collegial relationship with the president and the board, administration, student governance and each other, resulting in effective shared governance and informed decision making that will benefit the college and the students; tensions arising from inevitable conflicts are not discouraged but are systematically and transparently explored and ameliorated for the purposes of better decision making.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p>V. The Faculty's Role in Shared Governance continued</p>	<p>5. The roles between faculty/campus governance and collective bargaining are clearly defined and understood.</p>	<p>5. Confusion exists between the role of faculty/campus governance and the role of collective bargaining; faculty regularly bring issues to the inappropriate body; faculty/campus governance and collective bargaining units regularly do not work collegially or collaboratively; evidence of distrust or disrespect between faculty/campus governance leadership and collective bargaining leadership is too often apparent.</p>	<p>5. Faculty/campus governance engages in decision-making and recommendations on academic and educational matters; collective bargaining units engage in matters of contract and workload.</p>	<p>5. Faculty/campus governance and collective bargaining roles are clear and well respected by each; issues of common interest are addressed appropriately in each venue and collaboratively when necessary; faculty/campus governance leaders and collective bargaining work collaboratively to direct issues to appropriate body; liaison relationships exist between both bodies to perpetuate the sharing of information.</p>
--	---	---	---	--

VI. The Students' Role in Shared Governance

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<p>VI. The Students' Role in Shared Governance</p>	<p>1. The primary role of student governance in shared governance is to inform the other constituent groups about the needs and interests of students; create/maintain open and transparent governance and communication structures for facilitating conversations about governance issues with students; and, when necessary, advocate for reform or the creation of policies and practices that will work toward meeting those needs and interests while respecting the primary roles of the board, the president, and the faculty.</p>	<p>1. The student governance body is non-existent or ineffective; student governance representatives have an inadequate relationship with faculty/campus governance groups and is inadequately involved in decision-making processes at the college.</p>	<p>1. Student governance has effective bylaws, processes and structures for engaging students in decision-making processes at the college; selection of student governance representatives for serving on appropriate faculty/campus governance and other college committees is an open and inclusive process; the relationship between the student trustee and student governance is clearly articulated and both work together to serve the needs and interests of the students when possible; student governance has a clear relationship with SUNY's Student Assembly for the purposes of information sharing.</p>	<p>1. Student governance has effective bylaws, processes and structures for engaging students in decision-making processes at the college; the majority of full-time students are aware of the purpose of student governance and student governance issues and know the avenues for expressing their views on those issues; selection of student governance representatives for serving on appropriate faculty governance and other college committees is an open and inclusive process; student representatives actively participate on those committees while maintaining high academic standards; the relationship between the student trustee and student governance is clearly articulated and both work together to serve the needs and interests of the students and the board when possible. Student governance is actively engaged in the SUNY Student Assembly in working toward meeting the needs and interests of students at the college and within SUNY.</p>

VII. Joint Decision-Making

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
VII. Joint Decision-Making	1. The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in the area of long range planning.	1. The local board and administration are not sufficiently consultative or inclusive of faculty/campus governance, student governance and other appropriate constituent groups in the development and assessment of long range or strategic plans; the planning process is strictly administrative and not necessarily formalized or clearly articulated; academics or educational programming is not central to long range or strategic planning goals.	1. Given the primacy of the mission of the college as an institution of higher education, long range planning includes the involvement and input of faculty/campus governance, the president, administration, student governance, the local board, and other college constituencies; input to long range strategic planning is provided through a mutually agreed upon formal process developed in collaboration with faculty/campus governance.	1. Given the primacy of the mission of the college, long range planning includes the involvement and input of faculty/campus governance, the president, administration, student governance, the local board, and other college constituencies; input to long range strategic planning is provided through a mutually agreed upon formal process developed in collaboration with faculty/campus governance; mutually agreed upon shared governance processes are implemented in the monitoring, assessing, and revising of the approved plans.

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
VII. Joint Decision-Making continued	2. The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making regarding existing or prospective physical resources.	2. Decision making regarding existing or prospective physical resources is done by administration arbitrarily and without consultation; the impact on constituencies and end users is not sufficiently considered, and input regarding the impact is not sufficiently sought.	2. Master plans for physical resources, facilities, infrastructure and equipment are developed through a mutually agreed upon formal process, developed in collaboration with faculty/campus governance, allowing for input from constituencies and end users most likely to be impacted, especially when that input is derived from valid assessment processes.	2. Master plans for physical resources, facilities, infrastructure and equipment are developed through a mutually agreed upon formal process, developed in collaboration with faculty/campus governance, allowing for input of constituencies and end users most likely to be impacted; faculty/campus governance recommendations structures as well as faculty-driven program assessments are taken seriously in the final decision-making processes.
	3. The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in the area of budgeting.	3. The institution's shared governance system does not include a planning and budgeting committee; budget prioritization is determined with little to no input from faculty and staff; planning and budgeting is viewed as an administrative and board function only.	3. The institution's shared governance system includes a planning and budgeting committee that makes recommendations for budget prioritization; the planning and budgeting committee is inclusive of representation from faculty/campus governance, student governance, and other appropriate constituent groups.	3. The institution's shared governance system includes a planning and budgeting committee that makes recommendations for budget prioritization; assessment of planning and budgeting effectiveness to meet institutional mission and goals is open, transparent and communicated back to shared governance groups.

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
VII. Joint Decision-Making continued	4. The institution recognizes joint responsibility for the selection and evaluation of the president and senior administrators.	4. Searches for college president and senior administrators do not have broad campus representation, including faculty/campus governance leadership, on search committees; evaluation/assessment of college president and senior administrators does not sufficiently include faculty or faculty/campus governance leadership perspectives.	4. Search committees for selection of a college president and senior administrators include member(s) of the faculty/campus and student governance leadership as well as representatives of all major constituencies on campus; processes for evaluation/assessment of college president and senior administrators encourage input from faculty and faculty/campus governance leadership.	4. Search committees for selection of a college president and senior administrators include faculty/campus and student governance leadership as well as representatives of all major constituencies on campus; the majority of members are selected from the campus community, with faculty well represented; faculty/campus and student governance select their own representatives to serve on search committees; the search process is as clear and transparent as possible, with reasonable opportunities provided for the various constituent groups to meet the final candidates and provide feedback to the search committee which is then seriously considered in the final decision-making processes. Evaluation/assessment of college president and senior administrators includes a mutually established process for broad input from faculty and staff and campus governance leadership, solicits that input and includes it as an important factor in the overall evaluation/assessment, and conveys the results to the appropriate authority.

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
VII. Joint Decision-Making continued	<p>5. Structures and processes that allow for faculty/campus and student governance collaboration are clearly defined in governance documents; the autonomy of each shared governance body is respected and honored by the president, administration, and all other governance bodies, which includes the individual body's right to create and modify its own governing documents as needed by following its own clear and transparent processes.</p>	<p>5. Governance documents do not clearly articulate roles, charges, structures and processes for gathering input and advancing recommendations; collaboration among shared governance groups is poorly defined or non-existent; committee members tend to act as individual agents and not as representatives of their defined constituencies, thus undermining shared governance; processes for creating or amending governance documents are unclear and the autonomy of a shared governance body is not sufficiently protected by those documents.</p>	<p>5. Governance documents, particularly the bylaws, contain clearly articulated role definitions, committee charges, and processes for gathering input and advancing recommendations; faculty, students, and trustees acting within the shared governance framework collaborate as representatives of their defined constituencies and through committees, not as individual agents; processes for creating or amending governance documents are open and transparent and are determined by the governance body to which the documents apply.</p>	<p>5. Governance documents, particularly the bylaws, contain clearly articulated role definitions, committee charges, and processes for gathering input and advancing recommendations; faculty, students, and trustees acting within the shared governance framework collaborate as representatives of their defined constituencies and through committees, not as individual agents; within the clearly defined structures and processes allowing for shared governance are guidelines for committee collaborations, ad hoc committees, and the development of processes and procedures to respond to arising mandates, initiatives, and needs from local, state, and national agencies; processes for creating or amending governance documents are open and transparent and are determined by the governance body to which the documents apply, but are made available to other shared governance bodies for feedback prior to final vote.</p>

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
VII. Joint Decision-Making continued	6. Governance structures and processes function in an effective manner.	6. Shared governance committees are confused about their charges and consume excessive time trying to clarify them; processes are either held to unreasonably short deadlines or are excessively long and exhaustive, resulting in either hasty decisions or delayed decisions that render the recommendations moot; recommendations are often dismissed; results of forwarded recommendations are not followed up on or communicated back to committees; committees and their work are not assessed for effectiveness and improvement.	6. Shared governance committees address charges and issues in a timely manner; committee work directly relates to and accomplishes its charge; clearly articulated and committee-vetted recommendations are reasonable, practical and workable; shared governance leadership follows up on the status and success of recommendations and committee work; shared governance leadership regularly assesses charges and effectiveness of committees and processes.	6. As well as addressing charges in a timely way and providing meaningful, useful recommendations, shared governance self-assesses and uses those assessments as a means of ongoing improvement of its structures and processes; shared governance solicits input from its committee leaders and members and its governance bodies for suggestions for improvement; shared governance leadership effectively and efficiently follows through on governance business.

VIII. Structural Arrangements for Governance

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
VIII. Structural Arrangements for Governance	1. A faculty/campus governance body meets on a regular basis.	1. No such body exists, or if such body exists, it does not meet with any frequency or regularity.	1. The faculty/campus governance body meets on a regular basis throughout the academic year; meeting dates and times are established by the start of the academic year and communicated to all in an accessible way.	1. The faculty/campus or governance body meets on a regular basis throughout the academic year; meeting dates and times are established by the start of the academic year and communicated to all in an accessible way; reminders for upcoming meetings are communicated regularly and in a standard way; agendas and relevant materials are provided well in advance of meetings.
	2. Faculty determine how their representatives are selected.	2. A clearly articulated process for selection of representatives does not exist, or if it does exist, it is inadequate or not regularly followed; administration or governance leadership hand selects faculty representatives; length of terms and limits are not clear.	2. Faculty/campus governance bylaws include the methods by which representatives are selected, their terms and limits, and the process for replacement, if needed; representation is the purview of the constituency and not of the administration; administration does not interfere in the selection process.	2. Faculty adhere to established methods and processes for selecting faculty/campus governance representatives; faculty engagement results in competitive elections rather than volunteerism for representation; the administration accepts representation as determined by the established processes.

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
VIII. Structural Arrangements for Governance continued	3. For joint committees on which the faculty/campus governance is represented, the representation appropriately and proportionately reflects the degree of the faculty's stake in the issue or area the committee is charged with addressing.	3. Joint committees or committees in areas of joint decision-making responsibility do not always include faculty/campus governance representation or that representation is minimal and not proportional to faculty interest, stake or responsibility in the issue the committee is addressing.	3. Academic-oriented committees (curriculum, academic policy, academic standards) and committees having an impact on the delivery of academic instruction (e.g., academic technology) have faculty as the majority voting members, as faculty have purview over curriculum and academics.	3. Faculty/campus governance representatives are regularly and proportionately represented with voting membership on all shared governance committees; faculty/campus governance occurs on all administrative committees having an impact on academics and the educational mission of the institution.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.



FCCC Shared Governance Rubric List of References:

American Association of University Professors. Indicators of Sound Governance. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/88582027-8022-463A-9063-09073CD07766/0/indicatorsofsoundgovernance.pdf>

American Association of University Professors. (1966) Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>

Association of Governing Boards. (2017) Board of Director's Statement on Shared Governance. Retrieved from https://www.agb.org/sites/default/files/u27335/2017_statement_sharedgovernance.pdf

Association of Governing Boards. (2017) Cultural Markers of Shared Governance. Retrieved from <https://www.agb.org/blog/2017/04/06/cultural-markers-of-shared-governance>

Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2015) *Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation*, 13th ed. Retrieved from <https://www.msche.org/standards/>

New York State Education Department. Statement on the Governance Role of a Trustee or Board Member. Retrieved from http://www.regents.nysed.gov/about/statement_governance

Official Compilation of the Codes, Rules, and Regulations of the State of New York. Refer to the Official Compilation (8 NYCRR Part et seq). State University of New York Board of Trustees Regulations. Retrieved from https://www.suny.edu/sunypp/documents.cfm?doc_id=91

State University of New York. SUNY Shared Governance. Retrieved from <https://www.suny.edu/about/shared-governance/>

FCCC Governance Committee Sessions: *presentations, panel discussions and workshops used to develop and revise the rubric with broad input*

“Hands-On Workshop with Shared Governance Rubrics.” SUNY Voices Conference: Surviving Middle States with Shared Governance, SUNY Plaza, Albany, NY, March 3, 2018

Feedback Session with CGLs, Delegates, NYCCAP and NYCCT representatives, FCCC Spring 2018 Plenary, Mohawk Valley Community College, Utica, NY, April 5-7, 2018

Rubric Feedback Session, SUNY Voices: Campus Governance Leaders Institute, SUNY Plaza, Albany, NY, June 7-8, 2018

“Assessing Shared Governance – Testing the Rubric.” SUNY Voices Conference, Syracuse, NY, Nov. 8-9, 2018