

Preliminary Report
of the
Senate Ad Hoc Committee
on
Faculty & Staff Representation
on the
Board of Trustees

Submitted on March 9, 2020

By way of University Senate Agenda Committee

To

Terek Mahfouz, Chair & Bethany Allen, Secretary, University Senate

For Distribution

To

Senate membership

Chair, Faculty Council

Chair, University [Professional Personnel] Council

President, Staff Council

Submitted by

Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty & Staff Membership, Board of Trustees:

Jim Flowers

Diana Saiki

Christopher Airriess

Bryan Byers

Ronald Kovac

Bruce Frankel, Author

Contents

Cover Letter	3
Abstract	4
Introduction	7
Resolutions.....	9
A. <i>Senate Resolution Amending Membership on Board of Trustees 3-26-2020</i>	9
B. <i>Faculty Council Resolution Amending Membership on Board of Trustees 3-21-2019</i>	10
Faculty Voices	11
Staff Voices.....	13
Cornell [2012] & AGB [2010] Studies of Faculty on Governing Boards	15
Appendices.....	16
A. <i>Missives of Provost Rivera-Mills 10-4-2019 & Terek Mahfouz 10-25-2019</i>	16
B. <i>Board of Regents NKU</i>	18
C. <i>Statistical Board Compositions BSU & Other Indiana Universities & ICHE</i>	19
BSU	19
Indiana University	20
Indiana State University	21
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana	23
Purdue University	24
Indiana Commission on Higher Education	25
D. <i>Meeting Board of Trustees & Indiana General Assembly</i>	27
E. <i>Draft Letter to Trustees</i>	29
Current Indiana Code:	30
Proposed Indiana Code:	31
Board of Trustees By-Laws Amendment.....	31
F. <i>Survey Results Faculty</i>	32
G. <i>Survey Results Staff</i>	41
H. <i>Cornell Study on Faculty Representation on the Board of Directors [2012]</i>	57
I. <i>Middletown [Roosevelt University] Advocacy</i>	66
J. <i>AGB Trusteeship Study [2010] of Faculty & Students on Boards</i>	70
K. <i>Indiana University Policy on Faculty Participation</i>	72

Cover Letter

Tarek Mahfouz, Chairperson
University Senate

Dr. Mahfouz,

An ad hoc committee established by the Ball State University Faculty Council, in consultation with President Mearns, surveyed BSU faculty in October, 2018, in order to determine the degree to which faculty “support the addition to the Ball State University Board of Trustees of a full-time BSU faculty member as a voting trustee.” There was a higher-than-anticipated response rate of 47.5%, and 96.4% of 495 responses were in favor of that addition.

The committee reported back to Faculty Council and was reformed in 2019 by the Senate and charged with evaluating including a Board of Trustees full-time staff or professional personnel position. Working with the Chairperson of University Council and the President of Staff Council, a second survey was conducted in January 2020, this time of 1,577 professional personnel and staff personnel at the university. There were 657 (41.7%) responses. Of these, 95.1% indicated they “support the addition to the Ball State University Board of Trustees of a full-time, non-faculty BSU employee as a voting trustee.” Those who supported this were asked, “Excluding faculty, administrative personnel (e.g., vice presidents, deans), and members of a collective bargaining unit or union, which of the following categories should be included in the pool from which this trustee would be chosen?” Most of these respondents indicated preference that this individual be chosen from a pool including both staff personnel and professional personnel rather than just one of these two categories. Related comments were solicited from respondents on each of these surveys.

The committee also was charged to “Evaluate building a coalition of support from other higher education institutions in Indiana.” However, the committee did not want to contact those outside our university before contacting our own Board of Trustees. Instead, the hope is that the Board of Trustees will consider the benefits of increasing board membership by the addition of a tenth and an eleventh voting board member from the faculty and from the staff personnel or professional personnel. Such a decision would be up to the Board of Trustees and the state legislators, and at this point, after reporting back to the Senate and the President, the committee believes the next appropriate step is to contact the Board of Trustees. If the Board of Trustees does not wish to pursue or at least explore this issue, it would be improper for the committee to attempt to build a coalition of support. As the committee has been addressing this initiative for some time, we suggest that it would be beneficial if we could respond directly to questions trustees may ask.

Therefore, we request that the University Senate inform President Mearns of the findings, and that Senate Chairperson and a representative of the committee attend a Board of Trustees meeting with this item on the board’s agenda.

Abstract

According to the American Association of University Professors, over 16% of governing boards have faculty representation. Over 96% and over 95% of surveyed faculty and staff, respectively, at Ball State endorse the voting membership on the Board of their constituencies.

Northern Kentucky University, with presidential ties to BSU, has these constituencies elect their voting representative to the Board of Regents, with success as fiduciary agents.

Studies conducted by Cornell researchers [Ehrenberg, et. al] and reported in the American Association of University Professors [AAUP] and a sampling of this study in the publication *Trusteeship* during 2010-2012 revealed nation surveys of faculty representation on their governing boards. In 2010, AGB *Trusteeship* reported 181 [26.2%] institutions of 691 reporting institutions with faculty representation on the governing board, and with a majority [100, 55.2%] as a voting member:

Categories by <i>Trusteeship</i> 2010	Independent [private]		Public	
	%	#	%	#
Voting Member	14.9	74	13.3	26
Non-voting Member	14.1	70	9.7	19
Sub-Total Members	27.8	138	22.1	43
# Institutions Reporting		496		195

AAUP, as reported in 2013 and based on the 2010 *Trusteeship* survey, found that 60% of representatives were selected by faculty election. Another 17% were ex officio trustees (often by virtue of their role in the faculty's governing body), and 13% were nominated by the faculty but subject to approval by the board. The remaining 10% were appointed in other ways.

There were factors in limiting the influence of such faculty. One, the study found that the absence of informal contacts between the faculty representative and the other board members was critical in restricting effectiveness.

In related research, Ronald Ehrenberg and colleagues reported in a 2012 article in the *Economics of Education Review* that female faculty trustees significantly influence the rate at which academic institutions diversify their faculty across gender lines only after women make up 25-33 % of the board's members. With faculty members constituting such small percentages of total board membership, one might expect faculty board members to have relatively limited influence on board decisions.

The influence of faculty board members may also be diminished because of their relatively short term lengths. Short terms were the norm among respondents, 66 percent of whom reported that they served for less time than other board members did. The institutions in the Ehrenberg [Cornell University] sample had average faculty term lengths of 2.24 years (2.06 and 2.37 years for public and private institutions, respectively), while the AGB's 2010 survey reported an average non-faculty trustee term length of six years at public institutions and three to four years at private institutions.

Although a majority of faculty trustees serves shorter terms than the other members of their boards, eligibility for reappointment could potentially compensate for any diminished influence. In Ehrenberg's sample, 76.6 percent of faculty trustees were eligible for reappointment. Furthermore, it was more

common for faculty members to be ineligible for reappointment because of a faculty governance body's policy than because of a board's policy: 17.8 percent were ineligible for reappointment because of a faculty governance body's policy, while only 5.6 percent were ineligible because of a board's policy.

The standard term length on the BSU Board is 4 years and 2 years, as per gubernatorial appointment and for non-student and student members, respectively. Although recently chaired by a female member, there is board underrepresentation of female and minority members. Given the aging of scholarly research on this topic, much may have changed in the past 8-10 years.

Nevertheless, currently we found no university in Indiana with either faculty or staff representation on its governing boards, although Indiana University does have a policy encouraging faculty leadership participation in board meetings. This report's initiative would blaze a trail through the inertia of tradition and Indiana politics.

However and instructively, the State Code establishes Search & Screen Committees nominating candidates to the Governor for appointment at Purdue and ISU, and ITCC establishes its central board membership through its regional boards and six [6] functional areas of service. Further, the Indiana Commission on Higher Education [ICHE] accommodates a student and full-time faculty member on its 14-member board. Its chair appoints a ten (10) member nominating committee as follows:

(1) Five (5) students from state educational institutions, with not more than one (1) student from any one (1) state educational institution.

(2) Five (5) full-time faculty members from state educational institutions, with not more than one (1) full-time faculty member from any one (1) educational institution.

Our review of the Indiana Code, which is particular to each state-sponsored university, found the following methods of populating the boards of trustees:

	BSU	IU	PU	ISU	ITCC
Membership	9: 6 at large/ 2 alumni/ 1 student	9: 5 at-large; 3 alumni; 1 student	10:	9: 6 at large; 2 alumni; 1 student	1 each region + 1 by 1 of 6 functional areas; separate membership regional boards
Terms in Years	4; 2	3; 2	3; 2	4; 2	3
Selection	Gubernatorial	Alumni/ Gubernatorial	Alumni [3]/ Gubernatorial [7]	Nominated Alumni/ Search & Screen Committee of ISU Gubernatorial appoints	Regional Boards
Requisites	None	Diverse residency	All alumni & members AA; 1 School Agric; 1 resident Allen Co.; Search & Screen Committee of PU	At least 1 female	6 functional areas: manuf/commerce/ labor/ agric/ econ dev needs/ educ del system

Faculty Council and the University Senate have both resolved to recommend such an initiative for faculty and are presented with the same for staff at the Senate's March 26, 2020 meeting.

Provost Rivera-Mills has proposed that BSU enjoin other Indiana universities in a similar cause, and the ad hoc committee shall so confer with the Trustees and members of the Indiana General Assembly on the same during April, and report back to the Senate on this matter and others yet to be resolved, such as the method of appointment.

Of those commenting on a method in the surveys conducted in October 2019 and January 2020, a democratic determination by the respective constituencies of faculty and staff was the choice universally, in contrast to a gubernatorial appointment.

The cause of such representation has been amplified by the respective surveys. That is, better communication of these two highly informed and valued perspective constituencies with the Trustees, and consequentially better governance. That is also a better message of representation in the external affairs and public relations of the University. The Appendices presents the full results of both faculty and staff surveys, as well as their synopsis.

Introduction

In September 2018, the Faculty Council resolved to establish an ad hoc committee to investigate and report on the Council endorsed concept of voting representation on the Board of Trustees by a member of the full-time faculty. Two volunteers emerged in Jim Flowers and Bruce Frankel, and later joined by Diana Saiki, Christopher Airriess, Bryan Byers, and Ronald Kovac. Professor Flowers has served as chair.

The work centered on the following tasks:

- A. Review of the Indiana Code with regard to the membership of BSU's board and of other state university boards
- B. Review of faculty representation on other university boards throughout the nation
- C. Studies conducted by the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *American Association of University Professors*, and other advocacy and research groups on this topic
- D. Survey of full-time faculty at BSU as to their support for the proposal

In October 2018, a survey was performed in order to determine the degree to which faculty "support the addition to the Ball State University Board of Trustees of a full-time BSU faculty member as a voting trustee." There was a higher-than-anticipated response rate of 47.5%, and 96.4% of 495 responses were in favor of that addition.

In March 2019, Faculty Council passed a resolution of support and encouraged University Council to add its voice for a professional personnel member as a voting member of the Board.

The matter then was sent to the University Senate, which approved by resolution and forwarded to President Mearns for action. The President thereafter referred the matter to Provost Susanna Rivera-Mills, who referred the matter back to the Senate, requesting reconsideration of [a] professional staff representation on the Board, and [b] the ad hoc committee's leadership in organizing a consortium of state universities in similar actions.

The ad hoc committee responded by conducting a second survey of professional and staff personnel [excluding only those represented by labor union]. The results of the January 2020 were 657 responses and a 95.1% approval.

The chart below enumerates University employees by category, as effective 2016. Total staff is 2,139, compared to faculty at 1,022. Excluding administrative staff that includes the President, the cabinet, deans and departmental chairs, staff is at 1,872:

1 rep.	0 rep.	1 representative, excluding as represented by union					2 reps.
Faculty Council	President → Unit Chairs	University Council	Staff Council				
Faculty	Administrative Staff	Professional Staff	Technical	Clerical	Skilled	Service	Total
1,022	267	604	252	407	113	496	3,161

The Appendices recites responders' comments on both surveys and the recited resolutions and correspondence.

The ad hoc committee has deliberated at several meeting to reject the proposal to organize other Indiana Universities, to wit:

- a. The Indiana Code grants authority to each university board on an individual basis and does not pose an across-the-board endorsement
- b. It is politically unwise to pursue participation and then receive it partially, or not at all. The more effective form of leadership is to act.
- c. Nevertheless, the ad hoc committee shall schedule meetings with our representatives in the General Assembly, with the BSU Board, and with other State officials with regard to this matter and other unresolved issues, such as method of appointment, and the participation as advocates of President Mearns and other key officers.

The resolution before the Senate at its March 26, 2020 meeting is to endorse staff representation on the Board, in addition to re-affirming faculty representation, and to pursue our meetings with the Trustees and the General Assembly, which the Administration has approved¹. Thereafter, to report to the Senate with a final resolution.

¹ So received from Anita Kelsey, Senior Executive Assistant to the Board of Trustees and University President; Rebecca Rice, VP for Government Relations; refer to correspondence in Appendices

Resolutions

A. Senate Resolution Amending Membership on Board of Trustees 3-26-2020

WHEREAS in an October 2018 poll of all full-time faculty at BSU, 96% of (n=495) respondents supported “the addition to the Ball State University Board of Trustees of a full-time BSU faculty member as a voting trustee,” and

WHEREAS faculty are the prime producers of our educational, research, and service missions and, in the main serve the longest, and thus accord their perspective, and notwithstanding their devotion to a fiduciary responsibility to the institution and its sponsors, and

WHEREAS a resolution of said support passed both Faculty Council and the Senate, and

WHEREAS in a January 2020 poll of professional and staff personnel at BSU, 95% of (n=657) respondents supported “the addition to the Ball State University Board of Trustees of a full-time, non-faculty BSU employee as a voting trustee,” and

WHEREAS professional personnel and staff personnel provide a perspective on the viability, effectiveness, and efficiency of policies and programs that run the University, and notwithstanding their devotion to a fiduciary responsibility to the institution and its sponsors, and

WHEREAS with two added appointments to the Board of Trustees, there would remain an odd number of trustees, fostering majority rule, and raising the Board’s membership from nine [9] to eleven [11], and

WHEREAS the Senate ad hoc Committee on Faculty and Staff Representation on the Board of Trustees has submitted to the Senate its preliminary report awaiting a meeting with the Board of Trustees on such matters as preferred method of appointment and collaboration with other Indiana state universities on this matter, and to report again to the Senate for a final resolution with such details.

NOW THEREFORE BE RESOLVED that the Senate supports amending Indiana Code (IC 21-19-3-2) and the Ball State University Board of Trustees Bylaws:

1. To add one Ball State University Board of Trustees voting member who is a full-time BSU faculty member to serve for a standard four-year term;
2. To add one Ball State University Board of Trustees voting member who is a full-time BSU professional personnel or staff personnel and not a member of a collective bargaining unit to serve on the Board as a voting member for a standard four-year term;
3. The Senate ad hoc Committee shall report back to the Senate on the specifics of additional matters, and pending a second resolution incorporating the same, the Senate shall be presented with another opportunity to resolve this matter.

PASSED this ____26th____ day of ____March____, 2020 [pending at time of publication]

Tarek Mahfouz, Chairperson

Bethany Allen, Executive Secretary

B. Faculty Council Resolution Amending Membership on Board of Trustees 3-21-2019

WHEREAS, an October 2018 poll of all full-time faculty at BSU approved of a representative from the full-time faculty on the Board of Trustees by over 96%, and

WHEREAS, faculty are the prime producers of our educational, research, and service missions and, in the main serve the longest, and thus accord their perspective, and notwithstanding their devotion to a fiduciary responsibility to the institution and its sponsors, and

NOW THEREFORE BE RESOLVED, that the Faculty Council supports the following amendment to IC 21-19-3-2 Board of Trustees; *Membership*:

1. To add one member from full-time faculty as selected by the Faculty Council in an open, democratic election process to serve on the Board as a voting member for a four-year term [reference subsection 3-8 *Terms*]
2. Encourage the Professional Personnel Council to consider the selection of a full-time staff member in an open, democratic election process to serve also on the Board as a voting member for a four-year term, and raising the Board's membership from nine [9] to eleven [11]
3. Refer this Faculty Council resolved matter to the University Senate, President, Board and State Assembly for their consideration and positive action.

PASSED this ____21st____ day of ____March____, 2019

NOTE: The Senate version
passed with amendment
deleting #2

Yaron Ayalon, Chairperson

Bethany Allen, Executive Secretary

Faculty Voices

An online and anonymous survey of 1,041 full-time tenure line [tenured, tenure track], and non-tenure line [contract] faculty at Ball State University was conducted between October 3rd and October 16th, 2018, with the aid of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. There were **498 responses (47.8%)**. Of these 96.4% affirmed the proposal to appoint a voting representative from the full-time faculty to the Board of Trustees.

We have gleaned the comments made as part of the survey results, and find salient themes accompanied by faculty comments:

- a. To students the faculty are the leaders of the University, while reality is that while faculty are sometimes heard it is highly filtered
- *A few years ago, when former-president Ferguson rolled out a new brand, a student of mine asked, "What did faculty think of this before it came out?" and I said, "Why do you think faculty had a say?" and she said, "Because you're the heart of the university," and I laughed sort of ruefully. But of course, to *students* administrators are figureheads and faculty are in charge--mostly because we're the ones they see every day. But there's value in the connection between student and faculty; we're on the ground, so to speak. Students are the raison d'etre of the institution, and adding a faculty member to the board (in addition to the student rep) will give the board another conduit to their constituency.*
- *This has my full support. The Board of Trustees desperately needs the perspective of a member with experience in higher education as a full-time faculty member, which they currently lack. Likewise, the faculty need representation in university governance, which they also currently lack. In light of the Board's actions over the past several years, this would be a most welcome and necessary change.*
- *Two observations: (1) By state law, some key university stakeholders are already on the Board (students and alumni), which gives the Board direct access to their expertise in every Board meeting, including when the Board meets with only trustees present. Why deny the Board that same access to expertise when it comes to the faculty? (2) Trustees & other high university leaders often have to engage with audiences with which many faculty have little interaction -- political leaders, the media, the business community, and donors are some examples. This sometimes leads to Board decisions that seem to faculty to be out of step with BSU's academic mission -- & this in turn sometimes leads to faculty anger, protest, and resistance -- and so instead of moving forward efficiently to achieve important goals, the Ball State family can get divided. A faculty trustee will decrease the number of times this sort of thing happens. Trustees will have direct access to faculty input at every meeting (including meetings where only trustees are present), and faculty will be assured that their voice was one of the ones that leads to every decision. And I imagine that the faculty trustee will often be an effective advocate for the Board with the academic community.*

b. Institutional parity

- *IU and Purdue both have Board members who are elected by their constituencies (e.g. alumni, faculty, students). It is time for Ball State University to get parity on this.²*
- *A faculty member serves at the state level (i.e., ICHE); why not at the institution level?*

c. Trust in governance

- *BSU faculty understand the lived experiences of students, faculty, and staff and would provide a unique and valuable perspective on the teaching and scholarship aspects of the university. Additionally, having a faculty member on the Board may promote faculty trust and confidence in the Board of Trustees.*
 - *The senior administrators that interact with the Board are long removed from teaching, research, and service life of a faculty member. They are unaware of the morale, perspective, and aspirations of most of the faculty.*
- d. The remaining theme was on the method of selection, all favoring a democratic process by the faculty or through its Faculty Council, and not appointment by the State [Governor]
 - e. One advocated for a staff member to assume a voting seat, even though this was not the survey question
 - f. Of those opposed, the theme of conflict of interest on matters of salary and benefits emerged.

² The presence of faculty on IU and PU governing boards is a misconception, but the comment discloses perception that BSU is running behind.

Staff Voices

Positive Experience

I worked at other institution that had a representative voice from these groups and it was very powerful in the decision-making process for the Board of Trustees. A staff/non-faculty lens can help give another view to decisions and some of the broader implications of them.

Inclusive Excellence

It will help to demonstrate Ball State's commitment to inclusiveness if the Ball State University Board of Trustees was comprised of not only at-large, alumni, and student representation, but also faculty and staff. Each entity experiences Ball State's opportunities, accomplishments, challenges, and initiatives differently; therefore each entity should have a representative on the board.

Staff Morale & Public Relations as to Brand

It's a great idea that would create a positive perception and could boost employee morale, especially if staff personnel are included. I think this is a fantastic idea and provides an extra voice to important decision-making for campus. While I think professional staff (self included for full disclosure) are often provided a better understanding of machinations throughout campus and how things may or may not be related, I also think it would be a significant disservice to the many staff personnel on campus to discount them for candidacy. Additionally, there seems to be a persistent attitude shared from many staff of lacking a voice or being treated as "less than" compared to all others on campus, and excluding them might only prove to reinforce some of those attitudes. I debated recommending only staff personnel, but that could also reinforce some of those same ideas that some share. However, I would encourage for directors (and perhaps even associate directors) not be applicable for these positions—first, as they have plenty of responsibilities already in their dockets, and second, to encourage ideas and enhance perceptions of representation for those in other non-directorial roles. All said, this would be beneficial as a whole, and the idea of representation may even make the university more attractive as a destination for quality candidates searching for employment opportunities (doubly so for the faculty representation). I believe you are all on the right page and thank you for suggesting this quality proposal. (PS – This could easily be tied in as a nice campaign, presented from administration to staff as something like, "we want to be sure that when you hear our message of 'we fly,' you all are included in this statement—you are an important part of our institution and should be confident proclaiming together, 'we fly.'" Just an idea.)

Unrepresented by Superiors

As a non-exempt staff employee, our group does not really have a voice. I am confident that it is assumed that our supervisors and administration communicate everything to all of us. This is not the case. The truth is, our group is the "oil for the cogs in the wheels". Professional personnel are salary and do not have to account for anything.

Diverse Backgrounds

The board of trustees needs to be more diverse. Currently all the members are highly educated and are lawyers, presidents, CEOs, or owners of businesses. While it is important to have highly educated and successful individuals on the board, I think it is also beneficial to have individuals that do not have a college degree and that have achieved success a different way. This will bring a different perspective to issues that are

brought up. I do not feel as though the board is currently in touch with the struggles of the service, and staff employees that are living paycheck to paycheck and if there is a member of the board that is a service or staff member they can help bring ideas and solutions to the table from a different perspective than what is currently there.

Abets Implementation of Board Decisions

I think getting more direct input from the staff will help by providing better information on the implementation of Board decisions.

Concern with Conflict of Interest

I do not support the addition of a faculty seat to the Board of Trustees. If a seat is identified for faculty, a separate seat should be developed for staff to ensure representation and motto university governance structures. Moreover, if there were faculty/staff seats, I have concerns over the conflicts of interest that would exist for these two board members. How can an individual pledge fiduciary responsibility and not at all consider their own individual circumstances as employees at ball state including but not limited to merit raises, tenure and promotion, etc.

Cornell [2012] & AGB [2010] Studies of Faculty on Governing Boards

During the 2011–12 academic year, a group of faculty and student researchers at the Cornell Higher Education Research Institute (CHERI) gathered information on which public and private institutions had faculty members on boards of trustees. The results were reported in the May-June issue of *Academe* as published by AAUP. The article is found in the Appendices.

A 2010 article in *Trusteeship*, the magazine of the AGB, reported the findings of an AGB survey on board membership, which indicate that a growing number of boards of trustees are involving faculty members as either voting or nonvoting members. Voting faculty members served on the boards of trustees of 14.9 percent of private institutions and 13.3 percent of public institutions. Another 14.1 percent of the private institutions and 9.7 percent of the public institutions had nonvoting faculty members on their boards.

College and University Governing Boards with Faculty Members (2010)

	Independent		Public	
	%	#	%	#
Voting Member	14.9	74	13.3	26
Non-voting Member	14.1	70	9.7	19
Voting and/or Non-voting Member	27.8	138	22.1	43
Number of institutions reporting		496		195

College and University Governing Boards with Student Members (2010)

	Independent		Public	
	%	#	%	#
Voting Member	8.5	42	50.3	98
Non-voting Member	12.5	62	28.2	55
Voting and/or Non-voting Member	20.2	100	70.8	138
Number of institutions reporting		496		195

Appendices

A. Missives of Provost Rivera-Mills 10-4-2019 & Terek Mahfouz 10-25-2019

I am returning this resolution to the Senate for further consideration and revision for several reasons.

First, the Senate should consider whether the governing statute should be amended to add two additional representatives – a full-time faculty member **and** a full-time staff or professional administrator. While the faculty play a very important role in achieving our mission, our staff and professional administrators also play a very important role. And if the rationale for the current resolution is to ensure that the Board has representation from and receives the informed perspective from all constituencies, President Mearns and I believe that our staff and professional administrators should be respected and heard.

Second, and on a related note, if the governing statute is amended to add only one additional member, then the Board would consist of 10 members. It would be ill advised to have a governing board with an even number of members.

Third, President Mearns and I believe that the only possible way to persuade the General Assembly to amend the governing statute for our University is if the General Assembly were persuaded to make a comparable amendment to the governing statutes for all of the other public universities in Indiana. Therefore, we urge the Senate to seek similar resolutions from the comparable governance bodies at the other Indiana public universities.

Fourth, and finally, the President and I recommend that you directly contact the Governor's office and the leadership in the General Assembly to urge your elected representatives to support the necessary amendments to the governing statutes.

Respectfully,

Susana Rivera-Mills
Provost

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jim Flowers
Department of Educational Studies

FROM: Tarek Mahfouz, Chairperson
2019-20 University Senate

RE: Ad Hoc Committee - Faculty Trustee Position

DATE: October 25, 2019

This letter is to inform you of the structure of the Ad Hoc committee for the Board of Trustees membership. The Senate Executive Committee members have discussed the issue and decided that it is best to assign this responsibility to the original ad hoc committee that drafted the resolution. Thus, it is with great pleasure and confidence in the ability of the committee that I am sending you this letter to inform you of reinstating the original ad hoc committee, for this year 2019-2020, under your leadership. This decision has been conveyed to all senators in the recent senate meeting that was held on Thursday October 3, 2019. In addition, an invitation to all interested members from all councils have been announced indicating that any interested member in joining the ad hoc committee reach out to you. It is your prerogative to reach out and/or add any members to the ad hoc committee as you see appropriate.

To that end, the charge of the ad hoc committee is to

- (1) Evaluate including a BoT full-time staff or professional administrator position, in addition to the full-time faculty position, and augmenting the resolution in that manner.
- (2) Evaluate building a coalition of support from other higher education institutions in Indiana. It is believed that such support, whether through initiating similar resolutions in these institutions or by documented support letters, would facilitate persuading the General Assembly to amend the governing statute for Ball State University.
- (3) Draft a new resolution after addressing the aforementioned items.
- (4) Provide periodic reports to University Senate in person or via a written correspondence.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Tarek Mahfouz
Chairperson, 2019-20 University Senate

B. Board of Regents NKU

Kentucky law (Section 164.321(7)(a)) refers to membership on Northern Kentucky University's Board of Regents [President Mearns's previous institution] as in particular to faculty and staff voting representation:

"The nonteaching personnel member in a comprehensive university shall be any full-time staff member excluding the president, vice presidents, academic deans, and academic department chairpersons. He or she shall represent all nonteaching university employees including, but not limited to, building facilities and clerical personnel. The member shall be elected by secret ballot by the nonteaching employees..."

Northern Kentucky University Board of Regents

Authority: KRS 164.321

Status: Active

Term: 6 years

Description: The NKU Board of Regents is made up of eight members appointed by the Governor and three other members, including a teaching faculty representative, a nonteaching employee representative and the student body president. The terms are for six years.

Composition: 8 members appointed by the Governor. No more than 2 members shall be from the same county. Appointments shall reflect the proportional representation of the 2 leading political parties; reflect proportional representation of the minority racial composition of the Commonwealth; and reflect, inasmuch as possible, equal representation of the 2 sexes. The gubernatorial appointments may include 1 graduate of the respective institution who resides outside the State. 1 member of teaching faculty elected by faculty body, 1 university non-teaching personnel member elected by the non-teaching employees, and 1 student member, that member shall be student body president if such is permanent resident of Kentucky. Members shall serve no more than 2 full consecutive terms.

Compensation: Expenses

Meeting Schedule: Quarterly or as often as necessary.

Number of Members: 11

Needs Senate Confirmation: No

Address:

Nunn Drive Highland Heights, KY 41099
Highland Heights, KY

County: Campbell

Website: <http://president.nku.edu/regents.html>

C. [Statistical Board Compositions BSU & Other Indiana Universities & ICHE](#)

A compilation from the Indiana Code of the composition of major universities as to boards of trustees reveals none with representation from either faculty or staff. However, the Indiana Commission on Higher Education's 14 members includes one student and one full-time faculty from state institutions. Those are screened by a ten (10) member nominating committee as follows:

(1) Five (5) students from state educational institutions, with not more than one (1) student from any one (1) state educational institution.

(2) Five (5) full-time faculty members from state educational institutions, with not more than one (1) full-time faculty member from any one (1) educational institution.

The relevant provision of board members and methods of appointment and filing of vacancies in presented below:

BSU

The board of trustees is composed of nine (9) members, appointed by the governor as follows:

IC 21-19-3-2Board; membership

Sec. 2. The board of trustees is composed of nine (9) members, appointed by the governor as follows:

(1) Six (6) members who must be at large.

(2) Two (2) members who must be alumni of Ball State University.

(3) One (1) member who must be a Ball State University student.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-57.5-2 part.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.260.

C 21-19-3-8Terms

Sec. 8. (a) With the exception of the student member of the board of trustees, all appointments to the Ball State University board of trustees are for four (4) year terms. Each term of a nonstudent board member begins on January 1 of the appropriate year.

(b) The term of a member continues until the member's successor is appointed and qualified.

(c) The student member of the board of trustees is appointed for a two (2) year term. The student member's term begins on July 1 of the year in which the student member is appointed. The student member must be a full-time student at Ball State University throughout the student member's term.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-57.5-8.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.260.

IC 21-19-3-9Board; vacancies

Sec. 9. A vacancy occurring on the board of trustees from death, incapacitation, or resignation shall be filled by appointment of the governor for the unexpired term. Vacancies in offices held by alumni members shall be filled from nominees submitted by the Ball State University alumni council.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-57.5-9.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.260.

Indiana University

IC 21-20-3-2Board; membership

Sec. 2. The board of trustees has nine (9) members.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-23-2(a).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.261.

IC 21-20-3-3Board; residency requirement

Sec. 3. This section does not apply to the student trustee appointed to the board of trustees. Not more than:

(1) one (1) of the trustees elected to the board of trustees; and

(2) two (2) of the trustees appointed to the board of trustees;

may reside in the same county.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-23-2(b).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.261.

IC 21-20-3-4Board; elections

Sec. 4. (a) Three (3) members of the board of trustees shall be elected by the alumni of Indiana University under this chapter. In the year in which the term of any member of the board of trustees elected by the alumni expires, a successor to the trustee shall be elected by the alumni of Indiana University, to serve for a term of three (3) years beginning July 1 next succeeding the election.

(b) When a vacancy occurs in the membership of the board of trustees who are elected by the alumni, because of death, resignation, or any other reason, the vacancy shall be filled by selection by the Indiana University alumni association executive council for the unexpired term.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-24-2(a).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.261. Amended by P.L.29-2012, SEC.4.

IC 21-20-3-5Board; alumni elections

Sec. 5. The members of the board of trustees who are elected by the alumni of Indiana University must be alumni of Indiana University.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-24-2(b).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.261.

IC 21-20-3-6Alumni

Sec. 6. The alumni of Indiana University consist of those persons who have been awarded a degree by the board of trustees of Indiana University as recommended by the faculty.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-24-4.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.261. Amended by P.L.29-2012, SEC.5.

IC 21-20-3-7Alumni nominations

Sec. 7. (a) Any one hundred (100) or more alumni of Indiana University may file with the librarian of Indiana University on or before April 1 in each year a written nomination for a trustee to be elected by the alumni at the next election.

(b) After April 1, but not later than June 1, a list of all candidates nominated under this section shall be mailed by the librarian to each alumnus at the alumnus's address.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-24-5.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.261.

IC 21-20-3-8Elections; date

Sec. 8. The election of members of the board of trustees shall be held at Indiana University on the secular day immediately preceding July 1. At that time trustees shall be elected to:

- (1) serve for a term of three (3) years from July 1 next succeeding the trustee's election; and
- (2) complete any unexpired term or terms.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-24-6.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.261. Amended by P.L.29-2012, SEC.6.

IC 21-20-3-9Alumni voting procedures

Sec. 9. The university librarian shall conduct the elections to select the three (3) alumni members of the board of trustees. All alumni (as described in section 6 of this chapter) are eligible to participate in the election either by electronic or printed ballot, and each eligible individual may cast only one (1) vote. A request for a printed ballot must be made in writing to the university librarian not later than May 1 of an election year. The university librarian may adopt rules and regulations as necessary to carry out this section.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-24-7 part.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.261. Amended by P.L.29-2012, SEC.7.

IC 21-20-3-10Votes

Sec. 10. The person receiving the greatest number of votes cast shall be declared the elected trustee. If two (2) or more persons receive an equal and the greatest number of votes cast, the librarian shall cast lots to determine which of the persons shall be declared the elected trustee.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-24-7 part.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.261.

IC 21-20-3-11Board; terms

Sec. 11. The term of an elected trustee expires July 1 of the year in which the terms are to end.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-24-1.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.261.

IC 21-20-3-12Board; appointments

Sec. 12. (a) The governor shall appoint five (5) members of the board of trustees for terms of three (3) years.

(b) Whenever a vacancy occurs in the membership of the board of trustees who are appointed by the governor because of death or resignation or for any other reason, the vacancy shall be filled by an appointment of the governor for the unexpired term.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citations: 20-12-56-3(e) part; 20-12-24-3.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.261. Amended by P.L.29-2012, SEC.8.

IC 21-20-3-13Board; student appointment

Sec. 13. The governor shall appoint to the board of trustees a member who must be a full-time student of Indiana University during the two (2) year tenure of the appointment.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-24-3.5 part.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.261.

Indiana State University

IC 21-21-3-2Board; membership

Sec. 2. The board of trustees is composed of nine (9) trustees appointed by the governor as follows:

(1) Seven (7) competent individuals, one (1) of whom must be a student.

(2) Two (2) competent individuals who are alumni of Indiana State University nominated by the alumni council of Indiana State University.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-56-3(a) part.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.262.

IC 21-21-3-3Board; term

Sec. 3. (a) Subject to subsection (b), the term of a trustee is four (4) years.

(b) The term of a student trustee is two (2) years.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-56-3(b) part.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.262.

IC 21-21-3-4Search and screen committee; creation

Sec. 4. (a) To aid the governor in the selection of the student member, a search and screen committee is created consisting of one (1) representative of the governor and at least four (4) students chosen by the elected student government representatives of the student body.

(b) The search and screen committee shall establish the mode and criteria to be used in the selection of student nominees to serve on the board of trustees.

(c) The search and screen committee shall submit a list of at least ten (10) names to the governor for consideration.

(d) The governor shall select one (1) of these names for appointment as a trustee of Indiana State University.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-56-3(c).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.262.

IC 21-21-3-5Board; appointment qualification

Sec. 5. An individual appointed to the board of trustees must be a resident of Indiana and a citizen of the United States.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-56-3(d) part.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.262.

IC 21-21-3-6Board; alumni appointment

Sec. 6. An alumni member appointed to the board of trustees must have completed a prescribed course of study by Indiana State University or one (1) of the following predecessors of Indiana State University:

(1) Indiana State Normal School.

(2) Indiana State Teachers College.

(3) Indiana State College.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-56-3(d) part.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.262.

IC 21-21-3-7Board; student appointment

Sec. 7. The student trustee appointed to the board of trustees must be a full-time student of Indiana State University during the student trustee's term.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-56-3(b) part.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.262.

IC 21-21-3-8Board; female appointment

Sec. 8. At least one (1) woman must be on the board of trustees.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-56-3(a) part.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.262.

IC 21-21-3-9Board; vacancies

Sec. 9. (a) The governor shall fill a vacancy occurring in the board of trustees from death, resignation, or removal from the state for the unexpired term of the retiring trustee.

(b) The alumni council of Indiana State University shall nominate the appointee to fill a vacancy caused by the loss of an alumni member.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-56-3(e).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.262.

*Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana***IC 21-22-3-3Board; membership**

Sec. 3. (a) The number of members of the state board of trustees must equal the number of regions established by the state board of trustees plus one additional member. Each member of the state board of trustees must have knowledge or experience in one (1) or more of the following areas:

- (1) Manufacturing.
- (2) Commerce.
- (3) Labor.
- (4) Agriculture.
- (5) State and regional economic development needs.
- (6) Indiana's educational delivery system.

One (1) member of the state board of trustees must reside in each region established by the state board of trustees. One (1) member must serve as an at-large member. Appointments shall be for three (3) year terms, on a staggered basis.

(b) An individual who holds an elective or appointed office of the state is not eligible to serve as a member of the state board of trustees. A member of a regional board may be appointed to the state board of trustees but must then resign from the regional board.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-61-4 part.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.263. Amended by P.L.251-2017, SEC.19.

IC 21-22-3-4Board; vacancies

Sec. 4. (a) The governor shall fill all vacancies on the state board of trustees. Each trustee appointed to fill a vacancy shall represent the same region as the trustee's predecessor.

(b) If a vacancy occurs on the state board of trustees, the regional board for the region in which the former member resided may recommend to the governor one (1) or more qualified persons to fill the vacancy.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-61-6.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.263.

IC 21-22-6-2Regional board; appointment

Sec. 2. Whenever the state board of trustees establishes an administrative region, it shall appoint a regional board of trustees.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-61-10.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.263. Amended by P.L.169-2007, SEC.18.

IC 21-22-6-3Regional board; membership

Sec. 3. The regional board of a region consists of at least seven (7) members, including at least five (5) members who are representative of the manufacturing, commercial, agricultural, labor, and educational groups of the region, all appointed by the state board of trustees. All members of the regional board must be residents of the region. Appointments are for three (3) year terms, on a staggered basis, and all trustees must be citizens of Indiana. Members may serve for an unlimited number of terms.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-61-11(a).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.263. Amended by P.L.169-2007, SEC.19.

IC 21-22-6-4Regional board; vacancies

Sec. 4. A vacancy on the regional board shall be filled by appointment by the state board of trustees. The regional board shall nominate and submit to the state board the names of one (1) or more candidates to fill the vacancy within forty (40) days after the vacancy occurs. The state board of trustees may appoint one (1) of the persons nominated by the regional board or may reject all of the regional board's nominees. If the state board of trustees rejects all of the nominees from a regional board, the state board of trustees shall notify the regional board, and the regional board shall make one (1) or more additional nominations within forty (40) days after receipt of the notice. The state board of trustees shall then fill the vacancy from either the original group of nominations or from the additional nominations.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-61-11(b).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.263. Amended by P.L.169-2007, SEC.20.

Purdue University

IC 21-23-3-1Board; membership

Sec. 1. The board of trustees consists of ten (10) members, to be appointed for the term of service and in the manner provided by this chapter. The terms of all trustees terminate on July 1 of the year in which their terms of office expire.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-37-1.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.264.

IC 21-23-3-2Board; appointments

Sec. 2. (a) The governor shall appoint ten (10) trustees for Purdue University for the term beginning on July 1 in conformity with this chapter.

(b) The general assembly urges the governor to appoint at least one (1) resident of Allen County to the board of trustees of Purdue University.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-37-2.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.264. Amended by P.L.213-2015, SEC.237.

IC 21-23-3-3Board; selection of members; meetings; vacancies

Sec. 3. (a) Three (3) members of the board of trustees shall be selected by the members of the Purdue alumni association. One (1) of the members must be a graduate of the school of agriculture. All members of the board of trustees selected under this section must be members of the alumni association and graduates of Purdue University.

(b) At the annual meeting of the Purdue alumni association for the year in which the term of office of any one (1) of the trustees selected under this section expires, a successor shall be selected by the members of the Purdue alumni association, in the manner that the Purdue alumni association prescribes. The president of the Purdue alumni association shall certify all selections made by the Purdue alumni association.

(c) If, at any time, a vacancy occurs on the board of trustees, occasioned by the death, resignation, expiration of term, or otherwise of any of the members of the board of trustees selected by the members of the Purdue alumni association, the vacancy shall be filled by selection by the president of the Purdue alumni association. The member selected to fill a vacancy serves until the next annual meeting of the Purdue alumni association when a successor to fill out the unexpired term shall be selected in the manner provided in subsection (b). The member selected by the Purdue alumni association shall be appointed by the governor to fill out the unexpired term.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-37-3.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.264.

IC 21-23-3-4Board; number appointed by governor

Sec. 4. Seven (7) of the trustees shall be appointed by the governor.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-37-4(a).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.264.

IC 21-23-3-5Board; appointments with agricultural pursuits

Sec. 5. Two (2) members of the board of trustees appointed by the governor must be involved in agricultural pursuits. One (1) of the members of the board of trustees appointed by the governor must be a full-time student of Purdue University.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-37-4(b).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.264.

IC 21-23-3-6Search and screen committee; creation

Sec. 6. (a) To aid the governor in the selection of the student member, a search and screen committee is created consisting of:

(1) one (1) representative of the governor; and

(2) at least four (4) students chosen by the elected student government representatives of the student body, including at least one (1) student from each campus of Purdue University, main and regional.

(b) The search and screening committee shall establish the mode and criteria to be used in the selection of student nominees to serve on the board of trustees. The search and screening committee shall submit a list of the names of at least ten (10) individuals to the governor for the governor's consideration. The governor shall select one (1) of these individuals for appointment as a student member of the board of trustees.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-37-4(c).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.264.

IC 21-23-3-7Board; terms

Sec. 7. All members of the board of trustees serve for three (3) years, except for the student member who serves for two (2) years.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-37-4(d).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.264.

IC 21-23-3-8Board; vacancies

Sec. 8. In case any vacancy occurs on the board of trustees by reason of the resignation, removal from the state, expiration of the term of office, or otherwise of any of the trustees appointed by the governor, the vacancy shall be filled by the governor from the respective classes as provided in this section to serve only for the unexpired term.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-37-4(e).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.264.

Indiana Commission on Higher Education

ICHE mandates a faculty member as a member, in addition to a student member:

IC 21-18-3-1Membership

Sec. 1. The commission consists of fourteen (14) members appointed by the governor as follows:

(1) Each member must be a citizen of Indiana.

(2) Each congressional district must be represented by at least one (1) member who resides in the congressional district.

(3) One (1) member must be a student.

(4) One (1) member must be a full-time faculty member of a state educational institution.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citations: 20-12-0.5-5(b); 20-12-0.5-5(a).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.259.

IC 21-18-3-2Membership; restrictions

Sec. 2. Except for the one (1) full-time faculty member and the one (1) student member, a member may not:

- (1) be a full-time employee of; or
- (2) serve on the governing board of;
any state public or private college or university in Indiana.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-0.5-5(c).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.259. Amended by P.L.31-2010, SEC.1.

IC 21-18-3-3Appointments

Sec. 3. The governor shall appoint the student member and the full-time faculty member of the commission from a list that:

- (1) contains at least three (3) names but not more than five (5) names for each appointment; and
- (2) is submitted by a nominating committee.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-0.5-5(d).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.259.

IC 21-18-3-4Nominating committee; membership

Sec. 4. The chairman of the commission shall appoint a ten (10) member nominating committee as follows:

- (1) Five (5) students from state educational institutions, with not more than one (1) student from any one (1) state educational institution.
- (2) Five (5) full-time faculty members from state educational institutions, with not more than one (1) full-time faculty member from any one (1) educational institution.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-0.5-5(e).]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.259.

IC 21-18-3-5Membership not public office

Sec. 5. (a) Membership on the commission does not constitute holding a public office.

(b) A commission member is not required to take and file an oath of office before serving as a commission member.

(c) Except as provided in this chapter, a commission member:

- (1) is not disqualified from holding a public office or position by reason of appointment to or membership on the commission; and
- (2) does not forfeit an office, a position, or an employment by reason of an appointment to the commission.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-0.5-5.5.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.259.

IC 21-18-3-6Term of appointments

Sec. 6. (a) Appointments to the commission are for a term of four (4) years except:

- (1) the student member; and
- (2) the full-time faculty member;

who are appointed to a term of two (2) years.

(b) The governor shall promptly make appointments to fill vacancies for the duration of unexpired terms in the same manner as the original appointments.

(c) The term of a member begins on July 1 of the year of appointment and continues until a successor has been appointed.

[Pre-2007 Higher Education Recodification Citation: 20-12-0.5-6.]

As added by P.L.2-2007, SEC.259.

D. Meeting Board of Trustees & Indiana General Assembly

The ad hoc committee intends to schedule meetings with the BSU Board and district representatives and other key members of the Indiana General Assembly preliminary to our final report to the University Senate, and on several salient and sensitive matters, such as method of appointment and consortium with other Indiana universities.

The correspondence with the Board, key administrators and the Office of Governmental Relations follows:

From: Frankel, Bruce

Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2019 1:53 PM

To: Kelsey, Anita <akelsey@bsu.edu>

Cc: Flowers, Jim <jcflowers1@bsu.edu>

Subject:

Ms. Kelsey:

I have been authorized by the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Representation on the Board of Trustees to send the attached notice and invitation. I welcome our discussion.

Cordially,

Bruce Frankel

Bruce Frankel, PhD, AICP

Professor of Urban Planning

Coordinator of Real Estate Development Programs

AB 307

Ball State University

Muncie, IN 47306

765-285-5869

bfrankel@bsu.edu

Meeting with Board

Dr. Frankel,

I wanted to acknowledge I have received your email.

Anita

Meeting Representatives Indiana General Assembly

Letter to BSU Governmental Affairs & Response

SENT BY EMAIL: Tuesday, December 3, 2019

Rebecca Rice, VP for Government Relations
Sam Snideman, Director of Government Relations
Office of Government Relations
Ball State University

RE: Dialogue with Our Representatives in the Indiana General Assembly

Dear Ms. Rice & Sam:

I serve on the Faculty Council/ University Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Voting Membership on the Board of Trustees. Resolutions on the same passed both bodies last term.

The Committee wishes to conduct further due diligence with Representative Sue Errington and Senator Tim Lanane on the legislation that would ensue given Board endorsement.

As a courtesy we are so advising you of this future contact. Should we schedule a meeting on this matter with our representatives, you are welcome to attend, or to meet with the Committee separately prior to such a meeting.

Cordially,



Bruce W. Frankel

Cc: Committee Members

Rice Responds

Bruce:

Thanks so much for sharing your intent to meet with Senator Lanane and Representative Errington. Since Ball State has not taken a position on this matter at the present time, we will not plan to attend the meeting or meetings. However, we certainly appreciate your letting us know.

Thank you,

Becca

Becca Polcz Rice

Vice President for Governmental Relations
Ball State University
2000 W. University Ave., AD 103
Muncie, IN 47306
Cell: 765-717-9432



E. Draft Letter to Trustees

Board of Trustees
Ball State University

An ad hoc committee established by the Ball State University Faculty Council, in consultation with President Mearns, surveyed BSU faculty in October, 2018, in order to determine the degree to which faculty “support the addition to the Ball State University Board of Trustees of a full-time BSU faculty member as a voting trustee.” There was a higher-than-anticipated response rate of 47.5%, and 96.4% of 495 responses were in favor of that addition.

The committee reported back to Faculty Council and was reformed in 2019 by the Senate and charged with evaluating including a Board of Trustees full-time staff or professional personnel position. Working with the Chairperson of University Council and the President of Staff Council, a second survey was conducted in January, 2020, this time of 1,577 professional personnel and staff personnel at the university. There were 657 (41.7%) responses. Of these, 95.1% indicated they “support the addition to the Ball State University Board of Trustees of a full-time, non-faculty BSU employee as a voting trustee.” Those who supported this were asked, “Excluding faculty, administrative personnel (e.g., vice presidents, deans), and members of a collective bargaining unit or union, which of the following categories should be included in the pool from which this trustee would be chosen?” Most of these respondents indicated preference that this individual be chosen from a pool including both staff personnel and professional personnel rather than just one of these two categories. Related comments were solicited from respondents on each of these surveys.

The committee was also charged by the Senate Chairperson to “Evaluate building a coalition of support from other higher education institutions in Indiana.” However, the committee did not want to contact those outside our university before contacting our own Board of Trustees. Instead, the hope is that the Board of Trustees will consider the benefits of increasing board membership by the addition of a tenth and an eleventh voting board member from the faculty and from the staff personnel or professional personnel. Such a decision would be up to the Board of Trustees and the state legislators, and at this point, after reporting back to the Senate and the President, it is next appropriate to report to the Board of Trustees. If the Board of Trustees does not wish to pursue or at least explore this issue, it would be improper for the committee to attempt to build a coalition of support.

The University of Northern Kentucky, President Mearns' previous institution, has both a faculty and a staff trustee. Schwartz (2010) surveyed university's governing boards a decade ago and found that "among respondents, 14.9 percent of independent colleges and universities and institutions included at least one faculty as a voting member of its board" (p. 36). [Schwartz, M. (2010). Board composition: Student and faculty trustees. *Trusteeship*, 18(4), 36-38.]

As you know, Indiana Code establishes board of trustees' membership for state universities, and these requirements vary among institutions. Currently, none of these institutions has either a faculty trustee or a staff/professional personnel trustee. Indiana's universities do not have identical board of trustees membership requirements. Whereas Ball State is required to have two alumni on its board, Indiana University is required to have three, and these are elected by IU alumni rather than subject to a decision by the governor. The Indiana State University board must have at least one woman. The board of trustees for the University of Southern Indiana must have a resident of Vanderburgh County. There are ten trustees for Purdue University, two of whom "must be involved in agricultural pursuits."

Given this variety, and the separate establishment within the Indiana code for each university's board of trustees, the committee believes it is best to inform and assist the Ball State University Board of Trustees regarding this issue. A coordinated push by all universities may prove impossible, and will certainly slow the initiative. Instead, Ball State University has the opportunity to lead the way in this state, fostering respect for all employees and their input into strategic decision making. "The Ball State Initiative" may well be copied by other institutions in Indiana.

Some have raised questions about possible conflicts of interest for these two trustees. However, the trustees would have fiduciary responsibility for the entire university, and not be mere delegates or representative of a sector of employees, as evidence by the current position for a student trustee. Furthermore, Appendix A of the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees is a code of conduct that adequately addresses the issue of conflict of interest with any trustees. As a rule of thumb, these new trustees would be expected to recuse themselves where issues of their personal advancement were the topic, but would not be expected to recuse themselves from general decisions regarding faculty, staff personnel, professional personnel, or other topics.

In particular, we propose changing the Indiana Code from

Current Indiana Code:

"IC 21-19-3-2 Board; membership

Sec. 2. The board of trustees is composed of nine (9) members, appointed by the governor as follows:

- (1) Six (6) members who must be at large.
- (2) Two (2) members who must be alumni of Ball State University.
- (3) One (1) member who must be a Ball State University student."

Proposed Indiana Code:

"IC 21-19-3-2 Board; membership

Sec. 2. The board of trustees is composed of *eleven (11)* members.

Nine (9) members are appointed by the governor as follows:

- (1) Six (6) members who must be at large.
- (2) Two (2) members who must be alumni of Ball State University.
- (3) One (1) member who must be a Ball State University student.

Two (2) members are designated by the Chair of University Senate:

(4) One (1) member who must be a full-time Ball State University faculty member elected by Ball State University Faculty Council or directly by its full-time faculty.

(5) One (1) member who must be a full-time Ball State University staff personnel or professional personnel member, and not represented by a labor union, elected by Ball State University Professional Personnel Council or directly by its full-time and part-time staff personnel and professional personnel."

Board of Trustees By-Laws Amendment

We propose changing the Bylaws of the Ball State University Board of Trustees as follows:

Current Article 1, Section 2 of the Bylaws of the Ball State University Board of Trustees

"Section 2. Membership and Terms of Office. The Board shall be composed of nine (9) members (the "Trustees") appointed by the Governor of Indiana. Six (6) of the Trustees shall be at large, two (2) shall be alumni of the University, and one (1) shall be a student at the University. No more than six (6) of the nonstudent Trustees shall be of the same sex, and all of the Trustees shall be United States citizens. All appointments shall be for four (4) year terms beginning on January 1 of the year the appointment is effective, except that the student Trustee's term shall be for two (2) years beginning on July 1 of the year the appointment is effective. Trustees shall serve until their successors are appointed and qualified. The Governor shall fill Board vacancies by appointment for the unexpired term."

Proposed Article 1, Section 2 of the Bylaws of the Ball State University Board of Trustees

Section 2. Membership and Terms of Office. The Board shall be composed of *eleven (11)* members (the "Trustees"), *with nine (9) members appointed by the Governor of Indiana as follows:* six (6) of the Trustees shall be at large, two (2) shall be alumni of the University, and one (1) shall be a student at the University. *One (1) member shall be a full-time Ball State University faculty member elected by Ball State University full-time faculty. One (1) member shall be a full-time Ball State University staff or professional personnel member elected by full-time and part-time Ball State University staff and professional personnel.* No more than six (6) of the nonstudent, *nonfaculty, nonstaff* Trustees shall be of the same sex, and all of the Trustees shall be United States citizens. All appointments shall be for four (4) year terms beginning on January 1 of the year the appointment is effective, except that the student Trustee's term shall be for two (2) years beginning on July 1 of the year the appointment is

effective. Trustees shall serve until their successors are appointed and qualified. The Governor shall fill Board vacancies by appointment for the unexpired term *except for the faculty trustee and staff trustee, which shall be filled by election of the electorate for that position.*

Please note that the committee feels it is vitally important for these trustees to be elected by BSU faculty and staff/professional personnel rather than appointed by the Governor of Indiana. Merely selecting from among these groups two trustees who may be politically acceptable to the current governor subverts the initiative here to respect the input of faculty and staff/professional personnel.

In reflecting on this request, we ask the Board to consider the value added by the current and past student members. The value added to Board decision making by faculty and staff/professional personnel is hoped to improve effectiveness, relations, and communications.

We ask for a response by the Board on how you now want to address this. If we can be of assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty & Staff/Professional Personnel Trustee
(Christopher Airriess, Bryan Byers, Jim Flowers, Bruce Frankel, Ronald Kovak, & Diana Saiki)

F. Survey Results Faculty

An online and anonymous survey of 1041 full-time tenured, tenure track, and contract faculty at Ball State University was conducted between October 3rd and October 16th, 2018, with the aid of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. There were **498 responses (47.8%)**.

In Item 1 faculty were asked “Do you support the addition to the Ball State University Board of Trustees of a full-time BSU faculty member as a voting trustee? Yes / No”. Of the 495 responses to this item 477 (**96.4%**) were “Yes” and 18 (3.6%) were “No.”

In the second and final item, faculty were asked, “Please share any thoughts you have regarding addition of a faculty member to the Ball State University Board of Trustees.” There were 137 narrative responses.

These are shown below, with the response for Item 1 from that same respondent also shown.

Q1 Q2

Please share any thoughts you have regarding addition of a faculty member to the Ball State University Board of Trustees.

1 Yes Faculty representation on the Board would enhance cooperation and goodwill.

2 Yes I also believe that the alumni members of the board should be elected by the alumni as is done at Indiana University.

3 Yes Excellent idea.

4 Yes I believe this is the best way for the Board of Trustees to understand faculty needs.

5 Yes Seems like a good bridge

6 Yes BSU faculty understand the lived experiences of students, faculty, and staff and would provide a unique and valuable perspective on the teaching and scholarship aspects of the university. Additionally, having a faculty member on the Board may promote faculty trust and confidence in the Board of Trustees.

7 Yes My only concern is that this could be awkward if a person had to make a decision about his/her own department, with a colleague, etc. I assume that there would be an option to opt out of voting if there is a conflict of interest.

8 Yes Faculty often have a better or at least more current understanding of student wants and needs than current board members. Faculty are also the ones most often charged with implementing the board's decisions without any say in that decision.

9 Yes We need a faculty representative - greater transparency.

10 Yes It is long past time to have done this and to have someone on the power group who actually knows about education.

11 Yes I believe it is important and beneficial to have a board member representing the views of the faculty on any vote affecting Ball State University.

12 Yes The senior administrators that interact with the Board are long removed from teaching, research, and service life of a faculty member. They are unaware of the morale, perspective, and aspirations of most of the faculty.

13 Yes Need representation given some of the poor decisions made by those who govern this university. Sad!

14 Yes This would allow for more direct communication between faculty and the Board of Trustees.

15 Yes I prefer the addition of two full-time faculty members - one tenured faculty member and one contract faculty member.

16 Yes Absolutely essential, and long overdue.

17 Yes The Board of Trustees' composition should reflect ALL of the university's stakeholders.

18 Yes The faculty member should have a distinguished academic record.

19 Yes It does make sense to have at least one faculty and perhaps one employee stakeholder as a voting member. Especially if alumni and current student stakeholders are represented. Faculty and employees' livelihood depend on BSU, so they are vested stakeholders.

20 Yes Faculty are the lifeblood of the university, delivering the core mission. Their experience is critical for the Board.

21 Beyond the new member another Board Member should be assigned to have regular meetings with faculty groups to obtain faculty input and feedback.

22 Yes I would very STRONGLY SUPPORT the addition of a faculty member to the Ball State University Board of Trustees if the faculty member were chosen by vote of the full faculty. I would still support it, though less strongly, if the faculty member were appointed rather than elected. My reasons have to do with the core mission of the university - to educate students. Faculty members who do the educating should have a powerful voice in all major decisions relating to the university. That said, I think that a faculty member on the board would need a course release or some other form of assigned time to be sure they receive appropriate credit and have the necessary time to do well in their new role.

23 Yes There seems to be a culture of distrust when it comes to faculty at Ball State. Hopefully, having a faculty member on the board of trustees will help the board to see that faculty are not the enemy.

24 Yes As the board 'defines the duties of and provide compensation for faculty and staff of the university' I do think it would benefit the board to include a faculty member that can speak to compensation issues, such as pay inequity and diverse hires.

25 Yes The Board of Trustees are likely to become out of touch with the needs of the university without both student and faculty representation.

26 Yes Lessens distance between faculty and board - enhances communication

27 Yes This is a good move. It's important for the univ leadership to hear faculty input, and to try to support, enhance and recognize well scholarship, to help improve our reputation.

28 Yes Good Luck....

29 Yes Absolutely, we need a voice!!

30 Yes Yes it is a good idea. It will bring a faculty perspective to various issues.

31 Yes I think all faculty should vote on who that person should be

32 Yes A qualified yes: The faculty member ought to be elected rather than appointed.

33 Yes I believe that Faculty should have representation on the board. However, I also believe that Staff, the highest percentage of individuals employed by the university, should also have a seat and representation.

34 Yes The faculty should have some representation.

35 Yes Helps providetransparency.

36 Yes Adding a position will create the possibility of a tie vote. Alternatively, the faculty member position could replace one of the existing nine positions, thus avoiding that possibility.

37 Yes Faculty need a voice in all matters.

38 Yes As vested stakeholders in the administration of the University, it is only reasonable that the faculty have a voice on the Board.

39 Yes Great suggestion. One or many needed reforms.

40 Yes A tenured professor

41 Yes We have student representation on the board. Without the support of AAUP at BSU it would be important for faculty to have representation as well.

Yes Without that voice we will continue to have decision made FOR us and not BY us.

42 Yes This has my full support. The Board of Trustees desperately needs the perspective of a member with experience in higher education as a full-time faculty member, which they currently lack. Likewise, the faculty need representation in university governance, which they also currently lack. In light of the Board's actions over the past several years, this would be a most welcome and necessary change.

43 Yes I think it would bring a different voice/experience to the table. You have a student, you should also have a faculty member.

44 Yes A few years ago, when former-president Ferguson rolled out a new brand, a student of mine asked,

"What did faculty think of this before it came out?" and I said, "Why do you think faculty had a say?" and she said, "Because you're the heart of the university," and I laughed sort of ruefully. But of course, to *students* administrators are figureheads and faculty are in charge--mostly because we're the ones they see every day. But there's value in the connection between student and faculty; we're on the ground, so to speak. Students are the *raison d'être* of the institution, and adding a faculty member to the board (in addition to the student rep) will give the board another conduit to their constituency.

45 Yes Honestly, I have mixed feelings. I would like to know if other universities have a faculty member on the board. I am not sure this will solve the disconnect that sometimes happens between the faculty and board.

46 Yes You can have a university without administrators, and even one without undergraduate students. You cannot have a university without faculty. There should be one member of the trustees who is a current faculty member.

47 Yes Make the position open to contract faculty as well as tenure-line faculty. This is a great idea.

48 Yes It is imperative that if a full-time BSU faculty member is added to the University Board of Trustees, the representative needs to be an advocate for faculty members and faculty issues, not simply an ally of the board and administration. Issues such as those related to the recent decisions regarding John Schnatter and the continuing widening gap between administrative and (many) faculty salaries demonstrate the need for a faculty advocate on the board.

49 Yes If there is a student member, there should be a faculty member. This would increase transparency.

50 Yes BSU has a history of top-down, bureaucratic leadership. This would be a step in the right direction for demonstrating the faculty is valued and has a small voice in the affairs of the institution.

51 Yes I would argue that faculty representation at this level of administration, resource allocation, and decision making is absolutely vital and necessary for the continued growth and sustainability of Ball State University as an institution of higher education!

52 Yes I U and Purdue both have Board members who are elected by their constituencies (e.g. alumni, faculty, students). It is time for Ball State University to get parity on this.

53 Yes We need a voice.

54 Yes A faculty member serves at the state level (i.e., ICHE); why not at the institution level?

55 Yes I would like to see two faculty members (one tenured/tenure-track and one contract faculty) as voting members.

56 Yes Person should be tenured

57 Yes There's no reason to have a student and not a faculty member. An alternative would be to get rid of the student, I suppose. (Also, Qualtrics is flaking out on me.)

58 Yes I believe a member of the faculty will provide insight not normally available to the Board.

59 Yes A faculty representative can provide valuable input. How can you have a group governing a university without continuous and consistent insights and discussion from a member of the group most directly educating the students? Why would we have a student representative and not a faculty representative? Obviously the current board members have important viewpoints, knowledge, and skills, but it is ludicrous to think that the viewpoints of the educators themselves would not be equally important at the top level to the running of an educational institution.

60 Yes Having a representative that is not a lawyer or businessperson is very important on the Board of Trustees to promote education for all students. A faculty representative who would stress education over business practices at a university is very important.

61 Yes Should be tenured.

62 Yes Clearly, the Board as currently constituted has alienated the vast majority of faculty and staff -- they are not in tune with the spirit and values of this University. Including a faculty member would at least lend them some perspective, and hopefully be a moral compass.

63 Yes One each of tenure track and contract faculty might be better

64 Yes A faculty member would represent the faculty voice--a current omission.

65 Yes Is it a favorite? If so, we can do without this addition.

66 Yes seems logical and odd that it is not already this way.

67 Yes How common is it to have a faculty member (voting) on the BOT in academia?

68 Yes While faculty members may be committed to issues related to teaching our students, we are also interested in non-teaching issues that could have an emotional impact on students, faculty and staff. The inclusion of faculty to the board provides the opportunity for someone to explain to faculty why some unpopular decisions were reached.

69 Yes It is strange that there is a BSU student on the Board but not a faculty member.

70 Yes Yes, It is very important to have our representative in this Board! I . Sergei Zhuk, Professor of History, volunteer to be one of those candidates!

71 Yes Is being "full-time" the only qualification for the faculty member to serve on the University Board of Trustees?

72 Yes This would help the faculty to feel that we are part of the decision makers at the University. It would also help that faculty might be kept better informed of major changes.

73 Yes Very important if "education" is a mission of the university. This might be represented by a faculty emeritus person elected by the current faculty and staff.

74 Yes University can say it was heard.

75 Yes Two observations: (1) By state law, some key university stakeholders are already on the Board (students and alumni), which gives the Board direct access to their expertise in every Board meeting, including when the Board meets with only trustees present. Why deny the Board that same access to expertise when it comes to the faculty? (2) Trustees & other high university leaders often have to engage with audiences with which many faculty have little interaction -- political leaders, the media, the business community, and donors are some examples. This sometimes leads to Board decisions that seem to faculty to be out of step with BSU's academic mission -- & this in turn sometimes leads to faculty anger, protest, and resistance -- and so instead of moving forward efficiently to achieve important goals, the Ball State family can get divided. A faculty trustee will decrease the number of times this sort of thing happens. Trustees will have direct access to faculty input at every meeting (including meetings where only trustees are present), and faculty will be assured that their voice was one of the ones that leads to every decision. And I imagine that the faculty trustee will often be an effective advocate for the Board with the academic community.

76 Yes This position should be limited to a full professor who has experience and understanding of Ball State's history and position in Indiana.

77 Yes Faculty can provide a special perspective to a variety of important university issues. This can improve faculty's morale.

78 Yes Faculty are a major factor in the BSU system and should have a voice in University decisions.

79 Yes Must be elected by Faculty Council or other democratic process by faculty only. Results to be materially different.

80 Yes I also believe we should nominate alumni, and the board could pick from those nominations for an alum member.

81 Yes This position should be open to both tenure/tenure-track faculty and contract faculty.

82 Yes Make this person be a tenured faculty at assistant, associate or full level.

83 Yes This is an important addition that could certainly support the overall function and focus of the board. It would be important for that faculty member to have expensive knowledge about this campus as well as diversity issues. The latter is off the utmost importance!

84 Yes It seems important to have faculty representation on the board.

85 Yes I think there should be a voting representative for tenure-track faculty. Such faculty understand the importance of both teaching and research in adding value to our students' degrees as they go on to serve the State of Indiana and, indeed, the world. Tenure-track faculty are academia and understand its structures and demands. I also would like to see voting representation for staff who serve this university and are committed to it.

86 Yes It is overdue. There is no connection between the Board of Trustees and Faculty. The Board of Trustees mandates policies and makes decisions (usually detrimental for Faculty) without any prior feedback or consultation from Faculty.

87 Yes Seems odd that there is not a direct voice of faculty on the BOT.. This is long coming.

88 Yes Faculty are an essential part of the university and they have a unique and important perspective on its fundamental function of teaching students. Therefore, having one faculty member on the Board of Trustees would allow them to consider that important perspective.

89 Yes The perspective of a faculty member would be a welcome addition.

90 Yes It is reasonable for Trustees who are not part of the boots on the ground, to not realize all the aspects of how a decision they make, may impact faculty and students. It is nice to be able to add that perspective to the discussion.

91 Yes Faculty are an integral part of the campus and need to be included.

92 Yes Adding a faculty voice signals that this constituency, just as students, are important to a robust academic community.

93 Yes It would be beneficial for board to hear faculty's point of view.

94 Yes Faculty can provide perspective. The top down management style is contrary to Ball State's stated values.

95 Yes Adding someone with skills in budgeting and forecasting or with their pulse on economic trends would add value.

96 Yes The faculty member should be voted in by faculty and students, to add an additional voice that represents current views of the campus vs the oftentimes out of touch views of former graduates.

97 Yes I have indicated yes to the above question so that it can be further explored prior to making a final decision.

98 Yes It makes sense that someone on a University's Board should have actual contact with actual students, does it not...?

99 Yes The addition of a faculty member would add a perspective that is currently lacking on the board.

100 Yes As the actions of the board of trustees impact the lives of faculty, staff, and students, having a faculty voice will be beneficial to the decision making process and the trust that needs to be placed in the board's decisions.

101 Yes We need representation, and reporting back that aligns with our needs and concerns.

102 Yes Faculty have unique and important insight into the university.

103 Yes As is the case to have a student member, faculty are also a major stakeholder in BOT business.

104 Yes This is so important - please give faculty a voice on the Board.

105 Yes Faculty voice, like student voice needs to be heard

106 Yes It is important for the Trustees to hear the perspective of any topics from a faculty member.

107 Yes This is consistent with having a student member of the board. The faculty member could represent an important point of view regarding the life of the university. This viewpoint might not otherwise be adequately represented.

108 Yes I am surprised that a current faculty member does not already hold a position on the Board of Trustees. Indeed, the idea of shared governance is not very convincing without this most basic inclusion.

109 Yes I want to see a faculty member on the BoT because a faculty perspective would be useful in decision making for the entire campus. I would like that faculty representative to be willing and able to meet with faculty council and individual faculty members to listen to concerns and share those concerns with the board.

110 Yes Given how essential faculty are to the mission of the university, I think it both logical and inevitable that a faculty member would be added to the Board of Trustees.

111 Yes I'd like the faculty member to receive some training so they best represent faculty interests while aligning with the mission of a board member.

112 Yes This makes perfect sense!

113 Yes They are never going to allow it.

114 Yes A faculty member brings in another viewpoint of the educational system.

115 Yes Great way to add another stakeholder group to the Board of Trustees.

116 Yes must be tenured. Probably someone with administrative experience.

117 Yes Faculty are the front line providers implementing the mission of the university. They have a unique and highly informed perspective on various aspects of fulfilling this mission and understanding the students.

118 Yes Often it seems as though the members of the board are too far removed--ideologically and geographically--from the concerns of the university. A faculty member would bring a welcome and relevant voice to the table.

119 Yes It will help generate the feeling of genuine belongingness

120 Yes My interest in this addition is the result of the general lack of transparency demonstrated by the Board of Trustees in recent years.

121 Yes I have no idea about the implications. But it is always good to have more people voting.

122 Yes This seems like a good strategy to promote shared governance and dialogue between faculty and the board. Thank you for asking for my input!

123 Yes A faculty member can provide an additional perspective on a number of important issues.

124 Yes This is essential to give the board a view "from the trenches", so to speak.

125 Yes I feel that our voice (faculty voice) has been ignored and we have been unfairly treated. I strongly believe that BSU faculty member should be a member as a voting trustee to express faculty's voice as a representative.

126 Yes my only concern is how this will be chosen,

127 No Conflict of interest

128 No Tom Bracken needs to go.

129 No This is a silly proposal. It will provide yet another margin for aspiring administrators and do little to improve governance.

130 No Board members need to speak from the totality of their experiences, not as a representative of a subgroup. If we have a tenured faculty member on the board, then we should also have a contract faculty member, member of the professional staff, member of the support staff, member of the service staff, and probably a representative of another dozen types of people on campus.

131 No I am not sure state law will allow for this. Also, I am very concerned who might be appointed to this position. The wrong person could do substantial damage and create an acrimonious relationship between the board and faculty, which will be counter-productive to faculty and the

university. I am not totally opposed to this proposition but have a lot of questions and concerns on how it would work.

132 No There should be both a student and faculty member of the board serving as non-voting/advisory roles.

133 No I voted no because I see a potential conflict of interest in employee versus employer relationships. Following the recent stupidity of the Board in its handling of the Schnatter affair, it might also be best to not have the collective name of the faculty associated with the collective actions of the Board.

134 No I do believe the Board would benefit from more direct connection in an intentional manner with the faculty. Examples: a member of the Board should serve on a standing committee or task force, such as the Diversity Committee or the Gender Equity Task Force, and possibly attend Faculty Senate meetings as a non-voting member to learn more about faculty issues, concerns, and ideas. I believe having one faculty member as a voting member on the Board would not serve as a balanced, fair, or equitable source of faculty input to the Board, and serving in that role could possibly pose conflicts of interest for that faculty member in their regular roles and other service in their department and college. I believe having more input and connection is necessary and would be helpful, but not by way of having a voting member of the faculty serve on the Board of Trustees.

The following were recorded as “No,” yet appear positive:

135 The addition of a faculty to the Board will improve the quality and functionality. Our institution will be more benefited.

136 There will be some transparency on what is happening at the university.

137 This is a nice first step, but more should be done. The faculty member should be selected by faculty; the student member should be selected by students; alumni members should be selected by alumni; and a community member selected by the city or county commission. Not all appointed by the governor, which is why we currently have no one of color on our Board.

G. Survey Results Staff

University Senate Survey on Staff BOT representation Spring 2020

January 31, 2020 8:35 AM EST

Do you support the addition to the Ball State University Board of Trustees of a fulltime, non-faculty BSU employee as a voting trustee?

Yes No

Field Percentage

1 Yes 95.1%

2 No 4.9%

N=657

Excluding faculty, administrative personnel (e.g., vice presidents, deans), and members of a collective bargaining unit or union, which of the following categories should be included in the pool from which this trustee would be chosen?

All Respondents

Showing rows 1 - 4 of 4

Field Percentage

1. Professional personnel only (e.g., managers, supervisors, academic advisors, athletic trainers, librarians) 17.1%
2. Staff personnel only (e.g., technical, clerical, skilled, and service staff) 15.2%
3. Both professional personnel and staff personnel 67.7%
4. 619

Please share any thoughts you have regarding the addition of a full-time, non-faculty university employee to the Ball State University Board of Trustees.

Please share any thoughts you have regarding the addition of a full-time, n...

1. University policies play out in the daily lives of university employees, so a professional/staff employee will provide practical insight to help generate solutions that are logical, effective, affordable, and can be deployed with genuine enthusiasm.
2. With the amount of staff on campus I feel that it's important that the staff are included in making decisions that will impact the campus community.
3. I feel that the Board should have representation and the perspective of every section of the Ball State Community.
4. The addition of this personnel should assist the board in understanding the full range of thought and experiences of all.
5. Student and service jobs have been cut but professional staff get raises and more positions?
6. I believe in order to understand the purpose and importance that the individual should be someone who has experienced campus and has been in position of employment at the university for at least 5 years. I think that it is also beneficial if they are past Alumni of the University. I myself am both a well as a resident of the area for over 20 years, with children growing in the MCS community, i believe that it gives a unique perspective of campus, community and what we are attempting to implement both for the campus community and for the Muncie community. Someone less than that may have a difficult time understanding the Ball State Unique Culture and you may find that they will struggle and issues will get out of focus and off track rather then focusing on the implementation of items brought before the board to resolve, etc. The focus would revolve around the individuals rather than the issue or policy at hand and could have potential to hang issues up or derail them.
7. Professional and staff personnel are an important component in the success of the University. They should have a voice on the Board.

8. I think it is important to pick someone - not based solely on classification or title - but someone who is involved on campus (serves on University committees, volunteers with various events/activities) and has extensive knowledge of Ball State.
9. I think the diversity of thought will be a good addition.
10. Honestly, this seems unusual to have both a faculty member and staff member be a part of a university Board of Trustees, and I wonder about a potential conflict of interest, but think it is worth pursuing.
11. I feel that we should have a representative of both professional personnel and staff personnel on the Board. This will provide equal representation for all staff.
12. The trustees has a lot of say, for good reason, as to what happens at our institution. These decisions impact professional personnel and staff personnel (sometimes in different ways). To me, it makes sense to have a voting representative (possibly even one for each, though I know that continues to grow the number of decision makers) who can voice concerns and stand in as a representative vote of those concerns.
13. I feel like this person would be a voice from the people who never have one.
14. I believe there can be significant differences between professional and staff personnel and that needs to be accounted for. So the representative would need to understand the needs of both and be willing to work for what is best for both. Or maybe make it where if professional personnel is represented then the next time it will be staff personnel.
15. I think the Board is in the habit of referring to HR, Payroll and other administrative units on campus for making decisions, but not those who carry out the work mandated, so some of the details are glossed over. The voice of one who is "in the trenches" would be very valuable to the decision-making process.
16. The more representation I have, the better.
17. I am excited about this thoughtful idea of extending the BSU Board of Trustees to Professional personnel. Thank you!
18. I think representatives from this population would further help to inform future decisions as well as highlight the university's commitment to listen to all voices
19. I believe an odd number of trustees is helpful for voting, and if the faculty is represented, then I believe that we as professional personnel should also be represented. (However, I was pleased with the nine already in place). We all work with many audiences, students and community, and need fair and equal representation when decisions are made.
20. Professional and staff personnel often feel voiceless in university decision-making. Representation on the board of trustees could help remedy that situation, while simultaneously providing other members with a view of priorities related to the day-to-operations of our university that might otherwise never be considered.
21. I believe that this person should be from a unit that works directly with faculty, but themselves are not vested in the faculty. This person should also be in a position to make informed and educated decisions based on actual data from the university, rather than someone with little knowledge of the university at large.

22. It may also be helpful to the institution if the individual had a specified amount of service to Ball State as an employee and/or in their role. 5 or more years, something like that.
23. A representative from both Professional and Staff personnel should be selected to represent their classifications. I would suggest that there should be 12 trustee members on the Ball State University Board of Trustees for equal representation.
24. I do not believe that anyone in our positions (full-time, non-faculty) would have the knowledge of their organization to the point that they could make good decisions on behalf of the whole.
25. I worked at other institution that had a representative voice from these groups and it was very powerful in the decision-making process for the Board of Trustees. A staff/non-faculty lens can help give another view to decisions and some of the broader implications of them.
26. Full-time professional staff have a unique insight into this university that faculty, students, and others on the Board do not possess. They are attuned to the daily lives of students here at Ball State in terms of academic support services, advising, financial aid, counseling, career services, etc. This should have happened long ago.
27. Professional and staff personnel are a vital part of carrying out the university mission and often their issues are unique to them. It would be beneficial to have someone familiar with those issues to help have them addressed in Trustee meetings.
28. I support adding professional personnel to the Ball State University Board of Trustees. There needs to be representation from professional staff who are actually working with the student population we are serving. It is important for a representative at this level to voice issues that are arising for those of us working directly with students. Most, if not all, of the members of the Board of Trustees do not interact with students on a daily basis and they don't understand how the decisions they are voting on impact daily processes for students and professional staff.
29. Subtract a few of the governor's appointees to balance out the Board with those who have a sense of the impact of their decisions on the university.
30. This is an amazing idea, and a way to have everyone be heard.
31. I feel this is very important for the Trustees to be able to understand and consider the campus community on every level.
32. All populations of the university should be represented.
33. Staff employees have a unique "bottoms up" view with thoughts and issues that management doesn't necessarily have and deserves to be heard.
34. All too often, staff feels like the forgotten group on campus. Students are primary, as they should be, and faculty come in a close second as the group that imparts their academic knowledge. Faculty are always discussed as the underpaid group on campus and how they need to be compensated for their role in the university's success and future direction. Staff are rarely, if ever, mentioned when it comes to fair market compensation. Our raises have been minuscule at best for years. We do not make anywhere near fair market wages, while faculty in COB are making six figure salaries, many of which more than vice presidents

- and other senior executives on campus. We are expected to show up every day - we don't get a nice 3 month vacation every summer - and keep the university running so
35. students and faculty have a place to learn and teach. Those efforts are rewarded with pathetic 1% salary increases, which at the end of the day mean nothing with the rise in health insurance, parking fees, and other expenses taken from our pay check. Who is fighting for staff in any of the decisions that are made? It certainly doesn't feel like the administration does. A seat at the table might not change any of this, but it would at least recognize all of the other employees that are not faculty.
 36. I also don't support a tenth trustee selected from the faculty.
 37. This gives the opportunity for better understanding of the goals and decisions made by the trustees. A lot of times, I get questions and don't know the answers.
 38. It would be great to have a voice for the staff personal on the board at Ball State
 39. The Board of Trustees should include representatives from all areas of the BSU community.
 40. It will help to demonstrate Ball State's commitment to inclusiveness if the Ball State University Board of Trustees was comprised of not only at-large, alumni, and student representation, but also faculty and staff. Each entity experiences Ball State's opportunities, accomplishments, challenges, and initiatives differently; therefore each entity should have a representative on the board.
 41. An eleventh board member could help determine a majority (break a tie). Both professional and staff personnel share many of the same issues (though not all) and should both be included in the pool. Some measure of security for the staff person needs to be created to allow for candor in discussions and freedom from fear of retribution in voting. Staff do not share the security of tenure, and many feel that speaking up on certain issues comes with excessive risk.
 42. Will every employee group be given a representative? This would add either a professional or staff member to the Board, but not both. What about service employees? Will their elected (union) representative be given a seat?
 43. I think it is a great idea to include a professional or staff person to the Board of Trustees so that they are privy to information and to also offer input representing the best interests of the university.
 44. The more representation we have for all stakeholders on the Board the better.
 45. I think you will get a better insight of what the employees think by doing this I think it would be nice to see two non-faculty members added; one professional and one staff personnel.
 46. I think the board should reflect "we the people," meaning the actual people of Ball State University. And staff personnel represent the majority of the Ball State University community.
 47. These are the people who work and interact with the students on a regular basis as well as the faculty. They know what it is like to work in the "trenches".
 48. It would make sense to have representation for non-faculty employees on the Board of Trustees, especially if a faculty member is selected to serve. I'm having a difficult time coming up with any valid reasons why a non-faculty employee shouldn't serve on the Board.

49. I feel that the voices of the faculty and students are heard, but often the voices professional and staff personnel are not heard.
50. Non faculty personnel have a very different employment experience than faculty personnel.
51. Professional and staff personnel are much more involved with the administrative processes that provide the underlying functionality of the University, and would bring a unique perspective to the Board of
52. Trustees that is not available to someone faculty, students, and non-employees. Expanding the Board to include one or more employees with this voice will bring more opportunity to the Board to address improvements in operational efficiencies that impact the day-to-day tasks (and satisfaction levels) of this large segment of employees.
53. Non-Exempt Staff employees are the guts to operating each department. I feel this is pertinent to assisting the powers that be to understand the procedures and policies we live every day.
54. Having staff representation may help them to understand the impact/reality of implementing certain decisions – and vice versa.
55. TL;dr : It's a great idea that would create a positive perception and could boost employee morale, especially if staff personnel are included. I think this is a fantastic idea and provides an extra voice to important decision-making for campus. While I think professional staff (self included for full disclosure) are often provided a better understanding of machinations throughout campus and how things may or may not be related, I also think it would be a significant disservice to the many staff personnel on campus to discount them for candidacy. Additionally, there seems to be a persistent attitude shared from many staff of lacking a voice or being treated as "less than" compared to all others on campus, and excluding them might only prove to reinforce some of those attitudes. I debated recommending only staff personnel, but that could also reinforce some of those same ideas that some share. However, I would encourage for directors (and perhaps even associate directors) not be applicable for these positions—first, as they have plenty of responsibilities already in their dockets, and second, to encourage ideas and enhance perceptions of representation for those in other non-directorial roles. All said, this would be beneficial as a whole, and the idea of representation may even make the university more attractive as a destination for quality candidates searching for employment opportunities (doubly so for the faculty representation). I believe you are all on the right page and thank you for suggesting this quality proposal. (PS – This could easily be tied in as a nice campaign, presented from administration to staff as something like, "we want to be sure that when you hear our message of 'we fly,' you all are included in this statement—you are an important part of our institution and should be confident proclaiming together, 'we fly.'" Just an idea.)
56. Bringing staff and professional personnel to the table will broaden the diversity pool and provide a wider scope of knowledge pertaining to university needs.
57. The Board needs to hear first hand from both a Faculty and Staff rep the wishes of the working people at BSU – then maybe they will finally hear and understand what our wishes really are!!!
58. A great idea. Staff should be part of the decision making on the Board since many times the decisions made by the BSU Board of Trustees greatly affect the staff of Ball State. Thank you.
59. STAFF NEED TO BE REPRESENTED. There is a large portion of the employees that are staff and they should be represented in all aspects of the University make up.
60. I am certain that there is a professional person, who would be an excellent addition to the Board of Trustees, employed now at the University. The right person could add more breadth of perspective and

depth of experience here at the University that could be a direct liaison for their peers and employees and provide additional valuable insight for BSU as a Board member.

61. Professional and staff personnel work with students on a daily basis and would bring a lot of knowledge and expertise to the Board of Trustees.
62. It would be extremely beneficial for staff personnel to have a representative on the Board. Staff probably make up the majority of Ball State employees so their concerns are valid.
63. I believe all staff have a point of view that could be of value to the board of Trustees that may not be considered otherwise.
64. Staff play a very important role in the overall functionality of the university. They support, instruct, and provide a variety of services that help support education. Staff have a unique perspective as it pertains to the front and backend of functional services and hearing this voice would be extremely beneficial.
65. It would mean that all employee types would be represented on the Board.
66. It would be good to present a real world perspective of how the university works from those in the work environment.
67. Given the number of professional and staff personnel employed by Ball State, I feel they deserve to be represented on the Board.
68. Speaking as professional staff, I think this is a great idea as we genuinely care about and are invested in the success of the University and it's Students.
69. Full-time, non-faculty university employees are a large part of the university and its functioning. Any reasonable board would therefore be incomplete without a dedicated seat for this population of university employees.
70. Staff are affected by decisions that the Board makes. Whether it is the wait times we have at the counseling center or the changes that are made in the student center dining services, staff are affected by these decisions and they should be represented.
71. Such a forward thinking idea.
72. I believe individuals who are considered should have a strong record of service to the institution that goes beyond the proverbial norm.
73. I don't see why one shouldn't be added, we contribute a lot to making this university function and should have a say in decisions affecting our students.
74. If the intended goal of increasing the voting membership of the Board of Trustees is to ensure that university employee voices are represented, it seems appropriate that all categories of employees should have representation where permissible.
75. No burglars

76. Professional personnel and staff personnel are also the backbone to the University and are critical in meeting the mission statement of the University.
77. I think it would be important for a staff member to be appointed to the BSU Board of Trustees. We are the "front line" for students, staff, etc. and our voice needs to be heard. We are just as important as any other entity within the campus.
78. Professional staff and exempt/non-exempt staff have an equal stake in the success of Ball State University compared with faculty and students. Thank you.
79. I think the staff personnel are the most unrepresented group (or voiced group) on campus; and while maybe the majority of those staff might not take things very seriously, there is a group whom does and has awesome insights and opinions! And if everyone were being honest, this group has their ear to the ground and plays a vital role accomplishing the University's goals.
80. it would give employees a voice in decisions that are being made that affect us
81. A full-time, non-faculty university employee works closely with a diverse population of both students and faculty across all Ball State colleges and departments. The unique perspective of a full-time, non-faculty university employee will enhance the ability of the Ball State University Board of Trustees to adapt to the dynamic local and university environment in an impactful way.
82. This person should be able to purvey the sentiment of his/her respective employees.
83. If faculty wants a seat on the board it would not be right to exclude a seat for a staff member ALSO. If only one seat will be awarded then staff should have the seat. Staff represents more employees on campus than faculty.
84. I started to choose only professionals but I know there are extraordinary staff people with thoughtful perspectives who would provide value to the board.
85. If you wish to have fair representation, we should have both staff and professional. This could entail TWO representatives or perhaps a rotation in appointments?
86. I like giving everyone a voice, but non-faculty are in a supporting role for this university. I agree with the student as they are our "customer". I agree with the faculty as they are the ones that deliver the "product" and also help guide the university through their service activities.
87. Since we all work at the university, it's only fair that we have representation from all sectors....including both staff and professional.
88. Why is a vote on this even necessary? "Would you like representation?" you ask? Hmmm.
89. My vote would be for Matthew Ford - Business Support Services Supervisor at Bracken Library.
90. I believe it is very important that all employees of BSU are represented within the Board. Service staff experience campus on a different level than most other employees and therefore would help make the Board more well rounded and cognizant of the needs only service staff may be aware of.
91. I believe that all categories of employees should have a vote since all things approved effect all of us.

92. I feel the individual should: 1) have a minimum of 5 years of full-time service at Ball State in a professional or staff position 2) reside in Delaware County 3) not currently be serving on any campus-wide committees I think it is time staff have a larger voice at BSU and I would fully support a staff person on the board.
93. The addition of a full-time, non-faculty university employee offers a seat at the table for a representative of a group that I believe is often overlooked and taken for granted. Our issues are not faculty issues. As such, our voice and concerns will be best shared by one of us.
94. As a non-exempt staff employee, our group does not really have a voice. I am confident that it is assumed that our supervisors and administration communicate everything to all of us. This is not the case. The truth is, our group is the "oil for the cogs in the wheels". Professional personnel are salary and do not have to account for anything.
95. Non-faculty employees at the university have knowledge and insight from a different perspective than faculty. Their interaction with all audiences at the university could be valuable as a trustee.
96. Someone should be there to represent all. Faculty, Staff, Professional and Students
97. Non - faculty never get heard and their opinion does not matter in most cases in the 20yrs. I have worked at BSU.
98. The non-faculty should not be in the union.
99. non-exempt and exempt personnel have different BSU handbooks (i.e., policies/experiences). Therefore, actually - there should be one of each represented on the Board. "Regular" full-time staff (non-exempt) do have a staff council; exempt personnel often participate on University Committees.
100. The board of trustees needs to be more diverse. Currently all the members are highly educated and are lawyers, presidents, CEOs, or owners of businesses. While it is important to have highly educated and successful individuals on the board, I think it is also beneficial to have individuals that do not have a college degree and that have achieved success a different way. This will bring a different perspective to issues that are brought up. I do not feel as though the board is currently in touch with the struggles of the service, and staff employees that are living paycheck to paycheck and if there is a member of the board that is a service or staff member they can help bring ideas and solutions to the table from a different perspective than what is currently there.
101. The person considered for this position should be someone who has been exposed and have a well rounded knowledge of the jobs in the work force. This will help them vote on matters objectively.
102. Both staff and professional personnel have a vested interest in the future and direction of the university as there is always a resonating impact in the trickle down from decisions made. Giving voice to those who aspire to the success of our students and our campus culture and community offers an opportunity for authentic buy-in from this population at Ball State.
103. Why the full-time part? We have many part-time staff members who have zero representation on campus but give so much of their time to the university. I personally feel it should be 3 spots, the last one being a part-timer.
104. I do not support the addition of any employee (Faculty or otherwise) to the Board of Trustees as this would represent a conflict of interest.

105. Non-faculty staff are critical to the functioning of a university (and so are faculty). They are such a big part of the university, and therefore they should have a voice at every level of administration and decision making. Why have a student on the board? Because they are a critical part of the university and the student board member represents their interests. The same is true for staff (and faculty), and so in the spirit of Beneficence and the "We" Fly motto, staff should be included on the board as well.
106. My only thoughts are that the person is highly skilled to serve on the board of trustees and knowledgeable about the university, plus they should be a strong communicator who will be accessible to staff if needed.
107. I think many people default to thinking "professional personnel" are most equipped for roles like this, but staff personnel make up a very large portion of the Ball State Campus and thus deserve a chance to have representation.
108. Many staff personnel are very educated (often just as educated as professional personnel) and capable of understanding the complexities of higher education. I do not believe they should be excluded from the pool of potential trustees simply because they are "staff."
109. The only way this is possible is if Indiana State Legislature changes the law. It does not matter how much we want it or think it is a good idea.
110. We are the one segment of the working BSU community that is not represented on a regular basis.
111. I support this because there are many decisions made by the Board that directly impact staff, and we have no voice.
112. I think that staff would be more open and accept the Board's decisions if they knew that they were represented.
113. Professional personnel have different benefits and higher salaries. I feel like some of the changes that affect staff personnel are at a "harder" impact than to professional staff with higher salaries (i.e. insurance premiums, 1% raises, retirement benefits). It would be nice to have a voice and explain the impact it would have on a lower waged classification.
114. We should all have representation on campus. How about staff and professional for 10 and 11?
115. It should be a high priority to have a member of staff personnel on the Board of Trustees; frequently decisions are made that affect these employees yet they have no voice to ask questions or raise issues.
116. Need 12th person for hourly Staff the way it looks.
117. Why would any staff member NOT want a representative on the BoT? Students, alumni, business & industry, and presumably, educational entities all have representation on the BoT. LONG OVERDUE!!
118. This could improve the shameful lack of diversity we have on the board (only 2 of the more permanent 8 members are women and only 1 is a minority) and has the potential to improve communications and relationships between the employees who interact daily with students and the university. For years, the board never told campus what had gone on, leaving employees and students to rely on the Star-Press (and sometimes the DN) to get news out. With two additional trustees who work here, there would be more ways that board news and actions could get out more quickly to those trustees' co-workers and students. We seem to have fairly obsequious board members now, which doesn't always serve Ball State well. This is

a university, where discussing things is a vital skill that students should learn and faculty and staff should model and reinforce. Some different voices on the board could help in that area, too.

119. I do not support the addition of a faculty seat to the Board of Trustees. If a seat is identified for faculty, a separate seat should be developed for staff to ensure representation and motto university governance structures. Moreover, if there were faculty/staff seats, I have concerns over the conflicts of interest that would exist for these two board members. How can an individual pledge fiduciary responsibility and not at all consider their own individual circumstances as employees at Ball State including but not limited to merit raises, tenure and promotion, etc.
120. I selected professional personnel only, due to the education level, technical skill, leadership and decision-making skills required to appropriately act in this position. However, I made that choice without knowing how, or by what process this university board member would be chosen or appointed. If the process was one by which the board member was selected by vote of the professional personnel and staff personnel, I would see it as appropriate to provide a person on staff the opportunity make a bid for the seat, as an individual's ability is not necessarily a function of their job or position status at the university.
121. Staff members often feel disenfranchised with the goings on of the University, and representation will go a long way toward righting that.
122. I think that the person selected needs to be at the university for at least ten years so that they have some institutional history to base decisions on.
123. Should be knowledgeable of Higher Education environment (either via education minimum of a Bachelor Degree from Ball State or having worked at BSU for a set minimum number of years). My thinking would be that this person could help provide an intimate Ball State perspective that someone who isn't on campus in the weeds every day (even outside of meetings when they have informal discussions amongst themselves).
124. Full time non faculty employees are vital to university operations and goals and are heavily impacted by Board actions. Having representation on the BOT just makes sense because of that.
125. The entire University Community should have a seat at the table, the current status is typical, why not give everyone a chance to sit at the table.
126. Without this addition, professional personnel and staff personnel have no say or vote in any University matter. Staff council helps but they are trying to fix problems after they have been voted on by the board rather than being able to address it at the board.
127. Non-professional staff have a clear and unobstructed view of the current state of the university. By contrast, individuals in more prestigious positions aren't necessarily in touch with what is happening in various aspects that they are not directly involved with. A ground-level perspective of Ball State is key in implementing our future strategies, as well as improving things for our staff, faculty, and students in the short term.
128. We need someone to represent the staff employees and help fight for their needs.
129. I actually think there should be two. 1 professional staff, and one nonprofessional staff.
130. I feel if staff personnel could be represented on the Board of Trustees that it would make staff feel more valued and heard as a population.

- 131.If a governance body is meant to represent all of BSU it should include a representative from each stakeholder group.
- 132.I think this is a great idea. It's always good to have views from all areas.
- 133.I have mixed feelings about this. I'm not opposed to the addition of an 11th trustee chosen from university personnel, as I believe this could provide a different perspective as well as provide someone with board experience. That said, I don't know whether this is a best practice and whether this individual's perspective would advance the work of the board. I have additional questions as to how this person would be chosen - appointed or elected? If appointed, who appoints, and from what pool?
- 134.Currently, the board hears from representatives of different departments who are
135.invited to present on various topics. Would the work of the board be enhanced by the addition of this member?
- 136.As the Board of Trustees is tasked with setting the vision for the University having the input from those who are closest to performing the work of implementing the vision would most helpful.
- 137.The BoT decides many facets of our employment at BSU from raises, health insurance, retirement, and many other benefits. There is no reason why we should not also have a say in those decisions. Please consider appointing someone from the largest employment sector, Business and Auxillary Services.
- 138.I think this is a great idea. Both professional and staff personnel need a voice to express their concerns and opinions, which may be much different than those of faculty.
- 139.Staff need to be represented in university .
- 140.Adding a staff personnel representative to the Board of Trustees is a great idea because staff face their own set of issues which other BSU employees (faculty, professional) never face. This person needs to be articulate and not afraid to represent all staff personnel.
- 141.The Board of Trustees would have better perspective of the campus community by having a non-faculty member on the board.
- 142.Representation is always good. I also anticipate and odd number of voters would be helpful in voting.
- 143.If a non-faculty member is not added, I would like to see the faculty member work with staff council to ensure that staff concerns and ideas are moved forward. Staff are the ones who make the place run, who can foresee needs and problems when changes are proposed. The trustees need to hear from us.
- 144.Representation across all employee classifications on the BoT is a great way for all voices to be heard, receive input, and make decisions on all matters related to this higher ed institution and the community that it serves.
- 145.Professional personnel often have a strong pulse regarding the needs of the university, students, and employees though this voice is not heard enough as university governance is comprised predominately of faculty and senior level professional administration.
- 146.This should be an individual who is well versed and knowledgeable about the University. Will their time at the University be a factor?

147. Staff personnel are in the trenches keeping the university running every day. It would be beneficial for someone to represent them in the decisions that are made for the university. It would also connect all the classes of employees in their understanding of the decisions made. Thank you for this opportunity!
148. Seems like board creep - yes to a faculty voice, no to another non-faculty yes-man.
149. Why not have two new members - one professional personnel and one staff personnel?
150. Many times the BOT hasn't considered the impacts of their decisions on all levels of staff, but the lowest level of staff always seem to be impacted the hardest. I would hope that this would be changed in the future. My advice for you in choosing this individual, is to have it be a duty of the President of Staff Council, who already serves as an elected representative of the staff on several other University Committees and I believe would be a true and fair representative for all staff.
151. This seems like an excellent way to provide a voice for university employees to provide perspective and insight for university leadership.
152. I think this is a good idea to give different perspectives on issues.
153. More representation is always a good idea.
154. Staff at all levels are usually deeply committed to the success of the university. They are also important voices in our own community as they are more likely to live within Delaware County. I also think the addition of a faculty and staff member to the board will allow for deeper understanding of issues, challenges, and innovative solutions.
155. I believe that professional and staff should alternate terms to give a fair representation.
156. Both professional personnel and staff personnel help in the operating of this entity and should also be included in all decisions that need to be made.
157. There are so many people & roles that are required to make Ball State function & thrive. Without faculty & students, we wouldn't have a university. But those roles are supported & enhanced by the full time professionals who dedicate entire careers to administration and are key to achieving the goals & mission outlined in our strategic plan. We are here every day and are on the ground implementing the policies & regulations set by the Board. Representation is appropriate & warranted.
158. I feel they have a different perspective on how campus works and what is needed most.
159. Non-faculty account for a significant number of employees and work output. They have a very different view of and insight into how top level decisions may impact more varied constituent groups.
160. I have been both a staff and professional employee here at the University. There are many intelligent, progressive thinking staff that could contribute in meaningful ways to the Board of Trustees. This is long overdue!
161. Information is often the key to good decision making. One staff and one professional member could bring useful information to the pre-decision dialog. No one wants to feel like their voice is unheard. The addition of a staff level worker to the Board, would bring a sense of involvement and empowerment to all employees of BSU.

162. I think it would be ideal to include a voting member from both employment classes (Professional and Staff). Having this representation ensure their colleagues that the initiatives being examined will have someone relative to their own profession to vote on their behalf. I also believe creates more of a linkage between the Board of Trustees and the mid-level managers, professional personnel, and staff. I fully support this initiative.
163. Hell yes
164. I don't have statistics, but my observation is that the majority of people who live in Delaware County and are employed by BSU are in staff positions. These are the people most impacted by university policies both at work and at home and are, therefore, the most important link to the community surrounding BSU. Things like the quality of public schools, the city and county infrastructure, etc. - things that draw residents and businesses to Muncie and Delaware County and ultimately impact the image of and matriculation at BSU - are of paramount concern to these folks. I know, because I am one of them. Our perspective is valuable, even crucial, to determining how BSU policies
165. will be received and how successful the collaboration between "town and gown" will be. So, giving us a voice in the process should, hopefully, benefit all involved. Thanks for considering this addition.
166. It is only fair that we as staff members have someone on the Ball State University Board of Trustees to be on the side of the issues that concern staff members.
167. It is my belief that faculty and non-faculty have different perspectives on the inner-workings of the university. Having a non-faculty member representing that perspective would in my opinion boost morale and hopefully generate more dialogue before decisions are made.
168. It would be my expectation that the composition of the board would have representative experience that holds best interests at heart for faculty, staff, students, and community alike. They are serving on the board to be the strategic thinkers and directors of the vision. Is this to imply that none of the seven at-large members do not bring expertise or knowledge to the board table of issues that might affect non-faculty?
169. It would make the Board of Trustees a more well-rounded group of representatives. A voice from this portion of the Ball State community could be helpful as the ramifications of the trickle-down effects of the decisions being made can be very different to those of students and faculty.
170. Staff personnel only usually have some knowledge of both sides.
171. All Stakeholders need to feel like they have a voice. Faculty, professional and hourly staff each have different needs and can add perspectives that members of the current trustees may not have considered. Ball State programs teach and support social justice - this is a way to practice by example.
172. I think this would insure that at least those voices would also be heard. Thank you for considering this.
173. I think it would be phenomenal to see this additional board of trustees seat designated to a staff member. This could also create an opportunity for this person to partner with Staff Council in order to keep communication flowing back and forth. I feel that this seat could staff members across campus a voice and get involved with higher level decisions.
174. I think it is important to include a staff member because staff on campus feel out-of-touch with administration and like the administration doesn't care about staff or care to pass on important information. The administration also tends to make decisions on what they think is best without consulting those (lower staff positions especially) who are most likely to be affected by the decisions. The Board of

Trustees is probably not aware of how left out staff feel and having a staff member added might open up new avenues for better communication and awareness of what's really going on around campus.

175. Faculty and staff should stay in their lane and let the Board do their job.

176. I think getting more direct input from the staff will help by providing better information on the implementation of Board decisions.

177. I think representation of the employees on the Board is a step toward fair representation of all of the Board's Constituents. There needs to be a parallel effort to seek employee input on issues that either are or should be before the Board.

178. Professional personnel and faculty members do not necessarily share the same concerns

179. Staff is what makes the "University run" and should have a voice on the BOT

180. All employees should have a voice. Why not add another position for staff representation.

181. It seems to me if you want to have the full picture of how policy is going to affect the campus community, a large part of the campus community should be represented.

182. Professional and staff personnel make up a huge majority of the university and are impacted greatly by Board decisions. I think it would only be fair to have a voice at the table and representation in this forum. Also, while it's important to have faculty represented, professional and staff personnel can provide additional insight to processes that faculty members do not deal with on a daily basis.

183. It appears over the past years that professional and staff personnel need representation on the Board due to the recent attempts in changing retirement benefits and receiving minimal pay raises. While the President and his VP's get substantial pay increases from the Board!

184. I think all representatives of BSU should have a voice on the Board of Trustees.

185. We make up a good percentage of employees across campus, but have little power over decision making and make the lowest amount of money. That leads to us always being disregarded or getting an even shorter end of the stick when decisions are made. It would be really nice if a non-faculty-non-professional employee had a larger voice.

186. It cannot be limited to just professional personnel that would be insulting to many long time staff members who are just as capable serving on the board as professional staff members.

187. The addition of a Board member from the Staff Personnel would provide a perspective to the Board that it currently lacks and would give Staff a voice. The jobs Staff performs are critical to the success of both the students and the university as a whole. I have long believed Staff should be included in university governance.

188. I think it would be fair.

189. I think this would be an excellent way to represent this unique body of individuals.

190. Thank you for considering adding a staff representative to the Ball State University Board of Trustees. I believe doing so would provide much improved representation from this important demographic of those dedicated individuals that play an important role in keeping Ball State running.

191. The administrative functions of the university are critical to its success. The question is not "why" add a representative from the administrative operations of the university to the board, it is why would you exclude them?

192. This would be in accordance with our Inclusive Excellence plan. We need a diverse group of people from various backgrounds to best represent the university.

Professional and Staff personnel should have a voice in university business.

I feel that staff as a whole is under appreciated and it would be nice to have someone that could stand up for our interests.

I would want someone representing staff who wasn't afraid to speak the truth to power.

To provide the Trustees with an additional perspective of the potential ramifications for issues under consideration to additional areas of the campus population.

Find someone with thoughtful ideas, and a collegial way to debate issues before the Board.

I agree that someone from the faculty should be on the Board. My concern is that if we move forward with a nonfaculty person, this person will very likely be someone from the Administration Building that will simply counter the concerns raised by a faculty member.

The vote from an employee whether staff or professional gives a voice to the employee. Faculty, Alumni, and Students is great but the other side of the coin is that employees who are here and working everyday deserve to have a voice and a vote.

I have no comments at this time. I want to thank those responsible for allowing employees to vote on the possibility of allowing a staff employee as an additional trustee.

I believe that if faculty get a seat, there should be a seat set aside for a staff member as well. Faculty and staff do not always have the same concerns or opinions.

Although I'm sure that professional personnel would serve well in this position, I feel that staff are the most underrepresented class of employee at the university, and as a result, often the most underappreciated. I think it would go a long way to communicate value to your employees if the selection was made from staff personnel.

As someone who began as a staff member and got promoted to professional, I believe that it is extremely important that all full-time employees be considered. It would be incredibly unfair to exclude anyone. Especially staff, who already feel they are looked down upon by the University.

I believe the staff are the backbone of the university and we are not included in a lot of decisions that affect us on a day to day basis. Our input should be valued.

End of Survey Report

MAY-JUNE 2013 OF ACADEME, AAUP

Faculty Members on Boards of Trustees

The 2012 Cornell Higher Education Research Institute Survey of Faculty Trustees provides insight into the faculty role on boards of trustees.

By Ronald G. Ehrenberg, Richard W. Patterson, and Andrew V. Key

During the 2011–12 academic year, a group of faculty and student researchers at the Cornell Higher Education Research Institute (CHERI) gathered information on which public and private institutions had faculty members on boards of trustees and obtained the names of the faculty members serving in these roles.¹ In April and May 2012, we conducted a [web-based survey](#) of those faculty trustees to learn about their experiences as board members.

We asked them how they came to serve in their board positions, the length of their terms, the roles they played on their board, and how they related as board members to their faculty colleagues and to other board members. We asked unionized faculty members whether being at an institution with collective bargaining influenced their role as board members. We also asked faculty trustees whether they were voting members of their boards and, if they were not, whether they felt that the lack of a vote influenced their role. Respondents were promised that their answers would be kept confidential.

Faculty Service on Boards

Discussions of “best practices” for governing boards consistently cite improved relationships with the faculty as one of the characteristics of highly effective boards. We are in an era of increasingly “activist” boards, leading to significant mutual distrust between boards and faculty members and creating an impetus for improving faculty-board relations. Recent conflicts—such as the dispute at the University of Virginia, where the board of visitors forced the university president to resign only to vote unanimously to reinstate her just a few weeks later after being pressured by the faculty and other constituencies—make apparent the importance of faculty-board relations.

While both faculty and governance groups have advocated for greater dialogue between faculty members and boards of trustees, there is considerable disagreement as to whether faculty members should serve on boards of trustees. Those opposed to the inclusion of faculty members on boards, such as the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), emphasize the possible conflicts of interest. Those in favor emphasize the principle of shared governance.

A 2010 article in *Trusteeship*, the magazine of the AGB, reported the findings of an AGB survey on board membership, which indicate that a growing number of boards of trustees are involving faculty members as either voting or nonvoting members. Voting faculty members served on the boards of trustees of 14.9 percent of private institutions and 13.3 percent of public institutions.

Another 14.1 percent of the private institutions and 9.7 percent of the public institutions had nonvoting faculty members on their boards.

Institutional Characteristics

In our initial search for faculty trustees we identified sixty-one trustees from fifty-two public institutions and 142 trustees from ninety-seven private institutions. Information about which public higher education institutions had faculty members on their boards (and the voting status of these faculty members) came directly from the public boards database of the AGB's Ingram Center for Public Trusteeship and Governance. No public data source, however, has information on which private academic institutions have faculty trustees. To identify faculty trustees at nonprofit private institutions, research assistants at CHERI searched institutional web pages for the names of trustees and then performed subsequent website searches to identify which, if any, board members were also active faculty members. Not all private institutions publish information about their boards of trustees on their web pages, but we were able to find ninety-seven private higher education institutions that had faculty members on their boards.²

We sent each of the 203 faculty trustees we identified a link to a web-based survey asking fifteen multiple-choice questions and seven core free response questions. Based on respondents' answers to several of the multiple-choice questions, we then asked up to three additional free-response questions. Respondents were asked about their institution type, how they became board members, their voting status, their term length, their board training, and their committee membership. In the free-response portion of the survey, respondents were asked about their interactions with other faculty and board members, whether they perceived themselves as equal to other board members, the areas in which they had an impact as board members, and the factors influencing their effectiveness.

We also asked respondents for names of other faculty colleagues who were serving, or had recently served, as faculty trustees. Using this "snowball" sampling method, we identified sixty-three additional potential respondents.

Of the 266 total individuals to whom we sent surveys, we received 123 responses, a response rate of 46.2 percent. With various adjustments, the overall sample was reduced to 242 and, with 108 usable responses, the response rate was 44.6 percent.

The 108 respondents to our survey came from fifty-nine institutions (forty-three from twenty-six public and sixty-five from thirty-three private institutions). Table 1 presents summary statistics for the public, private, and combined sample of institutions. Public institutions have fewer faculty members on the board (1.12 versus 1.69, on average) and fewer board members (15.00 versus 29.25). Public institutions were also much more likely to have a bargaining unit for tenure-track faculty members (50.0 percent versus 3.0 percent), higher average faculty salaries (\$94,110 versus \$79,850), and much larger enrollments.

Table 1. Summary of Institutional Characteristics

Variable	Public	Private	Total
Number of faculty trustees	1.12	1.69	1.43
Total number of trustees	15.00	29.25	22.86
Faculty term length	2.06	2.37	2.24
Faculty has bargaining unit	0.50	0.03	0.24
Average nine-month salary (\$1,000s)	94.11	79.85	86.45
Total institutional enrollment (1,000s)	16.14	2.91	8.74
25th percentile SAT (math and reading)	923.20	1011.70	963.00
75th percentile SAT (math and reading)	1147.90	1228.50	1184.20
Observations	26	33	59

We sought to identify the terms of service of faculty trustees, including how they are selected, what fraction of the board membership they represent, and the length of their terms relative to other board members' terms. We found that 60 percent were selected by faculty election. Another 17 percent were ex officio trustees (often by virtue of their role in the faculty's governing body), and 13 percent were nominated by the faculty but subject to approval by the board. The remaining 10 percent were appointed in other ways. On average, the faculty members in our sample made up 7.1 percent of the boards on which they served, with faculty members making up 7.9 percent of the membership of public boards and 6.4 percent of the membership of private boards. In related research, Ronald Ehrenberg and colleagues reported in a 2012 [article in the *Economics of Education Review*](#) that female faculty trustees significantly influence the rate at which academic institutions diversify their faculty across gender lines only after women make up 25 to 33 percent of the board's members. With faculty members constituting such small percentages of total board membership, one might expect faculty board members to have relatively limited influence on board decisions.

The influence of faculty board members may also be diminished as a result of their relatively short-term lengths. Short terms were the norm among respondents, 66 percent of whom

reported that they served for less time than other board members. At public institutions, 86 percent of faculty trustees reported a shorter term than other trustees, while 52 percent of faculty trustees at private institutions reported shorter terms. The institutions in our sample had average faculty term lengths of 2.24 years (2.06 and 2.37 years for public and private institutions, respectively), while the AGB's 2010 survey [reported](#) an average nonfaculty trustee term length of six years at public institutions and three to four years at private institutions.

Although a majority of faculty trustees serve shorter terms than the other members of their boards, eligibility for reappointment could potentially compensate for any diminished influence. In our sample, 76.6 percent of faculty trustees were eligible for reappointment. Furthermore, it was more common for faculty members to be ineligible for reappointment as a result of a faculty governance body's policy than as a result of a board's policy: 17.8 percent were ineligible for reappointment because of a faculty governance body's policy, while only 5.6 percent were ineligible because of a board's policy.

Role of Faculty Trustees

Faculty trustees must balance perceived obligations to represent faculty interests with the broader interests of the institution. To gauge how faculty trustees view this issue, we gave the following prompt:

Faculty trustees have fiduciary responsibility for the institution as a whole. However, many people believe that it is difficult for them to act in this manner because their board colleagues assume that they will always serve the role of advocating for faculty positions. Did you experience such pressures from your faculty colleagues in your role as a trustee?

Only 10.2 percent of the faculty trustees indicated that they viewed their role as representing the institution as a whole without specifying their role as being a faculty representative. In contrast, 41.7 percent of the trustees indicated they viewed their role as that of a faculty representative. Another 22 percent indicated that they played a dual role and were able to fulfill their fiduciary responsibility to the institution while also advocating for faculty colleagues.

Table 2. Faculty committee membership*

Committee	Institution has committee	Faculty have served on committee	Faculty are eligible to chair committee	Faculty have chaired committee
Academic Affairs	0.83	0.98	0.31	0.06
Alumni Affairs/Development	0.59	0.74	0.29	0.00
Audit	0.70	0.63	0.20	0.02
Board Membership/Governance	0.70	0.46	0.17	0.02
Building and Properties	0.63	0.73	0.27	0.08
Compensation/Personnel	0.44	0.58	0.19	0.00
Executive	0.80	0.26	0.06	0.00
Finance	0.85	0.72	0.28	0.04
Research	0.17	0.40	0.10	0.10
Student Life	0.56	0.82	0.33	0.00

**Proportions in the three rightmost columns are for institutions that have the specific committee.*

With a majority of faculty trustees stating they represented faculty colleagues, how faculty trustees interact with other faculty members may be an important component of faculty governance. We asked respondents whether faculty members approached them with concerns. In response, 11.1 percent said that they were never approached by faculty colleagues, 9.3 percent indicated that they were seldom approached, and 47.2 percent indicated that they were routinely approached. Among those who were approached, 9.8 percent indicated that they redirected concerned faculty members to more appropriate venues.

In addition to the relationship faculty trustees have with other faculty members, a potentially large difference between faculty trustees and nonfaculty trustees may be voting status. Eighty-five percent of institutions in our sample, a much higher share than in the AGB survey cited above, granted their trustees voting privileges. Furthermore, when asked whether there were any issues on which they were not permitted to vote, only 12.1 percent of voting faculty members indicated that they were restricted.

While few faculty trustees in our sample were restricted from voting on board matters, greater differences from other board members existed in committee membership and leadership roles. Table 2 shows the frequencies across institutions in our sample of the board committees on which faculty trustees serve and of the ones that they chair. Two patterns emerge from this table: membership is not evenly distributed across different committees, and faculty trustees rarely chair committees.

Nearly every institution with an academic affairs committee had faculty trustees on the committee, with 98 percent of institutions having faculty representation. Faculty trustees were also well represented on certain other committees: 82 percent of student life committees had faculty trustee members, and more than 70 percent of alumni affairs, building and properties, and finance committees had faculty trustee members. Faculty trustees were not as well represented elsewhere. There was moderate representation on compensation committees (58 percent) and on board membership and governance committees (46 percent), but only 26 percent of institutions had faculty trustee members on the executive committee. Faculty representation on the executive committee was rarest (12 percent) at public institutions.

While the representation of faculty trustees as members of different committees varied widely, boards generally excluded faculty trustees from serving as chairs. The committees most likely to have faculty membership, such as academic affairs and student life, were also those most likely to allow faculty chairs; however, only slightly more than 30 percent of the institutions allowed faculty trustees to chair these committees. Consistent with committee membership, the least commonly allowed committee for faculty trustees to chair was the executive committee; only 6 percent of institutions permitted a faculty trustee to chair that committee. In practice, chairing committees was even rarer. In our sample of fifty-nine institutions, respondents from only six institutions reported that faculty had ever served as chair of any committee. Additionally, no faculty members reported having served as chair of the alumni affairs, compensation, student life, or executive committees.³

Areas of Influence

Despite being generally excluded from committee leadership and often being excluded from certain committees, many faculty trustees identified areas where they were able to have a major impact. In the free-response portion of the survey, each respondent was asked the following:

What is the major impact you feel you had on board decision making during your term on the board? (Please provide some specific examples.) What issues did your colleagues on the board pay most attention to your views on (e.g., academic, budgetary, student life, evaluations of administrators)? What were the issues that the board discussed that were most important to you?

As table 3 indicates, the most commonly mentioned area of impact and influence (at 49 percent) was academic affairs. Feelings of significant influence on academic affairs were relatively consistent across different types of institutions. The second most commonly mentioned area of influence was finance and budget, with 31 percent of faculty trustees saying that they had a major impact in this area. As with academic affairs, influence was not correlated with most institutional characteristics. However, faculty trustees were much less likely to influence financial matters if their board had a separate finance and budget committee.

Table 3. Areas of Influence

Variable	Mean
Influenced academic affairs	0.49
Influenced finances/budget	0.31
Influenced student life	0.15
Influenced faculty compensation	0.21
Influenced presidential evaluation	0.10
Influenced presidential search	0.08
Influenced presidential removal	0.05
Observations	108

Another area of influence commonly mentioned (by 21 percent of respondents) was faculty compensation. While influencing compensation was uncorrelated with most institutional characteristics, faculty trustee influence on faculty compensation occurred more frequently if an institution had a compensation and personnel committee. At institutions with such a committee, faculty trustee influence on faculty compensation was more likely to be expressed if the faculty trustee had served on the committee.

A final identified area of influence was presidential evaluation, search, and removal. However, as table 3 indicates, very few faculty trustees reported that they had influenced the evaluation of, search for, or removal of presidents.

Our survey asked several questions about factors having an impact on the level of general influence by faculty trustees. Respondents were asked how term length, nature of meetings

(public or private), and previous board experience influenced their effectiveness, and they were asked to identify factors that limited their influence.

In the free-response portion of our survey, each respondent was asked the following:

Some faculty trustees have complained that the short terms that they have (and often being ineligible to serve a second term) limits their effectiveness as a board member. Do you agree with this perception? If so, why?

Fifty-four percent of our faculty trustees identified short term lengths as limiting their effectiveness, and 17 percent identified the ability to be reelected to the board as enhancing their effectiveness. The importance of term length was not significantly correlated with institution type, voting status, the existence of a faculty bargaining unit, average faculty salary, relative term length, or institutional enrollment level. While the ability to be reelected to the board was cited as a factor enhancing faculty trustee effectiveness, this effect was observed only at institutions where the faculty trustee was a voting member of the board.

Respondents were also asked about their perceptions of how the public or private nature of their meetings influenced their performance as trustees. Specifically, faculty members from public universities were asked the following:

Many discussions at public boards, due to open meeting laws, are public in nature. Does the public nature of such discussions make it harder for you to take positions on issues relating to the faculty that might not be widely supported by the faculty?

Those at private universities were asked a different question:

Many discussions at private boards are confidential and not open to the public. Did the privacy of such discussions allow you to take positions on issues relating to the faculty (for example, size of faculty salary increase decisions) which it would have been harder for you to take if all discussions were public?

In response, 38 percent of faculty trustees indicated that it was harder to take positions at public meetings than at private meetings. Answers to these questions did vary by institution type, as 23 percent of those from public institutions and 49 percent of those from private institutions said that taking positions was harder at public meetings. A greater share of faculty trustees who were voting members (41 percent, compared with 10 percent for nonvoting members) agreed.

We also asked faculty trustees who indicated that they had previously served on another organization's board whether this experience had a positive impact on their ability to be an effective member of their institution's board. Of the 55 percent of faculty trustees with previous board experience, 58 percent indicated that the experience had helped. Those with voting status were more likely (64 percent) than nonvoting faculty trustees (30 percent) to indicate that their previous board experience enhanced their effectiveness.

In addition to these specific questions, our survey asked respondents to identify the major factors that limited a faculty trustee's ability to have a substantive impact on the board. Although responses to this question were highly variable, a few common themes emerged. The most

frequently identified limiting factor was exclusion from the executive committee, which 16 percent of faculty trustees mentioned. Other limiting factors included strained relationships with the institution's administration (12 percent) and having an administration that closely controls the information that flows to board members (9 percent).

Many participants volunteered information on factors that they believed enhanced their effectiveness. The two most commonly mentioned factors are related: almost 27 percent of the respondents mentioned the importance of personal relationships with other board members, while 12 percent mentioned communicating with other board members outside the formal board meetings (at trustee luncheons or other such gatherings).

Conclusions

Our survey of faculty members who have served on boards of trustees suggests that on balance faculty trustees believe their participation was positive and that they contributed to the well-being of their institutions. While some felt they were constrained in their effectiveness by their shorter term lengths or their inability to serve a second term, these constraints often result from the faculty governance process rather than board of trustee regulations; a number of respondents told us that, given the small number of faculty members on their boards, it seemed fair to constrain term lengths or reappointment possibilities to allow as many faculty as possible the opportunity to serve as board members.

One weakness of our study is that we surveyed only faculty members who served as trustees. Asking board chairs for their views on the contributions of faculty trustees could yield further insight into the role faculty members play on boards. Such a study, however, would likely need to include a larger number of institutions in its sample than our study did.

Ronald G. Ehrenberg is Irving M. Ives Professor of Industrial and Labor Relations and Economics and director of CHERI. He served as an elected faculty trustee on Cornell University's board of trustees from 2006 to 2010, and he currently is a gubernatorial appointee on the State University of New York's board of trustees. His e-mail address is rge2@cornell.edu. **Richard W. Patterson** is a third-year PhD student in policy analysis at Cornell University and a graduate research assistant at CHERI. His e-mail address is rwp83@cornell.edu. **Andrew V. Key** is a junior at Cornell's School of Industrial and Labor Relations and an undergraduate research assistant at CHERI. He currently is director of government relations for the SUNY student assembly. His e-mail address is avk44@cornell.edu.

Notes

1. We are most grateful to Hannah Clark, Ilea Malaney, and Kristy Parkinson for their help in this endeavor.
2. The 2010 AGB survey of 496 private institutions identified 138 private institutions that had faculty members on their boards of trustees, but the AGB data were collected under conditions of strict confidentiality, and the AGB was not free to share the names of those institutions with us.

3. An area that we had hoped to explore more deeply in this study was how the role of faculty trustees was influenced by whether their campus was one in which a collective bargaining unit for faculty was present. Having had only fourteen institutions with bargaining units in our sample, we were unable to draw any strong inferences about the impact of faculty bargaining units on the faculty trustee role.

I. Middletown [Roosevelt University] Advocacy

[AGB Trusteeship, July-August 2010]

The Virtues of Student and Faculty

BY CHARLES R. MIDDLETON



TAKEAWAYS

- 1 Student and faculty trustees, with their unique stake in board discussions and deliberations, add credibility and effectiveness to the board, providing a broader perspective.
- 2 Faculty representatives on boards must walk a fine line between advocacy of the faculty's interests and the occasional need to make other goals primary.
- 3 It can be useful for a president to meet regularly with faculty trustees, as well as with student trustees, to provide relevant information about forthcoming board discussions.

SHARED GOVERNANCE IS ONE OF THE MANY distinguishing characteristics of quality in American higher education. It is based on the premise that all of us know more than a subset of us, and that you get better results when you consult broadly, especially with those who have a stake in the outcome of the discussion.

These notions moved powerfully across the country when I was just starting my career as a faculty member 40 years ago. In those days, it was the students who professed these views most persuasively. They did so knowing not only that it was important to speak truth to power, but knowing as well that it was better to be the power that spoke the truth.

As a result, students found their way into the governance structure at many institutions of higher education. No sector was exempt, as students became fairly common features of the landscape of board membership in both public and

private, two-year and four-year institutions. Some of these early pioneers were “representatives” of the student body, empowered to attend board meetings but not to vote. But many were full board members, participating in the debates at the very least as junior colleagues and occasionally as full peers.

And why not? After all, everything that we do in higher education is about serving the students both academically and in their personal growth and development. What better way to accom-

plish that noble purpose than to have a student or two sitting in the room when the weightiest decisions about the future of the institution are being determined?

As for faculty participation and membership on governance boards, well, frankly, not so much. A recent AGB survey found that 14.9 percent of responding independent colleges (up from 10.7 percent in 1997) and 13.3 percent of public institutions (up from 3.4 percent in 1997) included at least one faculty member as a voting member of the board. In addition, 14.1 percent of independent and 9.7 percent of public institutions reported

including a *non-voting* faculty member on the board. It's not that there are few faculty participants in board meetings. There are. There are frequent occasions for the truly outstanding members of an institution's faculty to present the results of their scholarship or creative work, or to showcase their teaching successes, or to share what they are doing to help strengthen the infrastructure of the campus to better serve students and faculty alike.

In those moments we can see at work a vital component of the president's agenda to assure that members of the board better understand why their decisions are so vital to the well-being of the enterprise. What better way to reinforce the importance of board decision making than to showcase evidence that demonstrates how prior decisions lay the foundations for current success and that decisions soon to be taken will help move the institution forward?

While current practices for exposing the board to faculty endeavors are well and good, there is more that can be done. The simplest additional step is to assure that there is a faculty representative on the board, that is to say a faculty member selected by his or her peers to represent the interests and views of the faculty at board meetings.

Of course, dilemmas will present themselves—for example when the elected representative faces the tension posed when the broader purposes of the institution trump the narrower interests of a part of it. Faculty representatives on boards must walk a fine line between advocacy of the faculty's interests and the occasional need to make other goals primary. If they fail to do so, it is almost certain that board members will come to see faculty trustees as being self-serving or worse. Thankfully, this is not common in our experience at Roosevelt University.

Our practice of having faculty members on the board grew out of the university's founding moment, when the faculty of the College of the Central YMCA in Chicago voted to resign en masse in 1945 to form its own institution, thanks especially to a supportive vote by the student body.

Small wonder, then, that when a governing board had to be created, the leaders of the founding faculty were among

those at the table. I say leaders because the faculty didn't have just one seat, it had many. In an irony not lost on most of us, students fared less well, becoming members of the Roosevelt board with first one seat in the early 1990s and, subsequently, after the establishment of a second campus, with two seats.

Currently, students are nominated by the Student Government Association on each campus, selected from a short list by the board's trusteeship committee, and serve two-year staggered terms so that one experienced student trustee can mentor the new student board member. They contribute enormously to the quality of the discussions, especially in committees, and their views are actively sought, especially when not proactively given.

Faculty membership on the Roosevelt board of trustees, continuous from the founding moment in 1945, is as enduring as it is essential to the success of shared governance at the institution.

And it is a two-way street. Our student trustees, each with a full vote on all, and I mean all, matters, not only add leavening to the discussions. They also learn leadership skills that serve them well following graduation, as evidenced by how successful prior student trustees have been in a wide variety of fields and communities.

Faculty membership on the Roosevelt board of trustees, continuous from the founding moment in 1945, is as enduring as it is essential to the success of shared governance at the institution. Like outside trustees, faculty members serve three-year, staggered terms and can be re-elected. Elections to fill upcoming faculty vacancies take place at the last meeting of the university senate in the spring and are ratified by the board of trustees at its June meeting, but only upon the recommendation of the trusteeship committee.

These are merely the mechanics, however, born out of the history of the university and nurtured by the core values that guide all that we do and seek to accomplish. More important by far are the underlying assumptions about full student and faculty participation on all matters brought before the board. Full participation literally means just that. Like freedom and equality, it cannot be parsed. Either you are a trustee or you are not. And if you are, then you have both the authority and the accountability for your actions and all that you advocate and do.

On the surface, of course, absent other factors, this could well be a prescription for difficulty and even, on occasion, for disaster. One need not look too deeply into the experience of institutions of higher education over the past decades to find examples of both student and faculty

representatives on governing boards who shook things up, and not always to the advantage of the institutions. Of course, one also need not look far to find examples of students and faculty members who had no presence on boards and who shook things up even more.

What lies behind our success and makes it replicable across the academy, I believe, is a powerful principle—one that actually is present on all high-functioning boards as exemplified by the AGB study of such boards currently under way. The principle is that the Roosevelt student and faculty trustees are not representatives of, respectively, the student body and the faculty. They are full trustees as provided for by law on a board that prides itself on bringing a broadly diverse set of professional and personal perspectives to bear on university issues.

Put more prosaically, all trustees bring different backgrounds to board deliberations and thus enhance the quality of the discussions, expertise, and points of view presented. Their contributions reflect their life experience, their professional world views and skills, and their values as individuals. Student and faculty trustees fit nicely into the diversity of the board and provide unique perspectives in the deliberations.

When I arrived at Roosevelt eight years ago, I admit that I was skeptical about whether the theory could really be replicated in practice. Since then I have become a big fan of full faculty participation on the board, especially as an indicator of the level of shared governance—to which the institution is committed.

In our case we have five faculty trustees, or just under 10 percent of the voting membership of the board. The faculty trustees come from diverse disciplines and, accordingly, see most issues through different lenses. Thus one of the advantages that accrues to our public trustees is learning that the faculty is hardly a monolith. A side effect is that public trustees come to appreciate better the challenges that the president and others face in leading the institution internally when complex issues are under discussion.

A second advantage of the presence of even a single faculty trustee is shared information about board deliberations. In the monthly meeting of the Roosevelt senate, the faculty trustees report on the work of the board, discussing what the current issues are and the rationales for why those issues matter to the institution as a whole.

In this process, the work of our board has been demystified. It is now seen as a part of the institution, with its own unique roles and responsibilities for assuring the general welfare, just as other groups in the university have their roles. On more than one occasion, I have heard a faculty trustee tell the other members of the senate how impressed they are with the level of dedication the outside trustees display to the university, noting that the outside trustees are all volunteers, too.

There is a third advantage. Over time, there are more and more faculty members who have served in this role. I calculate

that I have personally worked with no fewer than 15 such individuals, and I know that there are many more who served before I arrived at Roosevelt. This cadre of individuals experienced in how things really work at the highest levels of deliberation is a valuable component of the broader faculty's understanding of how issues are resolved at the board level. Consequently there is virtually no "we/they" discourse vis a vis our board and its relationship to other campus groups.

But what about the issue of keeping board deliberations on sensitive topics confidential when students and faculty are present? When the Roosevelt board goes into executive session, where sensitive matters are usually discussed, the student and faculty trustees participate fully. In my eight years as president, to my knowledge there has never been a breach of that confidentiality, and if there has been, it has certainly never led to any external discussion in any campus forum of the issues discussed privately at the board level. The probity of student and faculty trustees at Roosevelt is exemplary.

One final comment about the role of the president in this environment is in order. Every president has as his or her responsibility regularly engaging individual members of the governing board beyond the formal meetings. How this is done varies widely depending upon institutional type and the size of the board. As a general rule, board leaders usually hear more frequently from the president than general members, with the board chair—who has regular meetings with the president—being most engaged.

I have applied a version of this engagement to our faculty trustees and, to a lesser extent, to our student trustees. While I meet selectively with student trustees when there are issues about which I think they may wish to have particular and more in-depth information prior to a forthcoming meeting, I have found it useful to meet regularly with the five faculty trustees.

In these meetings, we discuss a wide array of issues. Since each faculty member typically is on a different board commit-

tee, these meetings give them an opportunity to discuss forthcoming issues with each other, and many issues cut across several committees. I also get to gauge their views on all matters and can provide them with relevant information that can expand their understanding of forthcoming discussions.

One side effect of these meetings is that I get to know these colleagues better in their professorial roles. We have very interesting conversations about their scholarly work and their teaching, and this has more often than not helped shape the board's ensuing deliberations on the academic program and on faculty issues generally.

A second effect is that we can use these sessions to develop strategies to engage the university community as a whole in forthcoming issues or regarding difficult current challenges. Not all such issues need to be introduced into campus discourse by the administration. Indeed, it is very helpful on many occasions to ask faculty trustees to make presentations on such challenges in the senate. Their credibility with their colleagues adds weight to every discussion and helps keep the debate focused on the issues.

Returning to my baseline theme of shared governance, boards and presidents would be well served, in my view, by closer integration of faculty and students into high-level institutional decision-making. The uniqueness of our governance system in American higher education, based as it is on self-governance and comparatively limited regulatory interference, has led to high quality and diversity across the academy. It is the marvel of the world, current challenges notwithstanding.

Because we already have shared governance on operational issues, with the size of the share depending upon the issue, the principle is already a key component of that success. Perhaps we could all strengthen governance even further by also sharing responsibility at the strategic level of the governing board. Certainly it is an idea worthy of discussion. ■

AUTHOR: Charles R. Middleton is president of Roosevelt University in Chicago.

Board Composition: Student and Faculty Trustees

BY MERRILL P. SCHWARTZ

When board members step back and consider their own policies, practices, and board composition, they often wonder how they compare to other boards and whether there are better ways to accomplish their work. AGB periodically surveys how the gender, race, ethnicity, age, and occupational backgrounds of members have changed and explores policies related to terms, term limits, committees, frequency and length of meetings, and other basic and essential elements of board organization.

The most recent survey was conducted earlier this year, with the help of a generous grant from the TIAA-CREF Institute. The complete results will be published this fall in separate reports for independent colleges and universities, public colleges and universities, and institutionally related foundations. Board members, presidents, staff, and scholars will be able to use this data to compare the characteristics of their own institution's board with those of other institutions. The reports will include trend data based on prior surveys.

AGB has received many inquiries regarding the inclusion of students and faculty as members of governing boards. Bylaws (for independent colleges and universities) and either public statutes or state constitutions (for public institutions) may mandate that members of particular groups be nominated, elected, or appointed by a constituent group or other authority, or may designate individuals who serve on the board by virtue of their position. For example, the president of the

student government association, alumni association, or faculty senate may serve as a member of a board by virtue of that position, or those groups may have the authority to nominate, appoint, or elect board members. These special members may serve with or without voting privileges, and term lengths may be shorter, particularly for student trustees.

Highlighted here are data from AGB's 2010 survey on the inclusion of students and faculty members on boards. Respondents included the governing boards of 496 independent colleges and universities and 195 public colleges, universities, and systems.

Faculty as Board Members

It's become more common to include a faculty member on the board, but only about a quarter of public or independent institutions do so. Among respondents, 14.9 percent of independent colleges and universities and 13.3 percent of public institutions included at least one faculty as a voting member of the board. In addition, 14.1 percent of independent and 9.7 percent of public institutions included a non-voting faculty member. Among institutions with a faculty board member, the average was one faculty member. Compared to a survey conducted by AGB in 1997, boards with a voting faculty member increased from 10.7 to 14.9 percent among independent institutions and from 3.4 to 13.3 percent among public institutions. (Data on non-voting members was not available from the previous survey in 1997.)

College and University Governing Boards with Faculty Members (2010)

	Independent		Public	
	%	#	%	#
Voting Member	14.9	74	13.3	26
Non-voting Member	14.1	70	9.7	19
Voting and/or Non-voting Member	27.8	138	22.1	43
Number of institutions reporting		496		195

College and University Governing Boards with Student Members (2010)

	Independent		Public	
	%	#	%	#
Voting Member	8.5	42	50.3	98
Non-voting Member	12.5	62	28.2	55
Voting and/or Non-voting Member	20.2	100	70.8	138
Number of institutions reporting		496		195

Students as Board Members

It's much more common to include a student on the board of a public institution than on the board of an independent college or university. Among independent institutions, 8.5 percent included at least one student as a voting member of the board, and 12.5 percent included a non-voting student member. Among public institutions, however, 50.3 percent included at least one student as a voting member and 28.2 percent included at least one non-voting student member. Among institutions with a student trustee, the average number of student trustees was one. Compared to AGB's 1997 survey, independent institutions with a voting student member declined from 9.3 to 8.5 percent, and public institutions with a voting student board member more than doubled, from 20.5 to 50.3 percent. Data on non-voting student members was not available from 1997.

Make the Most of Your Situation

AGB generally doesn't support the inclusion of students or faculty as voting board members because of the inherent conflict of interest, especially for an employee, in serving on his or her own institution's board. That said, where there is a tradition of including faculty or students as trustees, any move by the board to break with tradition would likely result in a damaging political battle. The best approach is generally to ensure that all trustees receive a substantive orientation about their responsibilities and uphold the board's standards concerning conflicts of interest.

An alternative for an independent college or university would be to invite a faculty member or

experienced academic from another institution to serve as a board member. Public institutions could make such a recommendation to the appointing authority. And rather than including a current student as a board member, some independent colleges have a tradition of including a recent graduate as a young alumni board member. Including faculty and students as members of board committees is another alternative and can enrich the work of the board, enhance understanding, and avoid the possible conflicts students or faculty might experience as full voting board members.

Including a representative on a board doesn't ensure good communication between a governing board and the students or faculty on a campus. As noted in *Effective Governing Boards* (AGB, 2009, p. 24), "Regardless of whether board membership includes faculty, students, or staff, efforts should be made to assess the effectiveness of the board's communications with those constituencies and the best means of informing them and becoming informed of their views."

Whether elected by a constituent group or not, all board members bear the same responsibility to act in the best interests of the institution, and to serve its many constituents, not just represent the interests of their appointing authority—whether that's the governor, a church diocese, students, or the faculty. All board members must fulfill their fiduciary responsibilities to hold the institution in trust for future generations.

Merrill P. Schwartz is the director of research for AGB (merrills@agb.org).

K. [Indiana University Policy on Faculty Participation](#)

Policy Statement

A. Faculty Participation in the Open Sessions of the Board of Trustees Meetings

The co-chairs of the University Faculty Council should attend open sessions of the Board of Trustees meetings and present reports as a regular feature of the Board of Trustees agenda. The Board of Trustees may also invite and hear from the leaders of faculty governance on the campus at which the meeting is held. The co-chairs of the University Faculty Council may also request to be allowed to participate in the Board's discussions concerning issues that are of direct concern to the faculty.

B. Faculty Participation in the Executive Sessions of the Board of Trustees Meetings

From time to time, the President shall discuss with the Board of Trustees the advisability of the co-chairs of the University Faculty Council attending Trustee executive sessions at which issues of direct concern to the faculty are discussed.

C. Nothing in this policy is designed to discourage, displace, or prevent such informal contacts between members of the Board of Trustees and the faculty as now exist. Formal representation is intended to serve as the basis for expanded informal, as well as formal, conversations between members of the Board of Trustees and the faculty.

History

Language regarding Faculty Participation in the Executive Sessions of the Board of Trustees Meetings was adapted from a memorandum written by then-president of Indiana University Myles Brand. See the full memo [here](#).

(University Faculty Council, April 11, 1995)

(Board of Trustees, May 3, 2002)

(University Faculty Council, April 23, 2002)

(University Faculty Council, November 28, 2017)

END OF REPORT