Appendix 2/3.1: Survey of Planners

In order to obtain opinions about the effectiveness of the planning process at Fordham, in the summer of 2003 the Task Force on Planning and Resource Allocation conducted two surveys, one for members of four University-wide planning committees and another for those who did planning for 14 individual schools, colleges, and other operational units. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with nine statements about the planning process on a scale of one (disagree strongly) to five (agree strongly). Of the 144 individuals targeted, 57 percent (82) completed the questionnaires. The respondents represented a majority of those surveyed. However, the schools and operating units of the University were not represented evenly among the respondents. Disproportionate shares of unit planners came from the Graduate School of Social Service and the Library, 27 and 21 percent, respectively. It is difficult to assess what the effects of this might be. Hence, readers must interpret the results for the survey of unit planners with caution.

Important, since the survey was administered before new President's strategic planning initiative was fully in place and before the Board of Trustees approved the new mission statement, the results do not constitute an evaluation of the strategic planning process or planning related to the goals that are specified in the new mission statement.

Results

The pattern of responses of members of University-wide planning committees roughly paralleled those of unit administrators. The mean scores across of all respondents were 3.6 for each group.

Attitudes of University-wide planners. The University-wide planners include the Board of Trustees, the Administrative council, the planning council and the space planning committee. The mean responses of these planners appear in Table A1 below, and the percentages checking one through five on the scale of agreement appear in Table A2. University planners acknowledge that their plans, goals and resource allocations were mission-based and were prioritized. (See Table A1, items 1 and 2, each with a mean of 3.6 and Table A2, item 1 with 56% checking four or five on the agreement scale and item 2 with 66% with responses of four or five.) They agreed that the planning process identified and involved various constituencies (item 6, mean of 4.1 with 78% in agreement), was open to change (item 8, mean of 3.7 with 69% in agreement), and has resulted in verifiable improvements (item 9, mean of 3.7 with 62% in agreement).

There was positive, but weaker endorsement of items regarding communication of processes and reports to the University community (item 7, mean of 3.5 and agreement of 50%) and devotion of resources to planning longer than five years (item 5, mean of 3.3 with agreement of 50%).

Ratings of assessment of planning were mixed. While 56 percent of University-wide planners affirmed that there was assessment of the effects of resource allocation (item 3), only 41 percent of them believed that achievement of goals was appraised (item 4). These items had means of 3.3 and 3.4 respectively.

Evaluations of planners in individual operating units. Average scores of individual unit planners or planning groups range from a low of 1.7 for the Law School to a high of 4.7 for Fordham College at Rose Hill, Fordham College at Lincoln Center, and the Office of Student Services. (See Table A3.)

Unit planners agreed that goals were based on the University's mission statement (Tables 3 and 4, item 1, mean of 4.0 and agreement by 71%), that resources were allocated according to those involved in the planning process (item 6, mean of 3.6 and agreement by 60%), that the unit is open to change (item 8, mean of 3.9 and agreement of 69%), and that planning had yielded verifiable improvements (item 9, mean of 3.7 and agreement of 60%).

Only 44 percent of unit planners agreed that planning processes and reports were communicated to the community of the school, college or operational unit (item 7, with a mean of 3.3), and just 21 percent reported that their units devoted resources to planning beyond a five-year horizon (item 5, with a mean of 2.8).

Unit planners gave lukewarm endorsement to items concerning assessment. Only 46 percent agreed that their units assessed the effects of resource allocation (item 3, mean of 3.5) and 48 percent believed that their organizations assessed the achievement of goals (item 4, mean of 3.5).

Comparison of views of University-wide planners and unit administrators. A greater percentage of unit planners than University-wide officials (71% vs. 56%, Tables A2 and A4, item 1) viewed the University mission statement as directing planning. The reason for this difference is not clear. In addition, unit managers are less likely than University-wide planners to agree that various constituencies are involved in planning (60% vs. 78%, item 6). This suggests that there is greater integration of interested parties in the higher level planning committees than in the operational units. This in fact may be appropriate. The survey did not address which constituencies should participate. A greater percentage of University-wide planners reported devoting resources to planning beyond five years than did unit planners (50% vs. 21%, item 5). This too may be appropriate.

Summary
Respondents generally believed that planning and resource allocation at the University are guided by the mission statement, that a variety of constituencies are involved in planning, that the process is open to change, and that verifiable improvements have resulted from planning. Smaller proportions of respondents agree that the University assesses the results of planning and the effects of resource allocation and that planning processes and reports are communicated to the University community or the community of the operational unit. The more moderate endorsement of statements regarding assessment and communication are difficult to resolve with the strong endorsement of openness to change (69%) and the moderate agreement with the strong claim of verifiable improvement (60 to 62%). It is difficult to imagine how one might verify the improvement that results from a planning process without assessing the effects of that process. One can speculate that the failure to endorse assessment may have to do with the use of the term assessment in the questions. Assessment has acquired a technical and formal aura. Respondents might have associated the term assessment with a technical apparatus that they did not observe, and might have responded more positively to a broader array of questions that encompassed a process of reflecting on the effectiveness of University programs. Reference to contemplation and action as it is described in the Ignatian tradition might have been more recognizable to members of the University community.

Table A1
Mean Scores of University-Wide Planners

	Board of Trustees Executive Committee	Administrative Conference	Planning Council	Space Planning	All
1. Your planning committee bases its plans, goals, and resource allocations on the University's mission statement.					
	3.4	4.1	3.9	3.0	3.6
2. Your committee prioritizes its goals and objectives and bases its resource allocations on these priorities.					
	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.2	3.6
3. Your committee regularly assesses the effects of its resource allocations.					
	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.0	3.4
4. Your committee regularly does assessments of the achievement of its goals and objectives.					
	3.5	3.8	3.7	2.4	3.3
5. Your committee devotes some resources to long-range planning beyond the five-year projections.					
	3.1	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.3
6. Constituencies (e.g. schools and colleges) are identified and represented in the planning process.					
	3.7	4.0	4.6	4.1	4.1
7. Planning processes and reports are clearly communicated to the University community.					
	3.3	3.7	4.1	3.1	3.5
8. Your committee is open to influences from the inside and the outside for change and renewal.					
	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.7
9. Verifiable improvements have resulted from the planning process.					
	3.7	3.3	4.2	3.5	3.7
Mean	3.5	3.7	3.9	3.2	3.6
N	7	5	12	8	32

Table A2
Responses of University Planners

	Disagree Strongly 1	2	3	4	Agree Strongly 5	No Response	Total
1. Your planning committee bases its plans, goals, and resource allocations on the University's mission statement.							
%	9	9	25	28	28	0	100
N	3	3	8	9	9	0	32
2. Your committee prioritizes its goals and objectives and bases its resource allocations on these priorities.							
%	6	16	13	41	25	0	100
N	2	5	4	13	8	0	32
3. Your committee regularly assesses the effects of its resource allocations.							
%	3	19	22	34	22	0	100
N	1	6	7	11	7	0	32
4. Your committee regularly does assessments of the achievement of its goals and objectives.							
%	0	25	34	22	19	0	100
N	0	8	11	7	6	0	32
5. Your committee devotes some resources to long-range planning beyond the five-year projections.							
%	9	16	22	34	16	3	100
N	3	5	7	11	5	1	32
6. Constituencies (e.g. schools and colleges) are identified and represented in the planning process.							
%	0	12	6	30	48	3	100
N	0	4	2	10	16	1	33
7. Planning processes and reports are clearly communicated to the University community.							
%	3	9	31	25	25	6	100
N	1	3	10	8	8	2	32
8. Your committee is open to influences from the inside and the outside for change and renewal.							
%	0	19	13	44	25	0	100
N	0	6	4	14	8	0	32
9. Verifiable improvements have resulted from the planning process.							
%	3	9	22	28	34	3	100
N	1	3	7	9	11	1	32

Table A3
Mean Scores of Individual Unit Planners

	CBA & GBA	CIMS	Devel	Enroll. Svcs.	FCLC	FCLS	FCRH
1. Your planning unit bases its plans, goals, and resource allocations on the University's mission statement and that of the school, college, or operational unit.							
	2.3	3.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	3.5	5.0
2. Your unit prioritizes its goals and objectives and bases its resource allocations on these priorities.							
	2.3	3.2	5.0	4.5	5.0	3.5	5.0
3. Your unit regularly assesses the effects of its resource allocations.							
	2.3	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	2.2	4.0
4. Your unit regularly does assessments of the achievements of its goals and objectives.							
	2.3	2.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	2.2	4.0
5. Your unit devotes some resources to long-range planning beyond the five-year projections.							
	2.7	3.0	2.0	2.5	4.0	2.0	4.0
6. Constituencies (e.g. faculty, staff, and students) are identified and represented in the planning process.							
	3.3	2.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.2	5.0
7. Planning processes and reports are clearly communicated to the school, college or operational unit community.							
	2.3	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.2	5.0
8. Your unit is open to influences from the inside and the outside for change and renewal.							
	5.0	3.5	3.0	4.5	5.0	3.2	5.0
9. Verifiable improvements have resulted from the planning process.							
	2.3	3.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	3.2	5.0
Avg.	2.7	2.8	3.7	4.0	4.7	2.8	4.7
N	3	4	3	2	1	4	2

Table A3 Continued
Mean Scores of Individual Unit Planners

	GED	GSAS	GSSS	Law	Libs	MM	Stdt. Svcs.	Total
1. Your planning unit bases its plans, goals, and resource allocations on the University's mission statement and that of the school, college, or operational unit.								
	5.0	5.0	3.5	2.0	4.8	3.0	5.0	4.0
2. Your unit prioritizes its goals and objectives and bases its resource allocations on these priorities.								
	4.0	4.0	3.6	1.0	4.5	3.0	4.7	3.8
3. Your unit regularly assesses the effects of its resource allocations.								
	4.0	4.0	3.1	2.0	4.1	3.0	4.7	3.5
4. Your unit regularly does assessments of the achievements of its goals and objectives.								
	5.0	3.0	3.3	2.0	3.9	3.0	5.0	3.5
5. Your unit devotes some resources to long-range planning beyond the five-year projections.								
	2.0	4.0	2.2	3.0	2.6	3.0	3.0	2.8
6. Constituencies (e.g. faculty, staff, and students) are identified and represented in the planning process.								
	5.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	4.2	2.5	5.0	3.6
7. Planning processes and reports are clearly communicated to the school, college or operational unit community.								
	4.0	4.0	3.6	2.0	4.0	2.5	4.7	3.3
8. Your committee is open to influences from the inside and the outside for change and renewal.								
	4	5.0	4.0	1.0	4.5	1.5	5.0	3.9
9. Verifiable improvements have resulted from the planning process.								
	5.0	5.0	3.3	1.0	4.4	2.5	5.0	3.7
Avg.	4.2	4.1	3.4	1.7	4.1	2.7	4.7	3.6
N	1	1	14	1	11	2	3	52

Table 4
Responses of Individual Unit Planners

	Disagree Strongly 1	2	3	4	Agree Strongly 5	No Response	Total
1. Your planning unit bases its plans, goals, and resource allocations on the University's mission statement and that of the school, college, or operational unit.							
%	6	10	12	25	46	2	100
N	3	5	6	13	24	1	52
2. Your unit prioritizes its goals and objectives and bases its resource allocations on these priorities.							
%	6	6	19	31	35	4	100
N	3	3	10	16	18	2	52
3. Your unit regularly assesses the effects of its resource allocations.							
%	6	13	29	23	23	6	100
N	3	7	15	12	12	3	52
4. Your unit regularly does assessments of the achievements of its goals and objectives.							
%	4	13	31	31	17	4	100
N	2	7	16	16	9	2	52
5. Your unit devotes some resources to long-range planning beyond the five-year projections.							
%	19	25	29	17	4	6	100
N	10	13	15	9	2	3	52
6. Constituencies (e.g. faculty, staff, and students) are identified and represented in the planning process.							
%	8	8	25	29	31	0	100
N	4	4	13	15	16	0	52
7. Planning processes and reports are clearly communicated to the school, college or operational unit community.							
%	4	17	33	25	19	2	100
N	2	9	17	13	10	1	52
8. Your unit is open to influences from inside and outside for change and renewal.							
%	6	10	12	23	46	4	100
N	3	5	6	12	24	2	52
9. Verifiable improvements have resulted from the planning process.							
%	8	8	21	25	35	4	100
N	4	4	11	13	18	2	52

Appendix 4.1: Middle States Task Force On-Line Survey

Fordham University

Middle States Task Force Survey

Fordham University is preparing for the Middle States accreditation review. The Middle States Task Force is conducting this survey through electronic means. Your responses will remain anonymous and the data will be compiled, analyzed, and disaggregated. The data compiled will help us draft our self study report to the Middle States Association. The Middle States Task Force thanks you in advance for your cooperation and assistance.

To begin, please enter the last four digits of your social security number then click next.

[ ]

Page 1 of 2

[NEXT >]   [Reset]   [Cancel]

Fordham University

Middle States Task Force Survey

1. To which faculty are you primarily appointed?
[<Choose one..> ▾]

2. At which campus is your office located?
[<Choose one..> ▾]

3. What is your current rank?
[<Choose one..> ▾]

4. How many years have you held an appointment at Fordham?
[0]

5. Have you ever held an administrative position at the University?
[<Choose one..> ▾]

6. Have you ever been a member of the Faculty Senate or a committee of the Board of Trustees?
[<Choose one..> ▾]

7. My academic freedom is

`<Choose one...>` ▾

8. Please explain your answer to Question 7.

Leadership/Support

	True	True with some exceptions	Not evident one way or the other	Not true
9. The leadership/support accorded to my department/school by the Dean of my school has been good.	○	○	○	○

9.1 Please provide comments to illustrate your response to the corresponding question.

	True	True with some exceptions	Not evident one way or the other	Not true
10. The leadership/support accorded to my department/school by the Vice President for Academic Affairs has been good.	○	○	○	○

10.1 Please provide comments to illustrate your response to the corresponding question.

	True	True with some exceptions	Not evident one way or the other	Not true
11. The leadership/support accorded to me by the Dean of my school has been good.	○	○	○	○

11.1 Please provide comments to illustrate your response to the corresponding question.

	True	True with some exceptions	Not evident one way or the other	Not true
12. The leadership/support accorded to me by the Vice President for Academic Affairs has been good.	○	○	○	○

12.1 Please provide comments to illustrate your response to the corresponding question.

12.2 How would you define your understanding of leadership/support in the context of the statements answered above?

13. I would say that the department/school faculty's role in the governance of our department/school has been

<Choose one. >

Role played...

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Satisfactory with some reservations	Unsatisfactory	Don't know well enough to offer an opinion
14. To me the role played by the President in advancing the mission of the University has been	●	●	●	●	●

14.1 Please provide comments to illustrate your response to the corresponding question.

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Satisfactory with some reservations	Unsatisfactory	Don't know well enough to offer an opinion
15. To me the role played by the Board of Trustees in advancing the mission of the University has been	●	●	●	●	●

15.1 Please provide comments to illustrate your response to the corresponding question.

I would say that the Faculty Senate has represented the interests of the faculty to the

	Very Well	Well	Not Well	Don't follow the Faculty Senate deliberations well enough to comment
16. President	●	●	●	●

16.1 Please provide comments to illustrate your response to the corresponding question.

	Very Well	Well	Not Well	Don't follow the Faculty Senate deliberations well enough to comment
17. Board of Trustees	●	●	●	●

17.1 Please provide comments to illustrate your response to the corresponding question.

	Very Well	Well	Not Well	Don't follow the Faculty Senate deliberations well enough to comment
18. Administration	●	●	●	●

18.1 Please provide comments to illustrate your response to the corresponding question.

I would rate the governance-relationship between the University President and

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Satisfactory with some reservations	Unsatisfactory	Don't know well enough to offer an opinion
19. the faculty as	●	●	●	●	●

19.1 Please provide comments to illustrate your response to the corresponding question.

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Satisfactory with some reservations	Unsatisfactory	Don't know well enough to offer an opinion
20. the students as	●	●	●	●	●

20.1 Please provide comments to illustrate your response to the corresponding question.

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Satisfactory with some reservations	Unsatisfactory	Don't know well enough to offer an opinion
21. the alumni as	●	●	●	●	●

21.1 Please provide comments to illustrate your response to the corresponding question.

22. In your judgment, how successful are the Faculty Senate and university-wide committees in facilitating better understanding and working relations among faculty of different schools

- ○ 4 - Very successful
- ○ 3 - Somewhat successful
- ○ 2 - Not successful
- ○ 1 - Don't know well enough to respond.

22.1 Please explain:

The academic concerns of the University are given adequate priority by the offices of the Vice-Presidents. Please check the appropriate column for each vice-presidential office:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
23. Senior Vice President/CFO	○	○	○	○	○
24. VP for Academic Affairs	○	○	○	○	○
25. VP for Administration	○	○	○	○	○
26. VP for Development and University Relations	○	○	○	○	○
27. VP for Enrollment	○	○	○	○	○
28. VP for Finance	○	○	○	○	○
29. VP for Lincoln Center/CIO	○	○	○	○	○
30. VP for Mission & Ministries	○	○	○	○	○
31. VP for Student Affairs	○	○	○	○	○

32. Name (optional)

33. Department (optional)

Appendix 4.2: Results of the Faculty Survey

Introduction

In conducting its study of the adequacy and quality of the University's leadership and governance, the Task Force on Leadership and Governance relied heavily upon existing documents such as the University's mission statement, charter, constitutions, by-laws, etc., and interviews with the President, select members of the Board of Trustees and members of the Faculty Senate.

Although the Task Force's examination of documents provided it a good indication of the University's governance structure, that still left open the question of execution, viz., how well the provisions of those instruments are implemented. The question of leadership presented the Task Force an even thornier issue, because there are no formal mechanisms currently in existence for judging the nature and quality of leadership provided by the President, the Senior Administration, the Board of Trustees, and the Faculty Senate. To make this evaluation strictly on the basis of interviews with the principals involved might not provide the desired objectivity.

Therefore, in an effort to judge the adequacy of the University's governance structure, the implementation of its provisions and the adequacy and quality of institutional leadership, the Task Force, with the assistance of the RETC (Regional Educational Technology Center) of Fordham University, developed a survey questionnaire which was sent to 658 faculty members with University email addresses. In all, the questionnaire raised 31 questions dealing with the University's governance arrangements and the leadership roles of the President, the Vice Presidents, the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Senate. Replies were received from 208 of the 658 faculty to whom the survey questionnaire was sent. For this type of survey, the response ratio was a respectable 3l.6 percent.

The Respondents' Profile

To provide a rough profile of the respondents, their average number of years of service at Fordham was 14.6 years. As between professorial ranks, there were 47 assistant professors, 85 associate professors and 67 full professors. As between faculty appointments, 131 or 63 percent are in the Arts and Sciences and the rest in the remaining schools of the University. In terms of campus location, 103 or 49.5 percent of the respondents are on Rose Hill, 77 or 37.0 percent are at Lincoln Center and the remaining 28 are at the Marymount campus.

Interestingly, 92 or 44.2 percent of those responding to the questionnaire stated that they had held an administrative position in the University. Those positions could range from that of an assistant departmental chair to that of a Vice President. In addition, 48 or 23.1 percent of the respondents indicated that they had served or currently serve on the Faculty Senate or a committee of the Board of Trustees. Parenthetically, it should be noted that there may be some double counting in these numbers, so they are not necessarily cumulative. The fact that such a significant number of respondents have served in some administrative capacity would seem to suggest a collegial form of governance. These numbers also seem to add credibility to the survey results, because many of the answers are provided by persons who have first hand knowledge of the workings of the University.

As a broad gauge of their satisfaction or lack of satisfaction with existing arrangements in the University, the faculty were asked whether or not they felt that their academic freedom was respected. An overwhelming 173 or 83.7 percent of the 208 respondents stated that it is very well respected; 33 or 15.7 percent provided a qualified, but still positive response; and only 2 or less than 2 percent replied that it is not respected.

Results Regarding Leadership by Deans and Vice-President for Academic Affairs

The survey included a series of questions that asked the faculty to judge the quality of leadership accorded to their department by (i) the Dean of their school and (ii) the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

On a scale of 1 to 4 with the latter representing the highest score, 101 or 48.5 percent of those answering the question rated their respective Deans' leadership and support as good; 52 or 25.1 percent rated it as good with some exception.

Of the remaining 54 respondents, 33 or 15.8 percent reported it as not evident one way or the other and the other 21 or 10 percent of the group characterized it as not good. On a scale of 1 to 4, with the latter being the highest ranking, the mean or average response was 3.13, well above the midpoint of the range.

The rankings for the Vice President for Academic Affairs were somewhat lower, but still positive. Over half, 52.8 percent, judged his leadership as good or good with some exceptions. Only 24 or 11.5 percent of those responding did not think it was adequate. The comparison between the Deans of the respective schools and the Vice President for Academic Affairs is not surprising, because most faculty members deal with the Deans of their schools more frequently than with the Vice President. Nonetheless, the mean or average response for the Vice President's leadership was 2.76 which was above the midpoint of the range.

When the same question was asked about the leadership/support accorded to them personally by the Dean of their school and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the results were somewhat higher than for the preceding question. In the case of the Deans, 125 or 60 percent of the respondents rated that leadership as good and an additional 39 or 18.7 percent stated that it was good with some exceptions. The questions received a mean or average score of 3.33 out of a possible 4.0.

For the leadership/support provided by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, 86 or 41.3 percent of the respondents rated it as good and an additional 25 or 12.1 percent rated it good with some exceptions. A fairly large number, 87 or 41.8 percent, reported that it was not evident one way or the other. Nevertheless, the mean or average score of 2.90 for this question was above the midpoint of the range.

A related question on governance dealt with the faculty's role in the administration of their own department or school (in the case where there are no departments.) Of those responding, 126 or 61 percent rated their role as fully participative and another 65 or 31.3 percent answered not as participative as it should be, but still satisfactory; 13 or 6.3 percent indicated that there was no participation by the faculty and that the arrangement was not acceptable. The answers to this question clearly suggest widespread satisfaction with the existing governance structure at the departmental or school level as well as a seemingly high degree of collegiality in administering the affairs of their unit.

Another cluster of questions dealt with the roles played by (i) the President and (ii) the Board of Trustees in advancing the mission of the University. Among the respondents, 93 or 44.7 percent rated the President's performance as excellent; 43 or 20.7 percent rated it as satisfactory; and 48 or 23 percent felt that they did not know him well enough to render an opinion. This latter result may be explained in large measure by the fact that the President had been in office less than 18 months when the survey was undertaken. Even so, this lack of opinion on the President's performance was significantly lower than for that of the other principals in the survey. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest ranking, the mean score for the President's leadership was 3.6. This score, together with the fact that a total of 136, or just about two-thirds of the respondents, rated his performance as satisfactory or excellent indicates that he is off to a good start.

In the case of the Board of Trustees, 47 or 22.5 percent of those answering the question judged the Board of Trustees' role as satisfactory or excellent — significantly below the President's score. However, there are at least two reasons why one should not judge these results in a negative light. First, the opportunity for more positive rankings was limited by the fact that 125 or 60.1 percent of those responding stated that they were not in a position to offer an opinion. Apart from those faculty who serve on committees of the Board, most others have limited or no contact with the members of the Board. A second reason for not casting the Board's leadership in carrying out the mission of the University in a bad light is that only a very small minority, 20 or 9.6 percent of those responding, ranked the Trustee's performance as unsatisfactory, while the remaining 63 respondents, excluding those without an opinion, rated their role as satisfactory to excellent. Despite these qualifications, the mean or average score for the Trustees on this question was 2.02 out of a maximum of 5.0.

Results Regarding the Faculty Senate Role in Representing the Interests of the Faculty

A third group of questions centered on the role of the Faculty Senate in representing the interests of the faculty to (i) the President, (ii) the Board of Trustees and (iii) the Administration at large. According to the survey results, a surprisingly large proportion of the faculty stated that they do not follow the Faculty Senate well enough to render a judgment on any of these three issues.

In regard to the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the President, 88 or 42.3 percent of those addressing the question rendered no judgment, while at the other extreme, 101 or 48.5 percent of those responding thought that the Faculty Senate represented their interests to the President as either well or very well. The mean score on a scale of 1 to 4 was 2.31 slightly below the flat line.

In the question concerning the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Board of Trustees, 135 or 64.7 percent of the respondents offered no judgment on how well their interests are represented; 54 or 26 percent rated the Senate's performance as good or very good; and 19 or 9.1 percent scored it as not good. The mean or average ranking for the answer to this question on a scale of 1 to 4 was 1.72, a reading well below the midpoint of the range.

The results for the Senate's representation of the faculty's interests to the Administration closely paralleled those for the President. Of the 208 responding, 90 or 43.3 percent reported that they did not follow the Senate well enough to comment; 23 or 11.1 percent of them indicated that the faculty was not well represented; 56 or 26.9 percent stated that it was well represented and the remaining 39 or 18.8 percent noted that it was very well represented. The mean ranking for the answers to this question was 2.21, again below 2.5, the midpoint of the range.

In a related question, the faculty were asked: "How successful are the Faculty Senate and the university-wide committees (in which the Senate plays a large role in determining their membership) in facilitating a better understanding of working relations among faculty of different schools?" Again, the answers were not significantly different from the others in this category; 86 or 41.3 percent of the respondents did not know well enough to answer the question; 75 or 36.1 percent judged it to be somewhat successful and 18 or 8.7 percent as very successful. The mean or average score on a scale of 1 to 4 was 2.13, which was below the flat line.

Overall, the results in this segment of the survey questionnaire were disappointing because more than one-half of the respondents stated that they do not follow the deliberations of the Faculty Senate well enough to comment on the issues presented, or, too, do not feel that their interests are well represented. Given the important role which the Faculty Senate plays in representing them, many of the faculty are forfeiting their right to participate in the governance of the University. Clearly, this is an important finding and one which merits serious consideration by the Faculty Senate and the faculty at large.

Results Regarding the Relationship between the President and the Principal Constituencies of the University

A fourth battery of questions in the survey focused on the relationship between the President and the principal constituencies of the University: (i) the faculty, (ii) the students, and (iii) the alumni.

As between the President and the faculty, 41 or 19.7 percent of those answering the question judged the governance relationship as excellent; 54 or 26 percent judged it as satisfactory. The fact that these scores were not higher is that 70 or 33.7 percent of those answering stated that they did not know the President well enough to offer an opinion. Nevertheless, when the two categories are combined, the President received a rating of excellent or satisfactory from 95 or 45.7 percent of the respondents. Only 16 or 7.7 percent of those answering the question felt that this relationship was unsatisfactory. These results, together with an average score of 2.9 out of a maximum 5.0 for this question, suggest that while there is room for improvement in this area, the President appears to be holding his own at this early stage of his tenure.

The results for the governance relationship between the President and the students, as judged by the faculty, were inconclusive, because a very large proportion of the respondents, 127 or 61.1 percent, did not know enough to comment on the question. Even so, 66 or 31.7 percent of those responding deemed that relationship as satisfactory or excellent. The mean score for this answer was 2.28 out of a maximum of 5.

The outcome for the governance issue as between the President and the alumni was even less conclusive, because 142 or 68.3 percent of those answering stated that they lacked sufficient knowledge to offer an opinion. Nevertheless, 54 or 26 percent of those answering rated the relationship as satisfactory to excellent. The mean or average score for the answer to this question was 2.0 on a scale of 1 to 5.

In light of the relatively low response rate, not too much should be made of the results in this section of the survey. In retrospect, the two questions relating to the students and the alumni could have been better answered by the constituencies themselves. Why, then, were they included in the faculty survey? The reason is that the Task Force had hoped to obtain a reading on governance issues beyond those of immediate concern to the faculty, but that did not turn out to be the case.

Survey Results Regarding the Ranking of Academic Needs by the Vice Presidents
A final group of questions in the survey dealt with the priority assigned to academic concerns by the University's Vice Presidents, viz., the Senior Vice President/CFO, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Administration, the Vice President for Development and University Relations, the Vice President for Enrollment, the Vice President for Finance, the Vice President for Mission and Ministries, the Vice President for Lincoln Center, and the Vice President for Student Affairs. The reason for including this series of questions in the survey was to obtain some indication of how seriously the academic interests of the University are taken by them in the allocation of funds and the general governance of the University. In fairness, the Task Force understands that these senior officers may at times have a conflict of interest between promoting the immediate goals of their own offices and the greater good of the University. Nevertheless, the Task Force was intent on soliciting the faculty's views on whether or not they believe that issues of governance which have implications for academic interests are decided on a level playing field and are accorded an appropriate priority.

As might be expected, the Vice President for Academic Affairs received the highest scores among this group. Although 72 or 35 percent of the respondents answered that they did not know whether or not he provided adequate priority to academic concerns, 107 or 51.5 percent agreed or strongly agreed that he was assigning adequate priority to academic needs. The mean score for the answer to this question on a scale of 1 to 5 was 3.04.

Although the Office of Mission and Ministries was only recently established, the Vice President for that unit did comparatively well. Although 127 or 61.5 percent of the respondents indicated that they did not have sufficient information to pass judgment, most of the others, 74 or 35.5 percent of those answering, believed that the Vice President provided adequate support for the academic concerns of the University. Despite the downward bias caused by the lack of definitive replies, the average or mean score for the answer to this question was 2.3 out of a maximum 5.0.

For the Office of the Vice President for Enrollment, which has a strong collateral interest in the academic standing of the institution, the response ratio was higher than for most of the other offices. Even so, 122 or 58.7 percent of those replying could not comment on this issue. One of the reasons why the number of responses was not greater is that the Vice President for Enrollment deals largely with undergraduate recruitment. As a result, those faculty members who are affiliated with the graduate or professional schools would not be expected to have sufficient information to make a judgment on how well this office supports academic needs. Nevertheless, 56 or 26.8 percent of those responding agreed or strongly agreed that the Vice President for Student Enrollment provided an adequate priority to the academic needs of the University. Again, because of the downward bias caused by the large number of non-responses, the mean or average score for the answer to this question was 2.12.

Another office which might be expected to provide strong support for academic interests is that of the Vice President for Student Affairs. For the same reason as that for the Vice President for Enrollment, the response ratio was limited because faculty affiliated with the graduate and professional schools have little contact with this office. Of those canvassed, 133 or 63.8 percent stated that they had insufficient information to offer an opinion on this question. Even so, support for academic concerns was on the light side with only 40 or 19.2 percent of the respondents believing that the Vice President for Student Affairs provided adequate support for the academic interests of the University. The mean or average score for the answer to this question was 1.89, which was below the midpoint of the range, but again, this low ranking was caused in part by the low response ratio.

For the remaining five Vice Presidents who are farther removed from immediate academic concerns, the results were disappointing, because a very large proportion of the respondents, 70 to 75 percent of them, did not know how to rate them on the issue. The proportion of respondents who strongly agreed that the remaining Vice Presidents provided adequate priority to the academic interests of the University ranged from a low of 2.9 percent to a high of 5.3 percent. The average or mean scores for these five senior officers, on a scale of 1 to 5, ranged from a low of 1.6 to a high of 1.9. These are hardly resounding endorsements of the University's academic mission, but again these results were largely skewed by the lack of information on the part of the faculty.

Conclusions

Having reviewed the results of this survey, what conclusion can one derive from them? First, it should be cautioned that this was largely an opinion survey. Many of the responses, no doubt, were based upon impressions, normative judgments or even guesses. Therefore, the correspondence between faculty perceptions and reality may be open to question in some instances. Nevertheless, if interpreted with the usual caveats, the survey results do provide some insight on the extent and quality of institutional leadership and governance.

The one overarching conclusion that can be derived from this survey questionnaire is that the faculty, in general, find the University's existing leadership/governance arrangements to be satisfactory. The faculty appear to be especially well pleased with the role they play in the governance of their own departments or schools, with some 60 percent of the respondents stating that their role is fully participative. The leadership and support provided them by their respective Deans and the Vice President for Academic Affairs were also favorably reviewed.

The President of the University was also given high grades for his advancing the mission of the University, with two-thirds of those answering the question characterizing it as satisfactory to excellent. On the issue of the governance/leadership relationship between him and the faculty, the President again received good scores. Inasmuch as the President was in office for fewer than eighteen months when the survey was undertaken, the results clearly show that he has gained traction quickly and is meeting the faculty's expectations of him.

One of the more disappointing results of the survey was the fact that more than one-half of the questions lacked definitive responses. In 19 of the 31 questions for which a judgment was requested, one-third to two-thirds of the respondents indicated that they did not have sufficient information to answer them. This over-representation of non-responses in the survey caused a downward bias for the values of those alternatives which were selected by the respondents. One way to deal with this problem would have been to remove the non-responses from the data base. With a smaller basis for comparison, those alternatives which were designated by the respondent would have had higher scores or rankings. However, the elimination of a large number of the non-responses would have served to reduce the sample's universe to such a degree as to compromise the statistical significance of the results. For that reason, it was decided to present and analyze the data in raw form and with the necessary caveats.

Owing to their lack of personal contact with members of the Board of Trustees, one can understand why the faculty was unable to judge the quality and extent of the Board's leadership and governance of the University. But less excusable was the lack of a wider response to questions dealing with the Faculty Senate. In those instances, the respondents, by a margin of more than 40 percent, answered that they did not follow the Senate well enough to comment. This represents a serious "disconnect," because the Senate represents the faculty not only on academic matters, but also on terms of employment and other economic issues, e.g., salaries and benefits, as well. These and other issues should be of special interest to the faculty and so their lack of involvement raises serious questions: "Are the faculty insufficiently informed or are they simply abdicating their responsibilities to participate in the governance of the University beyond their own departments and schools?"

The large number of non-responses to questions relating to the Vice Presidents also merits closer scrutiny. Inasmuch as more than two-thirds of each question relating to the senior administration could not be answered, because of a lack of information, more effective means of communication between the two groups need to be explored. The fact that only 15 percent of the respondents felt that the Vice Presidents in the non-academic areas provided adequate priority to the University's academic interests is of concern. Therefore, the faculty, through its Deans, school councils, and the Faculty Senate should do more to impress upon the senior administration the importance of the University's academic mission and to ensure that it is accorded the high priority that it deserves.

On the negative side of the survey, one may conclude that either the faculty have not made a full faith effort to inform themselves on the broad issues of institutional leadership and governance, or that they may not have been provided adequate information to pass judgment on the various issues raised. Either way, the survey may not have achieved its desired results. On the other hand, the fact that in many instances the faculty passed on the questions may be interpreted in a positive light. That lack of response could be interpreted as a sign of satisfaction with the University's leadership and existing governance. For if, in their judgment, conditions were considered to be unsatisfactory, their responses to the various questions would have been registered in one or more of the other alternatives provided by the survey questionnaire. In effect, "no news may be interpreted as good news."

Another positive interpretation that can be gleaned from the survey results, notwithstanding the lack of a widespread response to many of the questions, is that the proportion of negative replies was under 10 percent in practically all cases. The inference to be drawn from this statistic is that the remaining 90 percent of the respondents for any one question were at least reasonably satisfied with the extent and quality of institutional leadership; otherwise, their scores would have served to inflate those of the minority who held a contrary view.

An additional finding that suggests general satisfaction or, at a minimum, an absence of serious problems with the University's leadership and governance structure is the average or mean score assigned to the answers to the various questions in the survey. Except for those questions which had relatively low response ratios, the mean or average values for most of the remaining questions tended to cluster around the midpoint of the ranges. Again, as noted earlier, one of the major reasons why the rankings and average scores were not higher than they might have been was owing to the inclusion in the data base (which served as the bench mark for computing rankings and mean scores) a large pool of non-responses which served to lend a downward bias to the results.

Comforting as these conclusions may be, they should not be viewed with complacency for there is room for improvement. In particular, the relationship between the faculty and the Faculty Senate merits attention as does the need to better inform the faculty and encourage them to take a greater interest in the broader issues of leadership and governance across the entire University and not just within the boundaries of their own departments and schools.

Appendix 4.3: Chart Representing Charge Questions and Answers

1. How do the documents (mission statement, constitutions, by-laws, charters, etc.) provide for collegial governance by defining a governance structure that includes the duties, powers, and responsibilities of administration and faculty?

§4-06.01 General Provisions

(a) Governance. The Faculty role in University governance is carried on through participation at the University, School and Department levels through representative bodies, committees and meetings of the Faculty at large. The Faculty has primary responsibility for fundamental academic matters [see §4-01.02]. In these matters, the power of review, lodged in the Board of Trustees and delegated by it to the President of the University, should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances and after consultation with Faculty. The Faculty responsibilities for governance are carried out primarily through the Faculty Senate, the faculty organizations of the Schools and Departments and the committees described in this Chapter.

§4-06.02 Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate is the representative body of the University Faculty. It serves in an advisory capacity to the President of the University on all matters of concern to the University pursuant to the Constitution of the Faculty Senate. It has the right and duty to initiate recommendations and to speak for the Faculty in all areas of University activity.

2. How do the documents assign authority and accountability for policy development and decision making, and describe the process of involving appropriate constituencies?

§4-06.01 General Provisions

(b) Faculty Voting Privileges. All full-time faculty members of a School or Department shall have the right to participate and vote in decisions of the unit, with the exception of certain restrictions in cases of joint appointments, personnel recommendations, and the nomination of Department Chairpersons [see §4-01.04 and .05 and §4-06.50(c)].

(c) Faculty Representatives. All faculty members shall be entitled to participate in choosing representatives for University, Campus and School bodies which represent the Faculty, subject to restrictions in these Statutes and the Constitution of the Faculty Senate.

(d) Selection Committees. Representatives of the Faculty shall have the right to participate in Search Committees for Deans of Schools and higher academic officers of the University. Faculty members of such committees are normally appointed after consultation with the President of the Faculty Senate or faculty of the Schools involved, by authority of the President of the University, or in the case
of Deans or the Director of University Libraries, by the Vice President for
Academic Affairs.

§4-06.04 University Committees

(a) The Board of Trustees and/or the President of the University may establish University Committees to consider matters which affect more than one School of the University. Every reasonable effort shall be made to ensure appropriate representation of the several Schools.

3. How do the documents provide for the selection process for governing body members?

§4-06.01 General Provisions

(c) Faculty Representatives. All faculty members shall be entitled to participate in choosing representatives for University, Campus and School bodies which represent the Faculty, subject to restrictions in these Statutes and the Constitution of the Faculty Senate.

(d) Selection Committees. Representatives of the Faculty shall have the right to participate in Search Committees for Deans of Schools and higher academic officers of the University. Faculty members of such committees are normally appointed after consultation with the President of the Faculty Senate or faculty of the Schools involved, by authority of the President of the University, or in the case of Deans or the Director of University Libraries, by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

4. How are governance documents and policies shared with the community?

The Board Bylaws are contained in the University Statutes which are available through Fordham's website. Board policies which are relevant to the University community are typically shared through letters sent to individual members of the community.

The mission and goals are transmitted through Catalogues and other official publications of the University. They are also communicated through the University web-site and in-house magazines such as Inside Fordham and Fordham Magazine, as well as in the addresses of the President, the Deans, and other University officials to students, faculty and alumni.

By-Laws Article IV (3) The Executive Committee and all standing committees shall meet as directed by the Faculty Senate, or as determined necessary by the committees themselves or their chairmen, but no less than once a year; the meeting shall be conducted according to orderly procedure, records of deliberations shall be kept, and all reports shall be made to the Faculty Senate as often as required, but at least once annually. Copies of all reports, final and accepted by the Senate shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate and shall be available for inspection by members of the faculty and the administrative staff of the University.

Constitution Article III (c) The president of the Senate shall preside at and conduct the meetings of the Senate. The vice president shall exercise all the powers and duties of the president in the president's absence. The secretary shall keep the minutes of all the meetings of the Senate, shall maintain the rolls of the members and shall send out all notices of meetings.

Constitution Article IV (f) (last sentence) The results of the election (of Senators) should be made public before the end of April.

By-Laws Article III Section 1 (3) Special Committees. The Executive Committee and all standing committees shall meet as directed by the Faculty Senate, or as determined necessary by the committees themselves or their chairmen, but no less than once a year; the meeting shall be conducted according to orderly procedure, records of deliberations shall be kept, and all reports shall be made to the Faculty Senate as often as required, but at least once annually. Copies of all reports, final and accepted by the Senate shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate and shall be available for inspection by members of the faculty and the administrative staff of the

By-Laws Article IV Section 5 (The Executive Committee shall:) (b) receive reports and communications prepared by or in any college, school or division of the University which may be of concern or interest to any other college, school or division, or the faculty, or the Faculty Senate; (c) act on behalf of the Senate on matters requiring immediate action when it is not possible to call a special meeting of the Senate, such action to be reported to the Senate for confirmation at its next regular meeting;

5. What opportunity exists for student input regarding decisions that affect them?

Arts and Sciences Council

The Faculty Evaluation Committee will have four non-voting student members. One student will be appointed from each of the following colleges: FCRH, FCLC, FCLS, and GSAS.

The Faculty Policies and Resources Committee will have one non-voting student member named as representative, and a second student named as alternate-representative. One of these students will be appointed from FCRH and the other from FCLC. The representative will be from FCRH one year and from FCLC the next year. The alternate-representative will come from the other college.

The Student Policy Committee will have four student members. One will be appointed from each of the schools: FCRH, FCLS, FCLC, and GSAS. Two of these students will have voice and vote and two will have voice but no vote. These roles will rotate through the colleges, in the order in which they are listed. For example, student representatives from FCRH and FCLS, will vote during the first year. During the second year, student representatives from FCLC and GSAS will vote, etc.

The Majors and Curricula Committee will have three non-voting student members. One will be appointed from each of the schools: FCRH, FCLC, and FCLS.

The Core Curriculum Committee will have three non-voting student members. One will be appointed from each of the schools: FCRH, FCLC, and FCLS.

The Arts and Sciences Council will have four students, one from each of the four schools: FCRH, FCLC, FCLS, and GSAS.

The above student appointments will be made by the appropriate Dean. All are one-year appointments.

The Executive Committee will have one student elected by the Council.

Security

Formal direct student participation in my area is largely focused on Security and Safety and Community Service

Students from all sectors of the University are represented on the Presidential Advisory Committee on Security which reviews detailed statistics and incident summaries and issues an extensive report to the President every spring. Student newspapers also are given access to security incident information which is then reported to the community at large. The RAs in the residence halls work closely with Security on a daily basis helping respond to incidents and shape policy and procedures. Both the Residence Hall Association and Student Government also meet periodically with the Director of Security.

Community Service

The programming and participation for the Community Service and Service Learning Programs is by design driven by student participation. Every placement site is run by a student or group of students. Activities, programs and fund-raising are all planned and executed by students — some 800 per semester at RH, about 150 at LC and 75-80 at MM. An extensive report is prepared annually summarizing these activities with recommendations for improvement.

Facilities

There are frequent ad hoc communications between students and Facilities Operations. The RHA and Residential Life serve as the conduit for more formal engagement.

Development

Students do not participate in governance issues in this department. Students do, however, participate in most if not all of its events and activities.

Finance

Students currently have no formal governance role in the Finance area. Consideration is currently being given to including students on the Board of Trustee's Audit and Finance Committee, which would change this situation drastically.

PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

Law

Student role in Law School Governance

The Student Bar Association (SBA) is the representative organization of the student body. All the members of the Executive Board are elected by the student body. These positions include the following positions: SBA President, Vice-President, Evening Division Vice-President, Treasurer and Secretary. In addition to these positions, the LL.Ms elects two representatives to the Board. Each 1st year section also elects a representative to the Board. (12 in total) Every year in conjunction with the Office of Student Affairs, the SBA Executive Committee arranges for the leadership of all the SBA funded organizations, the Moot Court and the journals to meet, on a monthly basis, with the Dean and other Law School and University administrators to redress issues of concern. The SBA also participates in scheduling and developing an agenda for the Town Meetings that are held with the Dean every semester. The SBA Executive Board or representatives of the groups also participate in a number of Faculty committees. These include the Information Technology Committee, the Student-Faculty/Student Services Committee. It is also common for faculty committees to invite students leaders to make presentations on issues of concern. Over the years, this has occurred with the Minority Affairs Committee, the Curriculum Committee and the Woman Law Students Committee. Student leaders have also played a key role in the interview process for the selection of the new Dean of the Law School and for tenure track faculty appointments. In addition to these activities, the SBA also has responsibility for implementing the procedure for the selection of 3 awards presented at the Law School Diploma Ceremony.

GSE

In GSE, students serve on all standing committees, except those involving personnel decisions. They have voting rights on the committees. Student representatives attend meetings of divisions, and in the Division of Psychological and Educational Service, they attend/participate in program-level meetings. Students participate in doctoral admissions interviews in PES. Student representatives are invited to School Council meeting; they do not have voting authority there.

GSSS

The student body is invited to send student representatives to all standing committees of the School except those that have to do with faculty personnel issues. This year no representatives have participated with any committees. We believe that this is the case, because our meetings are held on the days that students are in field placements. Two students do serve on the Alumni Board which is staffed by our Admissions Department. Students do participate in any Committee on Academic Progress along with faculty and the Field Work Department.

GBA

Students at GBA are involved in governance in the following ways:

3 GBA students are present at all Joint Council meetings with the entire faculty.

1 GBA student sits as a representative on the GBA Curriculum Committee.

 GBA students are involved in the strategic planning initiative.

In addition to above, students have a voice through open forums and lunches with the Dean on a regular basis. GBA has an elected student government with 5 representatives. Elections are held each spring.

GSRRE

The Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education now has a newly formed Student Council. We just had our first meeting and a core group has taken over leadership. Details are currently being worked out.

GSAS

GSAS students participate in the Graduate Council and its various committees. Either the CEO or VEO of the GSA (Graduate Student Association) is usually the GSA delegate to the Council. The GSA nominates students for membership on the various committees (Fellowships, Student life, etc.); this year because of the lack of a Director of Admissions we will be using the Admissions Committee in a new role and asking for expanded student membership on that committee. The GSA itself also sets up committees to work with the Dean and Departments. For example, they have established a strategic planning committee to translate some of their ideas into strategic initiatives — a process that started as the result of a meeting with Fr. McShane. They have had committees to study issues such as health care insurance. The CEO of the GSA and the Dean meet biweekly, and this meeting provides an avenue for student issues to be placed on the agenda of the graduate council or for resolution of problems in another manner (for example, this summer, the CEO was instrumental is helping to resolve the issue of the location of the GSAS computer lab equipment when the lab in Keating basement had to be closed due to renovations.

The CEO of our Graduate Student association has an ex officio seat on the Graduate Council. In the CEO's absence, the VEO may participate in a Council meeting. In collaboration with the GSA CEO, the Associate Dean GSAS provides graduate student representatives for the Arts and Sciences Council's committees and other bodies: such as the Taskforce on Campus Culture hosted by the
Dean FCRH.

UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGES

FCRH

Three students sit on the FCRH College Council. In addition, there is student representation from the College on the Arts and Science Council and on five committees of the Council. I am attaching the list of those student assignments for this year.

FCLC

At FCLC, there are five (5) student representatives on the College Council — three chosen by United Student Govt., one by the Residence Hall Association, and one by the Commuter Student Association.

There is a dean's advisory board made up of 25 members of the senior class.

The president of USG is a member of the Arts and Sciences Council. Student reps serve on the following committees of the Council:

Core Curriculum (voice, not vote)

Faculty Evaluation (voice, not vote)

Faculty Policies (every third year)

Student Policy (voice and vote one year, only voice the next)

I believe the dean of students has some form of advisory board.

FCLS

There is a student seat on the FCLS College Council. There are also Student Advisory bodies at each campus, primarily to sponsor and conduct social events, but also to serve as sounding boards for the administrators and conduits for the students. (Of course, from one year to the next, and from one campus to the other, these vary from highly

active to "only on paper", but the concept does indeed exist.) And I should mention, in the event no one else thinks to do so, that the University Arts and Sciences Council provides for student representation on the Council and on each of its Standing Committees.

CBA

CBA Students have had a long history of participating in the governance of the school. For as long as I have been at Fordham, some 16 years, CBA students have played a direct role in three primary governance groups in the school and they are as follows:

CBA Curriculum Committee

One CBA Student is selected to be on the CBA Curriculum Committee.

All major course and curricular changes, modifications, and additions go through this committee for approval. This is the first of two levels of formal approval that must be sought in order to for such changes to be officially enacted and incorporated into our program. This committee meets three times per year.

The student member has voting rights on this committee.

Schools of Business Joint Council

Three CBA Students are selected to be on the Schools of Business Joint Council.

All curricular changes, modifications, and additions go through this council for final approval before becoming official. This along with discussions of the state of the school, faculty concerns, student concerns, and programmatic discussions are typically addressed at these meetings which occur three times per year.

CBA SAC

Every few years, the College of Business also organizes a "Student Advisory Committee" to review and look at all aspects of student life as it involves the
business students and the business school.

Marymount

At Marymount College, student representatives serve on the Academic Computing Committee and the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee. When the College Council reports each month to the faculty, the student government president is asked to send a representative.

Campus Ministry

Campus Ministry on all three of our campuses relies heavily on student input in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of its various programs.

Each of our three main areas of ministry — the liturgy, retreats, and Global Outreach — operate with student boards or student leadership. For university-wide events, we gather ad hoc committees together to plan the events. We have close ties with Student Activities, Residential Life, and the United Student Government. We also have several "How're We Doing?" sessions each year to assess our performance: the first such session gathers a cross-section of the university community, while the second taps into the experience of graduating Seniors. Also in the planning stage is a CARA-designed survey for Jesuit colleges and universities, originally scheduled to be administered this Spring, but now — due to preparations for MSA visit — probably postponed till next Fall.

6. What is the role of the Board in the University's governance structure as defined through written documents including the Board By-Laws and Board policies?

§2-04.01 Authority of the Board

Subject to the laws of the State of New York and the Charter of the Corporation and in accordance with the By-Laws, the Board shall exercise ultimate authority over all acts of the Corporation.

§2-04.02 Powers of the Board
The Board shall have all necessary and convenient powers to direct and manage the business and affairs of the University. These powers shall include but shall not be limited to the following, to:

a. elect the President of the University by a majority vote of the entire Board; remove him/her from office by a two-thirds vote of the entire Board;

b. elect and remove the officers of the University as later defined in these By-Laws;

c. approve and adopt all major changes in the educational policies and programs of the University;

d. approve the granting of all degrees in course and of all honorary degrees;

e. enact and amend the statutes of the University, particularly concerning the election, appointment, promotion, tenure and duties of the officers, the administrative officials, and the faculty of the University;

f. enact and amend rules and regulations for the orderly government of the University, including procedures for the enforcement of the same;

g. authorize the establishment and approve the constitution of any official senate, council, committee, board or other organization of administrative officials or members of the faculty or the student body of the University;

h. authorize the establishment of any new school or college or major institute of the University;

i. concur in the appointment of a dean of any school or college and in the appointment of a director of any major institute of the University;

j. grant academic tenure to or authorize the President to grant tenure to full-time members of the faculty;

k. review and take appropriate action respecting the budget of the University, which shall be submitted to the Board with the recommendations of the President;

l. approve salary scales and authorize any change in the salary scale of the officers, the administrators, the faculty, and the staff of the University;

m. authorize any changes in tuition and fees within the University;

n. authorize the construction of new buildings and major renovation to existing buildings of the University;

o. authorize the sale and purchase or lease of land or buildings for the use of the University;

p. authorize and promote major fund-raising activities of the University;

q. authorize entrance on the part of the University into any contract with employees or their bargaining agents respecting wages, hours and other conditions affecting employment;

r. authorize the President of the University to accept gifts, except that the acceptance of restricted gifts which involve major obligations must be ratified by a majority vote of the entire Board;

s. authorize the incurring of debts by the University, the securing thereof by mortgage and pledge of real and personal property, tangible and intangible, presently owned or hereafter acquired by the University;

t. constitute such standing or ad hoc committees as the Board may from time to time deem necessary or convenient for efficient exercise of its powers and function;

u. approve all major changes in the university's athletics program and provide oversight of athletics through the appropriate standing board committee; and

v. take any other action customarily assumed by the Board of Trustees of a university and authorized by the laws of the State of New York.

§2-07.01 Special and Other Committees
The Board or the Chairperson of the Board with the consent of the Board may appoint from time to time Special and other Committees. A Special Committee member or other Committee member need not be a Trustee except as may be otherwise specifically provided by law, by the charter or by these By-Laws. Such Special Committees or other Committees shall have only such purposes, powers and authority as the Board shall designate, consistent with law, with the charter and with these By-Laws.

Summary statement

In accordance with the laws of the State of New York, along with the Fordham University Charter and the Bylaws of the Fordham University Board of Trustees, the Board has ultimate authority over all acts of the University. In Section 2-04.01 of the Board Bylaws, many of the Board's specific powers are enumerated. For example, the Board elects the President of the University, authorizes changes in tuition and fees, approves the establishment of new schools, colleges or major institutes at the University, and approves the granting of all degrees.

Section 2-04.01 also explains the Board's role in overseeing the University's governance structure. The Board approves amendments to the University statutes. In addition, the Board must authorize the establishment and approve the constitution of any official senate, council, committee, board or other organization of faculty, students and administrators.

7. How well defined is the Board's governance role?
Confer to question 9

8. How are these governance documents and policies related to the Board shared with the University community?

The Board Bylaws are contained in the University Statutes which are available through Fordham's website. Board policies which are relevant to the University community are typically shared through letters sent to individual members of the community.

9. Does the governance structure provide for a Board of sufficient size, expertise and independence to assure the integrity of the University and fiduciary responsibility?
§2-02.02 Number of Trustees
There shall be no more than forty (40) nor less than five (5) members of the Board, although the Board shall, from time to time, determine the number of Trustees which constitute the Board within said maximum and minimum limits in each case. There shall be no ex officio members of the Board except the President of the University.

§2-02.03 Term of Office
Solely for the purpose of fixing terms of office of the Trustees, the elected membership of the Board is divided into three (3) groups of approximately equal size. The term of office of the Trustees of only one group expires each year.

§2-02.04 Election of Trustees

At the annual meeting for the election of Trustees, for the purpose of maintaining the number they shall have constituted, the Trustees shall elect, by majority vote of the entire Board, as many Trustees as necessary to fill the vacancies created by the expiration of the terms of the Trustees whose terms of office expire in that year. Each Trustee so elected shall serve for a period of three(3) years to the date fixed for the annual meeting for the election of Trustees in the third year next succeeding, and shall be eligible for re-election for one (1) additional three(3) year term. If any member shall die, resign, or be unable or unwilling to act in such capacity, a vacancy in the membership shall exist. At any such time, the remaining members, by a majority vote at a regular or special meeting, may elect a successor to fill such vacancy for the unexpired portion of such term.

Summary statement

The Board Bylaws provide for a Board of a maximum of 40 term trustees as authorized by an Amendment to the University Charter granted by the Regents of the University of the State of New York. Currently there are 37 term trustees, in addition to 10 trustees emeriti. The Bylaws stipulate that the President of the University will serve ex officio. There are no other specific requirements or quotas for membership.

With certain exceptions for members of the Executive Committee, trustees may serve two 3-year terms. After completing two terms, they must leave the Board for at least one year before they may be considered for re-election.

New trustees are recommended to the Board for election by the Board's Trusteeship Committee. This committee maintains a Board profile document which groups trustees by area of expertise. When trustee vacancies occur, the Trusteeship Committee reviews general areas of expertise that may be missing and considers specific skills which might be needed. For example, when a trustee with an expertise in New York City real estate completed his trustee term, an effort was made to find a new trustee with an expertise in New York City real estate as the University is about to undertake some major building plans.

Pat Nazemetz is the Chair of the Trusteeship Committee. The Board relies on this Committee to select new candidates for membership on the Board. The new comers are well vetted and then the entire Board votes on new members.

A Governance Task Force has just been created to make an in depth review of the structure, charter, by-laws of the Board. This is chaired by Bob Campbell, a former Chair of the Board. Both John Tognino, the present Board Chair, and Pat Nazemetz are members of this Task Force. A number of alumni/ae are on the Board, although not many Board Members are scientists, hence, this perspective is missing.

The Board understands the University extremely well. They have a real commitment to the University Community. Membership is no longer just perfunctory. They take their role very seriously. Having forty Board Members allows for good diversity. The University is in a period of transition. The University has a new president who has improved the image of the University in a remarkable way. The Board has a relatively new Chair, and a number of Board Members are older, so are looking to retire soon. There is a broad constituency represented in the prospective new Board Members. The Board plans to initiate a Trustees Fellows program that will keep some of the former Trustees in the fold. The present membership has three sitting Presidents of Universities, four or five from an academic community. The present Board had had a distinguished professor from another school, but not at the present moment. A sizeable turnover will take place soon. The Board recognizes a need to maintain a faculty perspective.

10. Does the composition of the Board represent a sufficient mix of age, race, ethnicity and gender, as well as interests, points of view, experiences and expertise?

Among the current trustees (excluding the president), 17% are under the age of 50, 14 % are between the ages of 50 and 55, 25% are between the ages of 56 and 60, 33% are between the ages of 61 and 65, and 11% are over 65. Seventeen per cent of the trustees are female, and 6% are non-white. Eighty-four percent of the trustees have one or more degrees from the University including degrees from the following colleges and schools: Fordham College at Rose Hill,

the College of Business Administration, Marymount College, Thomas More College (formerly the woman's college at Rose Hill), Ignatius College (now Fordham College of Liberal Studies), the School of Pharmacy (now closed), the School of Law, the Graduate School of Business Administration and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. While most trustees reside in the Tri-State area, 14% live outside that area in California, Illinois, Massachusetts, Ohio and Pennsylvania. Forty-two percent of trustees have served less than three years, while 28% have served from three to five years and 30% more than 6 years. As far as their areas of expertise are concerned, 14% work in the arts and media field, 14% in business, 19% in education, 39% in finance and 14% in the legal field. Five current trustees (in addition to the president) are members of the Society of Jesus, and one current trustee is a member of the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary.

All on the Board are sensitive to the need for diversity. It is concerned to bring in representatives from outside the tri-state area, as many of our students are now from this "outside" area. The Board would like to have a diversity that somehow matches the diversity of the student body, including minority representation. Sensitivity to these factors has never been higher.

11. What type of orientation is provided for new Board members and how are current Board members provided continuing updates on the University's mission organization, academic programs and other objectives?

New trustees are invited to attend a New Trustee Orientation Session on the day before their first Board meeting. At that meeting, they hear brief overviews from the Academic Vice President, the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, and the Vice President for Mission and Ministries. Prior to this session and at this session, they are given many printed materials including a Board Handbook, sets of catalogues of all 11 schools, copies of policies such as the Board's conflict of interest policy, and the listing of the administrative structure of the University. New trustees are provided a campus tour of each of the University's three campuses as the Board meetings move from campus to campus throughout the course of the year.

Current Board members are provided a Board briefing book two weeks in advance of each quarterly Board meeting. This book contains quarterly updates from each of the nine vice presidents, as well as a President's Report. Minutes from past committee meetings and the most recent Board meeting are also included in this book. All trustees receive the student newspapers from both the Rose Hill and Lincoln Center campuses, as well as copies of new college or school catalogues as they are updated. Between meetings, Board members are contacted by phone, letter or email as needed.

John Tognino and Pat Nazemetz and others meet with prospective new members to solicit their questions and provide them with answers. Pat does much outreach to help them know what will be expected of them. The orientation program is on going. There is a Briefing book that is quite detailed, so the Board knows a great deal of what is going on. The Board feels that the Administration keeps them well informed. They do this well. In addition to this there is a book of "Clips" prepared by Bruno Santonocito and Libby Schmalz. This is excellent and growing in size.

The Audit and Finance Committee of the Board consistently refer to the Mission Statement of the University to make sure that the University is consistent with its mission. A large concern of this Committee is to build an adequate endowment. Other Committees also share this diligence to match the Mission Statement.

A new committee is planned, called Mission and Identity Committee. When this is in place there will be enhanced awareness of this match between the University and its mission.

A question was asked about budget planning. Great praise was given to our CFO, John Lordan. The zero based budgeting has entered us into a new generation, one that involves all the deans and administrators. The goal is to achieve a balanced budget based on sound fiscal policy. Enormous input goes into the preparation of the budget. Priorities in the budget are worked out by the Board along with the Administration. The Investment Committee debates this in a joint meeting with the Audit and Finance committee. There is strong consultation in the phase of the budget process. The Investment Committee is excellent. In the future there may be a move to separate Audit from Finance.

12. What information about the University and its developments is regularly presented to and discussed by the Board?

As noted above, all trustees receive briefing books which include quarterly reports from the President and the Vice Presidents prior to each Board meeting. In addition, they receive copies of the Rose Hill and Lincoln Center newspapers and the Fordham magazine published by the Department of University Relations and Development. Trustees also have copies of current college and school catalogues and other documents such as the annual University Fact Book.

As the strategic planning process for the University began last spring, the trustees received a number of documents about the University and its competitors. Last March, an all-day Board meeting was held. The sole topic of this meeting was strategic planning. A follow-up all-day meeting is planned for March 2005, and trustees receive updates on planning at each Board meeting.

Faculty members on the Committees of the Board play a distinctive role here. They are looked on as full members of the Committees and are very effective.

Briefing Books are prepared prior to a meeting of the Board. These reflect the well known need for communication.

13. What are the mechanisms through which the various constituencies (faculty, administration and students) communicate with the trustees and each other in order to share in the governance of the University?

§4-06.03 Committees
The faculty participates in several types of committees as part of its role in governance;

(a) University Committees (cf #2 above)

(1) Committees of the Board of Trustees (Academic Affairs Committee, Audit and Finance Committee, Facilities Committee, Student Affairs Committee, University Commencement Committee, University Relations Committee)

(2) Presidential Committees (Advisory Committee on ROTC, Athletic Advisory Board, Budget Planning committee, Computer Advisory Committee, Faculty Development Committee, Research Council, Committees Dealing with Student Affairs, Editorial Board of the Fordham University Press.)

3) Statutory Faculty Senate Committees (Faculty Elections Committee, Faculty Handbook Committee, Faculty Hearing committee, Faculty Library Committee, Committee on Student Life, Faculty Committee on Technology, Faculty Salary and Benefits Committee, Tenure and Reappointment Appeals Committee, University Tenure Review Committee).

§4-06.10 School or Faculty Committees

Each School or Faculty may establish such faculty committees as it deems appropriate.

§4-06.11 Department or Faculty Committees

Each Department may establish faculty committees as it deems appropriate.

§4-06.12 Ad Hoc Committees
When required, ad hoc committees may be established at the University, Faculty, School or Department level, to make appropriate studies and recommendations. These Committees normally shall be established after consultation between the involved faculty and administration, as appropriate for the level concerned.

Summary Statement
The University Statutes provide for faculty members on several of the Board committees. Over the years, additional committees have been added and procedures for filling the faculty seats on committees have changed. An effort is being made this year to amend the statutes to reflect current practice for the selection of these members and to indicate that faculty will serve on all committees except the Executive Committee and the Trusteeship Committee. Students currently serve on the Student Affairs and Academic Affairs Committees, and procedures for their selection are also currently being reviewed.

Members of the community who wish to communicate directly with the trustees about a specific issue are invited to send materials to the trustees in care of the University Secretary. These materials are then shared with the Chair of the Board and the rest of the Board as he deems appropriate.

14. What was the Board's role in selecting a new president?

When Fr. O'Hare announced his retirement, the Chair of the Board appointed the former Chair of the Board to serve as the chair of a search committee. The Search Committee included seven trustees appointed by the chairs of the Board and the Search Committee, four faculty members recommended by the President of the Faculty Senate, one undergraduate and one graduate student recommended by the deans of the schools and the Search Committee Chair. The Search Committee provided updates to the Board during the process and presented their recommended candidate at a meeting of the Board of Trustees for their approval. In accordance with the Board's Bylaws, the President was elected by the entire Board.

15. How does the Board define and update its responsibilities and powers?

The Board has established a Task Force on Governance which will review the Board's responsibilities and powers.

16. How will the Board assess the performance of the president and senior officers in terms of institutional leadership and governance?

The Board has recently established a Compensation Committee which will be headed by the Vice Chair of the Board who is the Vice President for Human Resources for Xerox. She will be joined on the Committee by the Chairman of the Board and the Chairman of the Audit and Finance Committee. Their major task will be to provide a performance review for the president and recommend his annual salary increase to the Board. They will also review salaries of senior officers of the University and provide guidance to the president in this area. They are currently in the process of establishing working procedures for this new committee.

The governance role is well defined. The Board is very sensitive that they will not micromanage the University, however they are very active, are asking more questions than ever before, and are able to supply counsel, advice | and professional expertise to solving University problems than ever before. There is very good communication going on. There is a strong sense of being well set for the next five to ten years.

17. How well does the Board promote the mission, goals and objectives of the University?

A few years ago, the Board established a Trusteeship Committee in order to formalize the process for the recommendation and election of new trustees. In addition, the Committee was charged with determining how to assess the performance of the Board as a whole and the performance of individual trustees. The Committee is now turning its attention to this second task and has begun by reviewing attendance records of trustees. It will begin to review assessment forms in the near future. The Committee has also been charged with reviewing the general structure of the Board, including its current committee structure.

The Board Members are ambassadors of the University. They attend functions, travel to events that are outside the tri-state area. They share their experiences with others. Joel Picket is outstanding in the area of real estate. His pro-bono work for the University is highly valued. There is a new Mission Identity Committee chaired by Fr. Blaszczak that is concerned with these issues.

Regularizing this aspect of the Board's work will continue and improve.

18. By what means are the University's mission and objectives communicated to members of the University community to ensure that governance decisions properly reflect the mission, goals and objectives?

The mission and goals are transmitted through Catalogues and other official publications of the University. They are also communicated through the University web-site and in-house magazines such as Inside Fordham and Fordham Magazine, as well as in the addresses of the President, the Deans, and other University officials to students, faculty and alumni.

19. How will the Board provide for periodic review, assessment and reform?

The Board of Trustees assesses the President. The President assesses Vice-Presidents, Deans, and senior University administrators. Faculty assess their colleagues in making recommendations for annual merit increments, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The Deans and the Vice President for Academic Affairs review and approve these assessments. Annual Faculty Reports are used as one vehicle for the ongoing process of assessment. Student evaluations of faculty teaching are used as input for the faculty evaluation process.

20. Describe the procedure for the objective assessment of the Board in meeting stated governing objectives.

Self assessment of the Board is working well. They are establishing benchmarks that measure financial concerns as well as overall achievement.

They have initiated a full day's retreat during which they do an in depth study of the University. They are studying how to bring in effective evaluators.

21. What is the role of the Faculty Senate in the University's governance structure as defined through its Constitution and By-Laws.

Constitution Article I A- Objects and Purposes
The objects and purpose of the Fordham University Faculty Senate shall be:

(a) To promote the best interest of Fordham University;

(b) To create a closer liaison between the members of the faculty and the Administrative officers;

(c) To develop greater cooperation and closer cultural and educational exchange among the faculties of the schools of the University;

(d) To serve as an advisory body to the President of the University;

(e) To initiate recommendations on policy to the President of the University.

By-Laws Article IV Section 5 - The Executive Committee shall:

(d) act as a liaison committee with the President of the University.

22. How well defined is the Faculty Senate's governance role?

Constitution Article I B. Powers, Rights and Duties of the Faculty Senate

(a) The Senate shall have the right and duty to advise the President and Trustees of the University and to initiate recommendations in all areas of University activity.

(b) The Senate shall deal directly with the President of the University and to this end the President of the Senate shall have the right to confer with the President of the University within a reasonable time after a request for such a meeting.

By-Laws Article III Section 3 - When the President of the University requests a favorable recommendation of tenure by the Faculty Senate under University Statutes §4-05.04(g)(2)(A), the Senate will act on the following premises:

(a) The function of the Senate is to review the recommendation of the original tenure committee. (The first sentence of this subdivision shall not preclude the Senate from requesting whatever documentation, testimony or other information it requires for the proper disposition of the case.)

(b) The burden of proof lies upon the President to show that the recommendation of the tenure committee was arbitrary, unreasonable or not in the best interest of the University (2/18/77).

By-Laws Article IV (3) The Executive Committee and all standing committees shall meet as directed by the Faculty Senate, or as determined necessary by the committees themselves or their chairmen, but no less than once a year; the meeting shall be conducted according to orderly procedure, records of deliberations shall be kept, and all reports shall be made to the Faculty Senate as often as required, but at least once annually. Copies of all reports, final and accepted by the Senate shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate and shall be available for inspection by members of the faculty and the administrative staff of the University.

Constitution Article III (c) The president of the Senate shall preside at and conduct the meetings of the Senate. The vice president shall exercise all the powers and duties of the president in the president's absence. The secretary shall keep the minutes of all the meetings of the Senate, shall maintain the rolls of the members and shall send out all notices of meetings.

Constitution Article IV (f) (last sentence) The results of the election (of Senators) should be made public before the end of April.

By-Laws Article III Section 1 (3) Special Committees. The Executive Committee and all standing committees shall meet as directed by the Faculty Senate, or as determined necessary by the committees themselves or their chairmen, but no less than once a year; the meeting shall be conducted according to orderly procedure, records of deliberations shall be kept, and all reports shall be made to the Faculty Senate as often as required, but at least once annually. Copies of all reports, final and accepted by the Senate shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate and shall be available for inspection by members of the faculty and the administrative staff of the

By-Laws Article IV Section 5 (The Executive Committee shall:) (b) receive reports and communications prepared by or in any college, school or division of the University which may be of concern or interest to any other college, school or division, or the faculty, or the Faculty Senate; (c) act on behalf of the Senate on matters requiring immediate action when it is not possible to call a special meeting of the Senate, such action to be reported to the Senate for confirmation at its next regular meeting;

24. Does the governance structure provide for a Faculty Senate of sufficient size, expertise and independence to equitably and suitably represent all the schools of the University?

Constitution Article II Composition
The Fordham University Faculty Senate shall regularly consist of twenty-five (25) members to be elected as provided in Article VI and apportioned as follows:

(a) Members of the Liberal Arts Faculty shall elect twelve (12) members representing District One (Rose Hill) and four (4) members representing District Two (Lincoln Center).

(b) Members of the Liberal Arts Faculty may enroll, for the entire academic year, as voters/candidates at the start of each academic year in either Election District. They shall continue as enrollees of that District until they choose to enroll in the other District, at the start of a subsequent academic year.

(c) Members of the Faculty of Business shall elect three (3) members.

(d) Members of the Faculties of the School of Law, the Graduate School of Social Service and the Graduate School of Education shall each elect two (2) members.

(e) If a faculty member teaches in more than one School or Faculty, that faculty member must choose one of those Schools or Faculties wherein to cast ballots or be candidate at the start of each academic year. The chosen status shall remain in effect until changed at the start of a subsequent academic year.

25. What information about the University and its developments is regularly presented to and discussed by the Faculty Senate?

Constitution Article I A. Objects and Purposes
The objects and purpose of the Fordham University Faculty Senate shall be:

(a) To promote the best interest of Fordham University;

(b) To create a closer liaison between the members of the faculty and the Administrative officers;

(c) To develop greater cooperation and closer cultural and educational exchange among the faculties of the schools of the University;

(d) To serve as an advisory body to the President of the University;

(e) To initiate recommendations on policy to the President of the University.

B. Powers, Rights and Duties of the Faculty Senate

(a) The Senate shall have the right and duty to advise the President and Trustees of the University and to initiate recommendations in all areas of University activity.

(b) The Senate shall deal directly with the President of the University and to this end the President of the Senate shall have the right to confer with the President of the University within a reasonable time after a request for such a meeting.

26. What are the mechanisms through which the various constituencies (faculty, administration and students) communicate with the Senators and each other in order to share in the governance of the University?

By-Laws Article IV Section 5 The Executive Committee shall:

(a) arrange the agenda for senate meetings, and shall serve as the channel through which any member of the Senate may introduce matters for the consideration of the Senate. It shall include in the agenda for any meeting any matters requested by the President or 20% of the members of the Senate;

(b) receive reports and communications prepared by or in any college, school or division of the University which may be of concern or interest to any other college, school or division, or the faculty, or the Faculty Senate;

(c) act on behalf of the Senate on matters requiring immediate action when it is not possible to call a special meeting of the Senate, such action to be reported to the Senate for confirmation at its next regular meeting;

(d) act as a liaison committee with the President of the University.

27. How effective are the various committees of the Senate, described in the University Statutes, in supporting the mission of the University?

Constitution Article V Committees

The committees of the Senate shall be appointed by the Senate and shall have whatever powers and duties are prescribed by that body. All members of the Fordham faculty are eligible for appointment to committees.

By-Laws Article IV Committees

Section 1 - There shall be three kinds of senate committees:

(1) An Executive Committee;

(2) Standing Committees;

(3) Special Committees. The Executive Committee and all standing committees shall meet as directed by the Faculty Senate, or as determined necessary by the committees themselves or their chairmen, but no less than once a year; the meeting shall be conducted according to orderly procedure, records of deliberations shall be kept, and all reports shall be made to the Faculty Senate as often as required, but at least once annually. Copies of all reports, final and accepted by the Senate shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate and shall be available for inspection by members of the faculty and the administrative staff of the University.

Section 2 - Except as otherwise provided, all members of all committees shall be appointed by the President of the Senate with the consent of the Senate, and the number, charge and composition of the standing and special committees shall be determined in the same way.

Section 3 - The members of the Executive Committee shall be appointed at the May meeting in which officers are elected by the President with the consent of the majority of Senators present. Members of the Executive Committee shall be appointed for one year and no member of the Executive Committee shall be appointed for more than three successive terms except when he is a member ex officio as hereinafter provided.

Section 4 - The Executive Committee shall consist of five members, two appointed as previously provided and the officers of the Senate ex officio shall be the remaining members.

Section 5 - The Executive Committee shall:

(a) arrange the agenda for senate meetings, and shall serve as the channel through which any member of the Senate may introduce matters for the consideration of the Senate. It shall include in the agenda for any meeting any matters requested by the President or 20% of the members of the Senate;

(b) receive reports and communications prepared by or in any college, school or division of the University which may be of concern or interest to any other college, school or division, or the faculty, or the Faculty Senate;

(c) act on behalf of the Senate on matters requiring immediate action when it is not possible to call a special meeting of the Senate, such action to be reported to the Senate for confirmation at its next regular meeting;

(d) act as a liaison committee with the President of the University.

Section 6 - There shall be the following Standing Committees: Constitution and Bylaws, Election, and Faculty Handbook. (2/18/72)

28. How effective are the lines of communication between the Faculty Senate and members of the University community?

Constitution Article I A. (d) To serve as an advisory body to the President of the University; B. Powers, Rights and Duties of the Faculty Senate

(a) The Senate shall have the right and duty to advise the President and Trustees of the University and to initiate recommendations in all areas of University activity.

(b) The Senate shall deal directly with the President of the University and to this end the President of the Senate shall have the right to confer with the President of the University within a reasonable time after a request for such a meeting.

By-Laws Article III Section 3 - When the President of the University requests a favorable recommendation of tenure by the Faculty Senate under University Statutes §4- 05.04(g)(2)(A), the Senate will act on the following premises:

(a) The function of the Senate is to review the recommendation of the original tenure committee. (The first sentence of this subdivision shall not preclude the Senate from requesting whatever documentation, testimony or other information it requires for the proper disposition of the case.)

(b) The burden of proof lies upon the President to show that the recommendation of the tenure committee was arbitrary, unreasonable or not in the best interest of the University (2/18/77).

By-Laws Article IV Section 5 The Executive Committee shall:

(d) act as a liaison committee with the President of the University.

29. What are the lines of communication between the Faculty Senate and the president of the University?

Constitution Article I A. (d) To serve as an advisory body to the President of the University; B. Powers, Rights and Duties of the Faculty Senate

(a) The Senate shall have the right and duty to advise the President and Trustees of the University and to initiate recommendations in all areas of University activity.

(b) The Senate shall deal directly with the President of the University and to this end the President of the Senate shall have the right to confer with the President of the University within a reasonable time after a request for such a meeting.

By-Laws Article III Section 3 - When the President of the University requests a favorable recommendation of tenure by the Faculty Senate under University Statutes §4- 05.04(g)(2)(A), the Senate will act on the following premises:

(a) The function of the Senate is to review the recommendation of the original tenure committee. (The first sentence of this subdivision shall not preclude the Senate from requesting whatever documentation, testimony or other information it requires for the proper disposition of the case.)

(b) The burden of proof lies upon the President to show that the recommendation of the tenure committee was arbitrary, unreasonable or not in the best interest of the University (2/18/77).

By-Laws Article IV Section 5 The Executive Committee shall:

(d) act as a liaison committee with the President of the University.

30. What are the lines of communication between the Faculty Senate and vice presidents and deans of the University?

Constitution Article I A. Objects and Purposes

The objects and purpose of the Fordham University Faculty Senate shall be:

(b) To create a closer liaison between the members of the faculty and the Administrative officers;

By-Laws Article IV Section 5 The Executive Committee shall:

(b)) receive reports and communications prepared by or in any college, school or division of the University which may be of concern or interest to any other college, school or division, or the faculty, or the Faculty Senate;

31. How does the Faculty Senate interact with the Board of Trustees?

Constitution Article I B. Powers, Rights and Duties of the Faculty Senate

(a) The Senate shall have the right and duty to advise the President and Trustees of the University and to initiate recommendations in all areas of University activity.

32. How will the Senate provide for periodic review, assessment and reform?

By-Laws Article IV Section 1 (3) Special Committees

The Executive Committee and all standing committees shall meet as directed by the Faculty Senate, or as determined necessary by the committees themselves or their chairmen, but no less than once a year; the meeting shall be conducted according to orderly procedure, records of deliberations shall be kept, and all reports shall be made to the Faculty Senate as often as required, but at least once annually. Copies of all reports, final and accepted by the Senate shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate and shall be available for inspection by members of the faculty and the administrative staff of the University.

33. Describe the procedure for the objective assessment of the Senate in meeting stated governing objectives.

By-Laws Article IV Section 5 - The Executive Committee shall:

(a) arrange the agenda for senate meetings, and shall serve as the channel through which any member of the Senate may introduce matters for the consideration of the Senate. It shall include in the agenda for any meeting any matters requested by the President or 20% of the members of the Senate;

(b) receive reports and communications prepared by or in any college, school or division of the University which may be of concern or interest to any other college, school or division, or the faculty, or the Faculty Senate;

(c) act on behalf of the Senate on matters requiring immediate action when it is not possible to call a special meeting of the Senate, such action to be reported to the Senate for confirmation at its next regular meeting;

(d) act as a liaison committee with the President of the University.

Section 6 - There shall be the following Standing Committees: Constitution and Bylaws, Election, and Faculty Handbook. (2/18/72)

34. How are the responsibilities and powers of the President of the University and the Board of Trustees defined and updated?

The first focus was on procedures for developing the executive budget and the President's role in providing it to the Trustees.

· Fr. McShane: the annual executive budget is compiled in a complicated process, based on system established by John Lordan, from the ground up. Items are prepared by Departments and Schools, reviewed by Deans and area Vice-presidents and sent to Vice-president for Finance. The completed budget is reviewed by the President and sent via the Audit and Finance Committee of the Board to the February meeting of the full Board of Trustees for approval. In some years, when a tuition increase is anticipated, some of the data is extracted and presented to the December meeting of the Board for early approval.

· During the rest of the year updates on the current year's budget and plans for next year's budget are presented to the Board for discussion.

The second focus was on the President's overall relationship with the Board of Trustees.

· This relationship is good and is evolving in several ways. There is a lot of interaction with the Chair of the Board and individual Board members.

· The Board formally reviews the performance of the President every three years.

· The Board itself, under its new Chair, John Tognino, is engaged in studying its own organization and ways of working with the President and the Administration. (see Board section of this report). It is developing its own Self-study Committee, and considering Task Forces to handle special assignments, along with the regular Committees of the Board.

35. How does the President interact with other University groups?

Internal administration

The President is making more active use of the Council of vice presidents as a Cabinet to engage in collegial discussions, beyond the individual responsibilities of each vice president. The Council meets weekly. It also meets before each meeting of the Board of Trustees to review proposals being presented to the Board, and afterwards to review Board actions and need for implementation.

The Presidents relationship with the Faculty

• The President personally attends and participates in Faculty Senate meetings. Holds meetings with Faculty Senate President frequently.

• He directly addresses and listens to Faculty and Forums and Open Meetings.

• He meets with many individual faculty members on various committees and task forces.

• He has instituted a Faculty Ombudsman to discover problems and report them to the President.President's relationship with Students-

• (See the list of student participation in various councils, administrative and trustee committees around the university compiled by this committee)

• There is already extensive Student participation in different areas of university activity, but the President hopes to institute a more formal representation of student representatives directly advising the President. He is working on appropriate selection.

• The President is very accessible to students, appearing at meetings and forums to answer questions, or informally attending games and social occasions. He encounters a cross-section of the student body regularly.

36. How are students involved in the governance of the University?

President's relationship with Students-

· (See the list of student participation in various councils, administrative and trustee committees around the university compiled by this committee)

· There is already extensive Student participation in different areas of university activity, but the President hopes to institute a more formal representation of student representatives directly advising the President. He is working on appropriate selection.

· The President is very accessible to students, appearing at meetings and forums to answer questions, or informally attending games and social occasions. He encounters a cross-section of the student body regularly.

37. The President's relationship with others

The President is frequently off-campus meeting with officials, businessmen, academics, alumni and the public, both in the New York area and around the country. He estimated he will spend 80 days a year on the road, bringing the message of Fordham to all those who can help the university.

38. The President's overall style of leadership.

From the discussion, the committee perceived an underlying style of leadership which characterizes this President. It is energetic and proactive. The President lays great emphasis, in practice as well as in conversation about implementing a collegial style of governance and administration. He is also concerned about meeting high standards of performance and intends to achieve that through careful strategic planning and critical review of performance at all levels of university activity.