

March 31, 2003

Mr. William B. DeLauder
Chair
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
3624 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104-2680

Dear Mr. DeLauder:

In June 2001, you wrote to inform me that the Commission on Higher Education had voted to reaffirm the accreditation of Gallaudet University. You also requested a follow-up report by April 1, 2003 to document steps taken to address the issue of governance.

I am pleased to send you four (4) copies of the University's follow-up report. Over the past year or so, Dr. Larry Gerber and Dr. Philip A. Glotzbach have worked with us as governance consultants and have prepared the enclosed report at my request. As you will see, we have made excellent progress in creating a climate of trust and collaboration through which changes to our governance system are now possible. An ad hoc governance work group has been established and is now working on the issues identified by our higher education consultants to enhance trust, improve communication and clarify roles in the governance system, address structural issues within the formal governance system itself, and shift focus from the past. A key factor in the membership of this group, as recommended by the consultants, is that it puts administrators, faculty Senators and faculty at large together in the same room to discuss, debate and agree upon steps to be taken to streamline our decision-making process.

I am confident that this group will make a concerted effort to focus on the issues uncovered this past year and that their work will reap positive results for us in the coming year. As a most hopeful sign, even before the formation of the governance group was official, we had already seen the results of an improved climate in a recent proposal to the University faculty that reduces the number of standing committees by one.

I appreciate this opportunity to share with you our response to your request for a follow-up report on governance. Should you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

I. King Jordan
President

**Follow-up Report to the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
From
GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY
Washington, DC 20002**

Prepared by
Larry G. Gerber, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Department of History
Auburn University
and
Philip A. Glotzbach, Ph.D.
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Redlands

March 25, 2003

Subject of the Follow-up Report:

Excerpt from Evaluation Team Report dealing with "Organization, Administration, and Governance": "In short, the current system of faculty governance causes great paralysis in the management of the University. Left unaddressed, the MSA Team believes it could seriously impede the effectiveness and efficiency of the campus in achieving its unique mission and thus, adversely affect its reputation as one of America's most treasured special purpose institutions. The issue is of such importance that the MSA Team suggests the President might wish to consider engaging three or four higher education consultants to review the structure of faculty governance with particular attention being given to the appropriate role the network of committees, councils, and other groups should or should not have in the management of the University." (pp. 5-6)

Date of Evaluation Team's Visit: April 8-11, 2001

Chair of the Evaluation Team: Earl S. Richardson

BACKGROUND

In reaffirming the accreditation of Gallaudet University in 2001, the Middle States Association (MSA) Commission on Higher Education requested a follow-up report by the University to document its efforts to address issues of governance raised in the report of the evaluation team that visited campus in April 2001.

The visiting team reported seeing a faculty governance structure at Gallaudet more like that of a much larger university, and noted its complexity and the duplication of effort among its various committees and bodies. The team was concerned about long processes that reduce efficient and timely responses to problems and issues. Governance, they said, took up a great deal of faculty time, and they expressed the view that a more streamlined system could free up more time for vital core faculty functions – teaching, research, and scholarship. The very strongly worded statement included the observation that “the faculty structure also tends to undermine the legitimate authority of the President, Provost, Vice President, and deans to make administrative decisions or otherwise carry out their duties and responsibilities as administrative officers of the University.”

Specifically, the MSA report recommended that Gallaudet

... consider engaging three or four higher education consultants to review the structure of faculty governance with particular attention being given to the appropriate role the network of committees, councils, and other groups should or should not have in the management of the University.

The strong language above regarding faculty governance generated considerable discussion within the Gallaudet faculty as to whether this is a valid or even partially valid characterization of the situation. Thus, the University started the process of identifying possible governance consultants, as recommended by the visiting team, in an environment of faculty-administration tension, though there was widespread agreement on campus that governance issues were very important to address. At least initially, however, the strong language used to describe the faculty governance structure made it difficult to proceed. Additionally, because the Commission guidelines preclude the possibility of asking visiting team members to expand on or explain the reasons for any observation or recommendation, the specific reasons for such a strong statement were not clear to either the administration or the faculty.

Nevertheless, the steps taken by Gallaudet to respond to the suggestions of the MSA team have produced positive results, so that the campus community is now engaged in a productive and ongoing process to enhance the effectiveness of governance at the institution. Although no major structural changes have yet been implemented in the governance system, this report details a number of steps that have been taken to improve communication and trust between the administration and faculty, without which reform of the governance system is unlikely to yield positive results. Moreover, processes for reviewing and revising the governance system have been established and promise to produce specific results in the near future.

SELECTION OF CONSULTANTS

Although both the University administration and faculty leadership expressed considerable surprise and even dismay over the evaluation team's harsh assessment of the governance situation at Gallaudet, they agreed to undertake, in the Spring of 2002, a collaborative interview process leading to the selection of one or more consultants to assist them (a) in responding to the MSA report and (b) in making whatever changes that the current situation might warrant. An agreement was reached early on to broaden the focus of this work to consider the functioning of university governance writ large – the way decisions are made within the institution through the participation of various constituencies – as opposed to the narrower scope of the MSA report, which emphasized the faculty committee structure. This broader focus was evident in the interview process that led to the choice of consultants and thereafter.

The search for possible consultants with expertise in governance issues began by the administration contacting higher education organizations including:

American Council on Education (ACE)
American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU)
American Association of University Professors (AAUP)
American Association of Higher Education (AAHE)
Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSA)
Association of Governing Boards (AGB)

These contacts resulted in a list of 15 consultants, well regarded for their knowledge and experience in higher education administration and governance. Dr. Jane K. Fernandes, University Provost, contacted all of these individuals to explain the nature of the consulting work and invite them to visit the University for interviews. Eight responded and were subsequently invited to campus for interviews between February and April of 2002. Each consultant came to Gallaudet for a full day of campus contacts, including meetings with the President, Provost, Academic Affairs Deans and Associate Deans, and Faculty Officers and Senators.

It is perhaps noteworthy that the consultant selection process itself, involving discussions about governance with eight persons from outside the University, seems to have advanced an important internal conversation among key members of the faculty and administration about Gallaudet – such that several participants remarked on the differences in the conversation that occurred from the first interview to the final one. (Ironically, as chance would have it, the two consultants finally selected occupied those first and final interview slots.)

When the interviews were completed, Provost Fernandes and President Jordan met with the Faculty Senate Officers to discuss with them the selection of a consultant to begin work in the fall. President Jordan sought to identify a consultant who could best demonstrate, to both faculty and administrators, a balanced view of Gallaudet's often disparate perspectives and needs. In order to achieve the appropriate balance, two consultants were selected and asked to work as a team. They are Dr. Larry G. Gerber, Associate Professor of History at Auburn University and Dr. Philip A. Glotzbach, Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Redlands. (See Appendix 2)

In addition to his continuing experience as a faculty member, and former department and University Senate chair at Auburn University, Dr. Gerber brings considerable experience in working with the AAUP in both regional and national settings. He has chaired the AAUP national Committee on College and University Government and now serves as first vice president of AAUP. For fifteen years, Dr. Glotzbach was a member of the faculty at Denison University (in philosophy) and there served as a department chair, a program co-director, Chair of the Senate, and in various other governance capacities. In 1992 he was named Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Redlands and in 1998 became VPAA. He has been active in the American Conference of Academic Deans, having served on its Board of Directors and as Chair of that Board. The consultants have made numerous presentations at conferences on university governance and administration. Although interviewed and selected separately, the two consultants were asked and agreed to work together as a team.

In undertaking this assignment, the consultants agreed to “conduct an assessment of shared governance as it currently exists at Gallaudet” to be based on both an analysis of documents (especially, the *Faculty Guidelines* and the *Faculty By-Laws*) and personal interaction with members of the Gallaudet University community. The consultants also agreed to “identify areas that they believe may be problematic” and “identify three or four of the most problematic issues that, if resolved, would have the most positive impact on governance.” The consultants undertook to “work with the faculty and administration...to develop possible options for resolving the prominent issues, incorporating comparative data from other universities.” Finally, the consultants agreed to produce “a comprehensive report . . . summarizing the assessment data, analysis, possible resolutions, and recommendations for action, which have been developed through a collaborative process, facilitated by the consultants, involving the faculty and administration.” Throughout this process, the consultants’ efforts have been directed consistently toward helping the Gallaudet faculty and administration work together to achieve a shared understanding of the difficulties they face and then to develop collaborative solutions to those problems.

The present follow-up report to the MSA builds upon a working draft that the consultants prepared in late January 2003 (See Appendix 6) to facilitate productive discussion and action on governance matters by the Gallaudet University community. The original draft offered some preliminary observations and recommendations based on two campus visits (subsequent to last Spring’s interviews): the first, in mid-September 2002 (See Appendix 4), coincided with the Gallaudet Stakeholders' Conference conducted by the Kaludis consulting group as part of a more general campus climate study (see below); the second, towards the end of October 2002 (See Appendix 5), allowed for additional fact-finding conversations with members of both the faculty and administration. After the preparation and distribution of the preliminary report, the consultants returned to campus in early February 2003 (See Appendix 7) to meet with the Governance Working Group that had been established as an outgrowth of the campus climate study.

During their several visits to Gallaudet, the consultants repeatedly commented on how impressed they were that a pervasive commitment to mission – to being the principal academic entity devoted primarily to meeting the educational needs of the national and international deaf community – remained a major strength of Gallaudet University. In their preliminary report, they observed:

The members of the faculty, administration, and staff alike appear united in their passionate commitment to Gallaudet's educational mission, a mission that focuses ultimately on the academic and personal success of Gallaudet's students. At the Stakeholders' Conference not only were students included as full participants but they also were accorded full respect and participative status. This spirit of inclusion and, again, commitment to mission energizes the Gallaudet community and would be a source of envy at many other institutions. It represents a primary source of strength that should always be celebrated (as it frequently was) and that in the end will enable the Gallaudet community to overcome whatever issues now confront it.

CAMPUS CLIMATE STUDY

In parallel to the selection of the external governance consultants, the University engaged Kaludis Consulting to facilitate a University-wide discussion of the campus climate involving all sectors of the immediate Gallaudet community. This process involved a series of discussions, including most importantly a three-day Stakeholder Conference on September 23-25, 2002 that considered not only matters of direct campus concern but also environmental features that in both the near term and over time may well lead to fundamental changes in the deaf population primarily served by Gallaudet and hence in the University itself. This Conference was preceded by a campus-wide survey developed by Kaludis that asked respondents to identify both positive aspects of Gallaudet's culture as well as issues of concern. As indicated above, the governance consultants were able to attend this conference and in so doing gained additional insight into the workings of this highly unique University. The Stakeholder Conference resulted in the creation of eight separate working groups to address issues that had been identified as of highest priority to the community. Initially, one of these working bodies was to be a Management/Governance working group to consider a range of issues implied by its title. Subsequently, the President decided to separate this body into two working groups, with the governance consultants charged to assist the governance sub-committee (See Appendix 5). The consultants met with this group in early February, and it has now begun a formal review of various aspects of the governance system at Gallaudet.

CAMPUS GOVERNANCE WORKSHOPS

Independent of the selection of governance consultants and the campus climate study, the President and the Executive Committee of the Gallaudet AAUP chapter had been in conversation regarding the process by which the President had appointed the current Provost and other issues and agreed to hold a shared governance workshop involving participants from the Gallaudet community and from off campus. That workshop, which was held on May 1, 2002, was co-sponsored by the Gallaudet AAUP Chapter, the Office of the Provost, and the Office of the President, and included representatives from the AAUP, the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities, and the American Council on Education (See Appendix 3).

A future governance workshop involving members of the board of trustees, administrators, and faculty officers, as well as Drs. Gerber and Glotzbach, is being planned for May 2003.

CHALLENGES TO EFFECTIVE SHARED GOVERNANCE IDENTIFIED BY CONSULTANTS

In their preliminary report, the consultants identified a number of challenges to effective shared governance that went beyond the challenges identified by the MSA evaluation team. The consultants' report discussed six areas of concern:

1. Mistrust and lack of mutual respect:

It is true that both mistrust and lack of mutual respect are present in various places throughout the faculty and administration – not everywhere and with everyone, but sufficiently so that this issue needs to be named and acknowledged. Those faculty members who express mistrust for the administration typically identify past actions with which they disagree or that they believe were taken without sufficient consultation. Nevertheless, most faculty members seemed to attribute good will to members of the administration and expressed approval for many actions that have been taken in the recent past. Even so, a strong sense of mistrust directed toward “the administration” does remain, and again was frequently associated with specific decisions or actions taken in the past.

Administrative distrust towards some members of the faculty also was in evidence upon occasion, and in a parallel way was typically tied to specific instances such as an individual's views (expressed in a conversation) having been misrepresented to a broader audience. Although no administrator expressed disrespect for members of the faculty, some faculty members indicated that they thought that the behavior of administrators on occasion conveyed such disrespect.

Having said this, we should emphasize that these attributions – whatever their validity or lack of validity – may reflect certain habitual patterns of behavior that have grown up over time and have become invisible to the individuals who display them. Moreover, the vast majority of our conversation with both faculty members and administrators emphasized the intentions of all players to improve the present situation.

2. Failures of communication:

As noted, problems regarding trust frequently feed upon and exacerbate problems of communication. We did hear complaints that communications regarding governance are not always accurate and that distortions of people's positions in reports of conversations impede collaboration and effective decision-making. These complaints tended to come more from the administration than from the faculty.

3. Continuing concern in some quarters with past administrative decisions (some going back several years):

Much of the faculty conversation at the Senate Meeting on September 23rd did focus on the past – the decision to close Northwest Campus, the appointment of the Provost, etc. Related to the previous point, many of the concerns raised by members of the faculty about past administrative actions related to a perceived unwillingness of the administration to consult and collaborate fully with the faculty. For their part, administrators frequently believed that what was being said either misrepresented the actual record or omitted key facts.

It is important that a community maintain its history and that it do so accurately. At the same time, in the context of shared governance, it is crucial that conversations ultimately focus on actions to be taken for the betterment of the institution. Conversations that simply revisit the past and keep alive feelings of injury or betrayal related to earlier events can deflect attention, time, and effort from the task of making things better in the future. Such conversations can take on a life of their own in the narrative structure of communal discourse.

4. Uncertainty about the specific roles and responsibilities of administrators within the new administrative structure (e.g., associate deans), along with a related concern over accountability:

Questions and concerns were expressed on some occasions by members of the faculty regarding the outcome of recent administrative restructuring – particularly with regard to the roles and responsibilities of the Associate Deans and department chairs. Some members of the faculty broached the topic of term limits for administrators.

5. Concerns were expressed both by some faculty and administrators that the Faculty Senate does not devote as much time and energy to substantive educational matters (e.g., curriculum reform) as it does to more strictly internal procedural issues relating to the operation of the governance system. Although no one contended that the Senate completely ignored issues relating to the educational mission of the institution, a significant number of faculty and administrators voiced concerns that such issues received too little attention at Senate meetings.

6. Barriers to participation in governance caused by the complexity of Faculty Senate and University committee structure and nomenclature:

Attitudes towards the formal governance system reported by faculty members who have been active in that system differed significantly from attitudes reported by faculty

colleagues who had not been so heavily involved. In this case, frustration over lack of broader participation expressed by those more heavily involved was counterbalanced by frustrations concerning the difficulty of understanding the system, of gaining entrance to it, and of affecting change once one had become a participant.

The record does need to indicate that concern regarding the existing formal governance system – the Senate, the system of faculty committees and councils, the University Faculty body itself, and administrator appointed task forces and committees – is both broad and deep. The University Faculty *Rainbow of Rosters* describes the array of *ad hoc* University committees and task forces that exists in addition to the standing committees of the Senate as “so overwhelming that not even the most astute governance mavens on campus know who is who or what is what.” People did report an inability to understand what the different committees did, and statements were made to the effect that attempts to participate led to so much frustration that the individual simply gave up.

Related to these concerns about difficulty of participation was a broadly reported sense that the system resulted in a relatively small group of faculty members doing the majority of governance work. The record contradicts this perception in part because the governance system itself does require the participation of many faculty members on both standing and *ad hoc* committees (the latter created primarily by the administration). In that sense, many people do participate in governance. Nevertheless, individuals who care about the University and seemed to be willing to participate in governance did indicate that they found the existing structure to be an impediment.

RECOMMENDATIONS BY CONSULTANTS FOR ONGOING EFFORTS TO IMPROVE GOVERNANCE

After identifying, in general terms, existing obstacles or challenges to effective shared governance at Gallaudet, the consultants in January outlined four basic areas for the Gallaudet community (and, more specifically, the Governance Working Group) to focus on in the coming months.

1. Enhancing trust:

As everyone well knows, there is no silver bullet that can address these issues in a discrete process or in the short term. Establishing (re-establishing) trust requires continued efforts on all sides over a protracted period of time. It helps for the community to remind itself as frequently as possible of its commitment to a shared mission. As noted above, we believe the Gallaudet community is especially fortunate, in comparison to many other colleges and universities, in having a clear sense of its mission. It also helps to reaffirm perceptions of good will and to acknowledge and reinforce (through praise) actions that contribute to trust (such as following through on a commitment).

Although no one single action can by itself establish trust, we believe that successful efforts by faculty and administration to implement even relatively minor changes to enhance the effectiveness of governance can help build momentum for broader

improvements. It is, therefore, appropriate to try to identify specific actions on which widespread agreement can be reached as starting points for improving the overall climate of trust.

2. Improving communication and clarifying roles in governance system:

As noted above, effective governance depends on both good communication and a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the various players in the governance system. There appears to be general agreement at Gallaudet that the recent reorganization of the administrative structure has left some uncertainty about the role of deans, associate deans, and department chairs. In our observation of other institutions, the problem of such lack of clarity often seems to accompany any administrative restructuring, no matter how clearly and distinctly the new roles are described in documents. What matters most to people who deal with administrative offices is how their issues are addressed. Nuances of structure (and structural change) frequently escape notice until someone has a problem that forces him or her to deal with the administration. At that moment, confusion over where to go or just who is in charge of what can arise – not because the new structure is not clear in some abstract sense, but because the person had been used to dealing with a particular office in a particular way in the past (an option precluded by the new system) or because the person had not understood the articulation of the new structure in a way that made sense of her or his needs. In any event, clarity of expression needs to be joined with training of support staff so that they can answer questions and quickly direct people where they need to go.

On the faculty side, and particularly at the departmental level, department chairs need to understand the new structure so that they can work effectively in it and so that they can help their colleagues do so as well. Devoting extra attention to facilitating this knowledge among chairs may help.

Another issue involving communication and clarification of roles is the appropriate role (if any) for administrators (including the president and provost) at Senate meetings and in the deliberations of Senate committees and councils. Are there ways of fostering improved communication and consultation between faculty and administrators without compromising the principle that faculty should retain primary responsibility for the academic program? This question raises possible structural issues, which are further addressed below.

All parties to the conversation – faculty and administrators alike – need to acknowledge the larger issues relating to communication and redouble their efforts to be clear and precise in their interactions. This does not necessarily mean that the volume of communications should be increased. Indeed, the consultants heard some commentary to the effect that the sheer volume of messages being sent throughout the Gallaudet community may be part of the problem. So part of the solution may be to focus communications more precisely. Making communication itself a topic of communication may help. It may help for people to give one another permission to revisit a particular interchange that led to misunderstanding to attempt to see just what went wrong and to seek structural ways to improve the effectiveness of communication.

3. Addressing structural issues within the formal governance system itself:

This issue, in particular, pertains directly to the charge of the Governance Working Group. We need to learn just what items that group has already placed on its agenda, or to see what items it will identify as most important.

At some point questions of system complexity and nomenclature deserve attention. It might be a good exercise simply to go through the existing system of both standing faculty committees and ad hoc University committees to determine if there is unnecessary duplication of effort and to replace the current designations (“Committee A,” etc.) with more descriptive names. (The national AAUP has just done this with its own committees.) A more descriptive nomenclature would facilitate understanding by members of the faculty not already familiar with the system. More importantly, that discussion itself necessarily would focus attention on the functions of the various committees. Looking at those functions could lead to new ways of envisioning the structure either in part or in whole.

Most systems of governance committees cover a set of standard academic functions:

- curriculum (and, increasingly, assessment),
- academic standards (sometimes included with curriculum in one body),
- faculty personnel policies,
- faculty review, promotion, and tenure,
- planning, budget, and resource allocation,
- a larger deliberative body – e.g., a senate or an assembly of the whole,
- grievances.

When they met with the Governance Working Group during their on-campus visit in February, the consultants reviewed these categories with the participants and facilitated a discussion that considered how the components of the present Gallaudet governance system related to these more abstract categories. That discussion provided a starting point for further discussions by the Working Group concerning possible changes in the structure of the governance system.

As the AAUP *Redbook* makes clear, it is important for the governance system to be clear about when the decision of a committee is determinative and when it constitutes a recommendation (either to another governance body or to the administration). Knowing just what authority a given body retains is often crucial to the ability of its members to function effectively and to the capacity of everyone else to understand the meaning of the body’s actions. Both of these considerations are important to the well-functioning of shared governance and should be included in the review of the Gallaudet governance system.

A number of people with whom the consultants have spoken, both faculty and administrators, have expressed concerns about the delays created by a system in which decisions by the Faculty Senate must be reaffirmed by the University Faculty as a body. A review of the relation between the Senate and the University Faculty would seem a useful undertaking.

Another issue of equal importance is the tendency of certain structural features to foster collaboration between the faculty and administration or to impede it. Structures that place administrators and faculty members together in the same room to deliberate and jointly craft decisions tend to foster a spirit of collaboration. Systems that have faculty committees making decisions that they then deliver to administrators (who have not been involved in the process until that point) tend to foster a spirit of division. This is not a hard and fast rule, and there can be creative ways to encourage collaboration in any system. But this idea can serve as a useful heuristic, a way of asking questions about governance structures that can lead to new ways of envisioning the shared work of the faculty and administration. The existing Gallaudet governance system tends to isolate faculty and administrative decision-making. Finding creative ways to rethink the membership of governance bodies to bring faculty leaders and administrators together at the beginning of a governance process (as opposed to doing so at the end of a process) would go a long way towards overcoming some of the most important problems that have been identified.

Fostering wide participation within the governance system and also insuring the responsiveness of those in positions of influence within the system, whether they be faculty or administrators, are likely to enhance the effectiveness of an institution's decision-making processes. In comparison to most other institutions, Gallaudet has had an unusual degree of continuity in various leadership roles. While there are obvious advantages to such continuity, the Gallaudet community may want to discuss possible structural reforms to encourage wider participation in leadership positions in the governance structure and to assure that those serving in administrative positions (department chair and above) undergo formal review procedures at regularly stated intervals.

4. Shifting focus from the past:

It would be helpful for all parties to the governance conversation to adopt a treaty acknowledging that the past *is* past and that references to the past should always be made in the service of asking how to improve the future. The University is where it is at present. It faces numerous challenges (and the challenges related to governance are certainly less important than are some of the external ones). Time and energy will be best spent if they are focused on specific decisions that need to be made to make things better.

SPECIFIC INDICATIONS OF PROGRESS IN IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SHARED GOVERNANCE

Since the visit of the MSA evaluation team in 2001, Gallaudet's efforts to enhance the effectiveness of shared governance and to improve the campus climate have already begun to yield specific results. The most significant of these has been the successful revision of the *Guidelines of the University Faculty*, including an effort to somewhat streamline the process for making changes in the future. Changes in this critically important compilation of faculty personnel policies were developed in a collaborative spirit between the faculty and

administration. While the drafting process was a lengthy one, the final document was accepted by Faculty Senate in late October and then adopted with only minor changes by the University Faculty in early December. At its February 7, 2003 meeting, the Board of Trustees approved the revised guidelines, with the exception of one section regarding Board procedures, which it requested the Faculty Senate revise and resubmit.

The successful revision of the *Guidelines* has been viewed as a positive step forward in the implementation of effective shared governance by all those involved. Board action at its February meeting was also accompanied by what faculty and administration agreed was a healthy and open discussion at an informal gathering of faculty, administrators, and board members of the issues raised by preliminary report of the governance consultants.

Another positive step that will enhance the effectiveness of governance at Gallaudet involves efforts now being undertaken by the Provost to hold meetings involving department chairs, associate deans, and deans to clarify the responsibilities and roles of administrators in the relatively recently restructured University organization.

Finally, as of late March when this report is being written, although the Governance Working Group has not yet had time to make specific recommendations, proposed changes to the *By Laws of the University Faculty* will be discussed at the April meeting of the University Faculty. While it is uncertain what the outcome of these discussions will be, it is noteworthy that among the issues to be considered will be proposals for eliminating one standing committee (out of seven now existing).

Reform of the governance system, broadly conceived, is certainly now a key item on the agenda of the University community. Both the faculty and the administration are devoting considerable time and energy to a good-faith effort to address the general concerns raised in the original Middle States' report and the more specific issues that have been identified through the consultative process described in this report. Overall, the University has made notable progress towards addressing those issues in a relatively short period of time. In doing so, we believe that the University has responded both to the letter and the spirit of the Middle States' recommendations.

APPENDIX GUIDE

Appendix 1: Annual Institutional Profile

Appendix 2: Curriculum vitae for Dr. Larry Gerber and Dr. Philip A. Glotzbach

Appendix 3: May 2002 shared governance workshop agenda and participants

Appendix 4: September 2002 visit itinerary for Drs. Gerber and Glotzbach

September 24, 2002 University Faculty Advisory Sent by Chair of the Faculty after Senate meeting of September 23, 2003

October 1, 2003 Memorandum from University President I. King Jordan describing the results of the Stakeholders Conference and announcing the formation of eight working groups, one of which is on Management & Governance

Appendix 5: October 2002 visit itinerary for Drs. Gerber and Glotzbach

Memorandum from Drs. Gerber and Glotzbach to the Gallaudet faculty seeking their input into improvements in governance

October 23, 2002 email from Kaludis suggesting that the Management & Governance working group be divided into two with Drs. Gerber and Glotzbach focusing on consultation in governance. This suggestion was accepted.

Appendix 6: Preliminary report prepared by Drs. Gerber and Glotzbach

Appendix 7: February 2003 visit itinerary for Drs. Gerber and Glotzbach