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Established in 1992, the Center for Collaborative Policy is a self-supporting unit of the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies at California State University, Sacramento. The Center has three emphases:

- **Service** through assisting government agencies, stakeholders and communities in addressing complex public policy challenges for such issues as state fiscal reform, natural resource and energy policy, regional transportation, land use planning, and health policy through:
  - Multi-party consensus-building, negotiation, and dispute resolution;
  - Long-range strategic planning and visioning;
  - Inclusive and participatory public participation processes on emerging and controversial policy issues.

- **Teaching** collaborative policy development and collaborative leadership to undergraduate and graduate students at the University. The Master’s program in Public Policy and Administration offers a three-course series in collaborative policy development leading to a Certificate in Collaborative Governance.

- **Research** focusing on theory building in the fields of collaborative governance and deliberative democracy, evaluation of the outcomes of collaborative efforts, and research on collaborative process effectiveness.
Acknowledgements

I thank Dorian Fougères and Charlotte Chorneau for extensive research assistance and Susan Sherry, Lisa Beutler, and David Booher for conceiving the project and commenting on prior drafts.
1. Introduction: Shared Governance in an Era of Change

Never has the need for effective academic governance been greater than in today’s rapidly changing environment. Among the most salient trends and challenges facing colleges and universities are the following:

- Public funding is declining, especially for public universities: down from 62% of all revenue in 1981 to 50% in 1997 (Collis 2004a).
- Public sentiment may be changing from the traditional view of higher education as a public good that benefits society (and that society should pay for) to a private good that benefits the individual (that the individual should pay for) (Tierney 2004b).
- Public and/or governmental sentiment can create pressure for more accountability and managerial “corporatism” in university governance (Burgan 2004; Scott 1996).
- Student retention and graduation rates have remained stable nationally over several decades (Barefoot 2004; Carey 2004; Horn, Berger, and Carroll 2004), yet administrators face mounting pressure to increase retention to demonstrate outcomes-driven accountability, backed by per capita funding formulas.
- Demand from “nontraditional” students is increasing, especially in teaching-focused institutions. So-called nontraditional students are older, mid-career, vocational, multi-ethnic, or lower income (Collis 2004a).
- Demand for distance learning is increasing.
- Administrators increasingly seek to include more stakeholders in governance processes (Burgan 2004). "New entities—alumni, business firms, parents, spectators at athletic contests, the media, mayors, and state legislators—desire to share in the way U.S. colleges and universities are run" (Keller 2004, 165).
- Rising expectations for tenure and promotion leave less time for faculty to effectively participate in shared governance (Schuster and Finkelstein 2006).
- Unionization of full-time and adjunct faculty has been gradually rising since the 1970s (Ehrenberg et al. 2004), creating ambiguities over how unions and other faculty bodies should share authority when participating in campus policy decisions (Aronowitz 2006; Mortimer and Sathre 2007, 35).

Most of these trends and challenges have been evolving gradually over many years. George Keller’s (1983) seminal book Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education, published 25 years ago, begins with a stern warning: "A specter is haunting higher education: the specter of decline and bankruptcy." Most of the issues raised in the book are still salient today. Widespread angst about the future of higher education certainly is not new. However, in an era of change, stakeholders will push to reopen debates that others assumed were settled long ago. For example, in a changing climate, the university’s core mission may be called into question in the name of adapting to external circumstances or being responsive to the university’s
constituents. In a changing climate, who the university "belongs to" (e.g. students, alumni, donors, trustees, or voters) can suddenly seem unclear.

Some of the most fundamental tensions that need to be sorted out include:

- Providing a traditional liberal arts and sciences education versus preparing students to enter the workforce, and offering courses to satisfy market demand.
- Offering courses during traditional day-time work hours versus courses offered online or on nights and weekends.
- Offering smaller classes that afford more opportunities for in-class discussion versus larger classes that allow enrollment to rise while increasing the student-to-faculty ratio to control costs.
- Teaching highly specialized courses that match the instructor’s area of expertise versus basic courses that appeal to a broader cross-section of the student body.
- Spending money on basic educational infrastructure, such as well equipped classrooms, libraries, and laboratories versus investing in highly-visible capital improvement projects (such as recreational facilities, athletic venues, health centers, food courts, and bookstores) in the hopes of generating revenue, enrollment, or interest from donors.
- Encouraging faculty in student-focused universities to focus on teaching versus rewarding faculty who also pursue research to create new knowledge, enhance their teaching, and to attract extramural funding and prestige for the university.
- Enrolling students who are well-prepared for college-level work versus offering remedial courses so that disadvantaged students can also be successful.
- Positioning the university as a statewide or national institution by offering a complete college experience that attracts students from a large geographic region versus striving to build a locally-based university that extends educational opportunities to underrepresented categories of students.

Resolving these issues requires institutional structures and cultures conducive to effective deliberation and decisionmaking. However the high stakes and high uncertainty that characterize today’s environment can strain existing institutions beyond their breaking point.

Parallels can be seen in the current debates over the scope, causes, and consequences of atmospheric climate change. Emotional exchanges, personalized attacks, and policy gridlock lead many to question whether our traditional democratic institutions are capable of responding to this challenge with adequate force and speed. So it is with the current era of climate change in academia, where working relationships between faculty and administrators have deteriorated in many instances, and observers residing both inside and outside higher education are questioning whether traditional institutions of academic governance are up to the task (e.g. Duderstadt 2000).
For perhaps the last 75 years, "shared governance" has been the overriding principle that guides decisionmaking in American universities (Kezar, Lester, and Anderson 2006, 121). The core notion of shared governance is that faculty and administrators both have important roles to play in setting university policy. This notion receives overwhelming support among administrators and faculty alike (Minor 2003; Tierney and Minor 2003). Moreover, faculty participation in many facets of campus decisionmaking actually appears to have increased in recent decades, contrary to conventional wisdom (Kaplan 2004c, 201).

However, there remains an overwhelming diversity of opinions regarding exactly what shared governance means and how it should be practiced on the ground. Exciting developments in the fields of deliberative democracy and collaborative planning suggest the possibility of applying promising new decisionmaking strategies to resolve the issues facing higher education. These newer visions of shared governance are being articulated in books such as Mortimer and Sathre’s (2007) *The Art and Politics of Academic Governance*, and through the work of national networks of faculty and administrators such as the higher education project of The Democracy Imperative (e.g. Mallory 2007).

This discussion paper surveys recent research on the obstacles and opportunities for effective shared governance. For the sake of brevity and focus, the paper concentrates on scholarship relevant to public four-year universities published during the last ten years.
2. Obstacles to Shared Governance

Strained Working Relationships

Nationally, trust between faculty and administrators is relatively high, on average, but exceptions abound. Extremely tense relationships are not unheard-of. Occasionally, these conflicts are described in stark terms such as "war" and "evil" (Adams and Balfour 1998; Nelson 1999; cited in Waugh Jr. 2003).

Tierney and Hagedorn (2003) report that 75 percent of faculty nationwide feel there is sufficient trust while 24 percent perceive insufficient trust. Among assistant vice presidents, the split is 90 percent to 9 percent. The researchers conclude:

"Apathy and lack of trust are the most significant barriers to meaningful faculty participation. Individuals related that meaningful involvement is difficult when the faculty voice is not respected and shared governance is not taken seriously.

Respect trumps resources. Although many respondents outlined the need for better staffed committees, senates, and task forces, individuals placed a higher value on genuine respect by the administration for creating effective faculty involvement in governance."

A more recent and comprehensive national survey of 40,000 faculty at 421 institutions found that only 52% of full-time faculty at four-year public universities believe that the relationship between faculty and administration is satisfactory or very satisfactory (The Chronicle of Higher Education 2006a). However, only 15.3% agreed that faculty members at their institution "are typically at odds with campus administration."

The 2001 Survey of Higher Education Governance, representing 910 responding institutions, found that only 6.5% of respondents rated relationships between faculty and administration as being adversarial, whereas 53% described them as cooperative, and 41% “marked by conflict yet collegial” (Kaplan 2004c, 176).

Faculty Salaries, Workload, and Satisfaction

Faculty who are overworked, underpaid, or generally unsatisfied with their work environment might have a strong desire to see improvements in their working conditions. However, these faculty are also less likely to have time to participate in campus governance, and probably doubt whether campus decisionmakers would consider their input seriously.
Nationally, faculty salaries have stagnated. Over the last 20 years, faculty salaries rose only 0.25% after inflation (Wilson 2007). Average faculty salaries actually declined for two years between 2003 and 2005 when adjusted for inflation, and then outpaced inflation by 1.3% in 2006 (Millman 2007).

Salary satisfaction is mixed nationally and probably lowest among young faculty in expensive urban areas. In a national survey, 47.1% of full-time faculty at four-year public universities are satisfied or very satisfied with salary and fringe benefits (The Chronicle of Higher Education 2006a). A 2007 survey by the investment firm TIAA-CREF found that 91% of Generation-X faculty (ages 27-42) say that their salary meets their expectations, compared to about 68% of senior faculty (Jaschik 2007).

Many junior faculty working in urban regions with high housing costs struggle to attain a comfortable middle-class life, according to a recent article in the Chronicle of Higher Education (Wilson 2007):

"We didn’t take these jobs to get rich, but we didn't take them to get poor, either," says Christopher M. Witko, a 33-year-old assistant professor of government at California State University’s Sacramento campus. "You expect when you go to graduate school, get a Ph.D., and become a professor, that you’ll have a solid middle-class existence, but that’s not always the case anymore."

Faculty workload appears to have remained fairly stable in recent years according to an analysis of survey data from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty conducted in 1993 and 2004 (Townsend and Rosser 2007) and another national survey administered by California State University in 1990 and 2002 (Serpe 2003). The later study found no significant difference in workload between the two administrations of the survey, with faculty reporting a workweek averaging 47 hours. Within the 23-campus California State University system itself, the average workweek increased from 48.4 hours to 50.2 hours. According to the Townsend and Rosser (2007) analysis, faculty at four-year public institutions work an average of 51 to 55 hours per week, depending on the type of institution, with faculty at research universities self-reporting somewhat longer work weeks than those at liberal arts colleges.

Work load satisfaction is mixed nationally. According to a 2004-2005 survey of 40,000 faculty conducted by the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute, 62% of faculty at four-year public universities are satisfied or very satisfied with their teaching load. Regarding administrative responsibilities, younger faculty (ages 27-42) in the TIAA-CREF survey are considerably less satisfied than their more senior colleagues, with 39% saying their administrative work load had exceeded their expectations, versus about 15% among senior faculty.
Overall job satisfaction is reasonably high among faculty nationally. According to the UCLA 2004-2005 national survey, 75.2% of faculty at four-year public universities rate their overall job satisfaction as satisfactory or very satisfactory. The TIAA-CREF survey found that 53% of full-time faculty at four-year colleges are "very satisfied" while 43% are "somewhat satisfied" and 2% are "not at all satisfied" (Jaschik 2007).

Part-Time Faculty

Universities increasingly are relying on part-time faculty to cut costs, with implications for shared governance and campus climate. In 1987, there were 0.8 million faculty in the United States, with 66% in full-time positions and 34% in part-time positions. By 2005, the number of faculty had swelled to 1.3 million, with 52% full-time and 48% part-time (The Chronicle of Higher Education 2007b).

Mallon (2004) discusses these trends and their implications for shared governance:

"By the late 1990s, nontraditional faculty (part-timers, non-tenure-track faculty) made up more than 50 percent of all faculty appointments at research and doctoral universities (Anderson, 2002). By 1999, 55 percent of all new full-time faculty were hired into non-tenure-eligible term or contract appointments (Finkelstein and Schuster, 2001)…

With the increased diversity of faculty types on campuses, notions of academic citizenship have become more pluralistic. These new coalitions of faculty and instructional staff have begun to demand and win a role in the operational and decision-making structure in university affairs. Part-time and non-tenure-track faculty at several universities, for example, have their own faculty senates (Chait, 2002)....

Core faculty increasingly have to compete with these groups... Similarly, there is more than one governance paradigm at the university. While shared governance among three traditional groups (faculty, administrators, trustees) may be a useful concept in some aspects of university life, ultimately it only describes a circumscribed, and shrinking, core of responsibilities."

With adjunct faculty growing in number, relationships between adjuncts and tenure-track faculty can be strained over issues of shared governance, union representation, course assignments, comparable pay, and social status (Jaschik 2006b; Kezar, Lester, and Anderson 2006)

At least one institution, Georgia State University, has bucked the trend by converting about 100 part-timers into full-time lecturers. These lecturers are not eligible for tenure,
and earn considerably less than tenure-track faculty, but they do enjoy enhanced job security and full benefits, and are reportedly happier under the new system (Jaschik 2006a).

Faculty Culture and Sociology

The sociology of academia can create obstacles to leadership and shared governance. For example, Wergin (2007a) argues that academia attracts people who are skeptical or disdainful of hierarchical bureaucracies. "Why should they want to become part of a world they thought they had successfully avoided?" Moreover, faculty who do "cross over" to administration are viewed by their peers as either having "venal motives, such as the desire for a larger office" or worse, "they can’t ‘cut it’ doing teaching or research."

Del Favero (2003, 904-5) recognizes administrators and faculty have different values, interests, and responsibilities. These differences lead to an unreliable foundation for decision making. Faculty are specialized. They have a passion for a certain subject and they are immersed in it. They are not as connected to broader university goals. They are not as concerned with administrative details, and so they easily overlook them or do not understand them. They frequently perceive money spent on administration as a misuse of funds. They frequently have few institutional incentives to participate in governance: “Pursuing institutional aims comes at the cost of the faculty, especially those who have yet to reach tenure.”

Duderstadt (2004, 144), rightly or wrongly, articulates one of the most forceful criticisms of faculty culture:

"The faculty culture typically holds values that are not necessarily well aligned with those required to manage a complex institution. For example, the faculty values academic freedom and independence, whereas the management of the institution requires responsibility and accountability. Faculty members tend to be individualistic, highly entrepreneurial lone rangers rather than the team players required for management. They tend to resist strong, visionary leadership and firmly defend their personal status quo. It is frequently difficult to get faculty commitment to—or even interest in—broad institutional goals that are not congruent with personal goals."

External Demands upon Faculty and Administrators

In summarizing the dilemmas facing today’s universities, Mortimer and Sathre (2007, 111) suggest "external forces have more to say about internal matters than ever before. With the onslaught of unavoidable external distractions, faculty and
administrators are often forced to turn their backs on the university proper, to the detriment of positive working relationships and effective shared governance.

Kezar et al. (2007) lament that "new faculty members are being socialized to view involvement in external activities as more important than campus involvement." This trend is driven largely by the need to "derive supplementary income from grants and outside contracts"—what Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) call "academic capitalism."

This increasingly external focus of many faculty is articulated in a recent article in the Chronicle of Higher Education (Wilson 2007):

"Elizabeth Hoffman, a lecturer in English at Cal State Long Beach, says the declining value of faculty salaries has led to changes that aren't good for higher education. "Your job on campus becomes something separate, and you are involved in side deals to make money," she says. "It is a corporate model: You're portable, and out of necessity, your allegiance is to yourself." That doesn't fit with professors' traditional role in academe, she says. "You are expected to do a lot of work that no one ever knows about" and that you don't necessarily get credit for, she says, like mentoring students and serving on committees. Young professors who are commuting long distances and holding down second jobs don't have time for that."

Kezar et al. (2007) offer eight strategies that universities can pursue to overcome this outward focus and to enable faculty to participate meaningfully in shared governance. For example, administrators can help foster faculty leadership by promoting opportunities for networking among faculty, such as inter-departmental symposia, workshops, and mentoring programs. Administrators must also create an environment where faculty members feel free to pose questions and express concerns. Otherwise, faculty will avoid leadership roles for fear of being labeled as troublemakers and penalized during the tenure and promotion process. The article goes on to offer 12 tips that faculty can use to maintain a productive balance between university service and their other professional obligations.

Nationally, university presidents focus much (or most) of their time on financial and external affairs. This external orientation can leave presidents appearing aloof or disengaged to faculty who feel campus affairs should take center stage.

Waugh (2003) articulates a trend towards diminished presidential focus on students and faculty:
"Presidents are being held more accountable to external constituencies, particularly the public officials and business leaders involved in hiring them and the foundations and businesses that supplement their salaries and benefits. [Presidents], therefore, feel less accountable to the faculty and other internal constituencies. To increase efficiency and meet goals, presidents are increasingly hiring professional administrators without academic experience, who feel more accountable to their administrative superiors and less accountable to faculty, students, and others within the institution."

In a survey of two thousand college presidents (The Chronicle of Higher Education 2007a), the top three issues that occupy presidents' time are fundraising, budget/financial management, and community relations. The four areas that presidents most enjoy are community relations, fundraising, academic issues, and capital-improvement projects. Presidents consult most frequently with the campus provost (i.e. the top educational administrator), the chief financial officer, and the director of development/fundraising (The Chronicle of Higher Education 2005).

For university presidents, faculty issues rank 11th (out of 19 issues) in terms of enjoyment and 8th in terms of time spent. Academic issues rank 3rd in enjoyment and 10th in time spent. Among eleven constituent groups, faculty are ranked by presidents as their number one source of "greatest challenges" and, paradoxically, the number three source of "greatest rewards." Students and staff are the top two constituencies who provide presidents with their greatest sense of reward.

Presidential attention to capital improvement projects is arguably not a trend but rather a longstanding, permanent, and perhaps unavoidable necessity driven by competition among universities for students, according to higher education scholar J. Douglas Toma (The Chronicle of Higher Education 2006b):

"It does drive up costs for students. But, to some extent, institutions compete with one another for students based on the campus amenities they invest in. Do institutions realistically have a choice not to build new facilities? At public universities, students' willingness to pay fee increases to construct student or athletics facilities, as shown through referenda, indicates their direct support of those amenities… Can a president risk adopting a strategy of not building a new fitness center when all of his or her competitors are? Is a principled stance against the "bells and whistles" that are thought to contribute to recruiting worth the risk of having admissions numbers decline…? …In many ways, the decision to participate in the construction arms race is not really a decision at all."
3. Competing Conceptions of Shared Governance

Widespread Support

Shared governance is widely appreciated as a laudable goal, nationwide. For example, Tierney and Minor (2003) and Minor (2003) report that 82% of respondents at master’s-degree universities agreed that shared governance is an important part of the institution’s values and identity. “Overwhelming support for shared governance can be found in all three constituent groups on campus: 96 percent of [academic VPs], 86 percent of Senate leaders, and 78 percent of faculty indicated their belief that shared governance is important.”

According to the UCLA 2004-2005 national faculty survey, only 44.6% of full-time faculty at four-year public universities agree (strongly or somewhat) that “Faculty members are sufficiently involved in campus decision making” (The Chronicle of Higher Education 2006a).

Concerns about the legitimacy of policy decisions form one of the main arguments in support of having administrators, faculty, and other interested parties share decisionmaking responsibility in higher education. Mortimer and Sathre (2007, 24) explain the reasoning in terms of four claims to a seat at the table: “competence, concerns, cooperation, and cash, the four Cs of shared governance.”

"[A]uthority and power need to be distributed in ways that ensure that those who have the relevant expertise/competence are in decisive roles. In addition those who are concerned about the issue, those whose cooperation is necessary to implement it, and those whose cash is needed to fund it all have legitimate claims to participate."

Shared governance appears to be more prevalent now than 30 years ago. Contrary to the conventional wisdom about faculty roles in shared governance declining in recent decades (e.g. Birnbaum 2004; Burgan 2006), a comprehensive longitudinal survey found that faculty participation in all fifteen measured categories of decisionmaking actually increased between 1970 and 2001 (Kaplan 2004c, 201). Moreover, the amount of influence faculty perceive they wield relative to the influence of administrators also increased during this 30-year period. However, Kezar et al (2006, 121) suggest that "shared governance has been an important part of higher education institutions over the last 75 years."
Disagreement on Definitions

There is little consensus among faculty or administrators regarding what shared governance means. Echoing the 1967 policy statement on shared governance issued by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Duderstadt (2004, 140) argues that faculty should concern themselves primarily with academic decisions such as standards for curriculum, student admissions, faculty hiring, and promotion. Conversely, Duderstadt borrows lessons from corporate management to advocate:

"...a principle of subsidiarity should characterize governance in which decisions are made at the lowest possible level consistent with expertise and accountability. Centralization is a very awkward approach to higher education during a time of rapid change." (p. 146)

Minor (2003, 962) summarizes the literature on faculty involvement in governance as generally representing "three perspectives: (a) faculty should be, to some degree, involved in nearly all campus decision making; (b) faculty should be involved in decision making, but their involvement ought to be limited principally to academic matters; and (c) higher education institutions have changed so dramatically that there is a need to reconsider how campuses are governed altogether."

Tierney and Minor (2003) coded open-ended questions about the meaning of shared governance into the following categories:

- **Fully collaborative decision-making** was supported by 47 percent of respondents. "This refers to a traditional approach that some might call a "collegial model" of governance. Here, the faculty and administration make decisions jointly and consensus is the goal."

- **Consultative decision-making** was supported by 27 percent of respondents. "This describes a more communicative model where the faculty’s opinion and advice is sought but where authority remains with the senior administration and the board of trustees. Although many individuals and groups are brought into the decisionmaking process, the model revolves around information sharing and discussion rather than joint decision-making."

- **Distributed decision-making** was supported by 26 percent of respondents. "In this model, decisions are made by discrete groups responsible for specific issues. The understanding is that faculty have a right to make decisions in certain areas, and the administration and board in others."

"The presence of these various interpretations is important because strife and conflict are likely to appear when individuals on a campus have dissimilar views about shared governance. In such cases, the first step in approaching governance issues might be to create conditions where
differences about the best approaches to decisionmaking can be worked out."

In the concluding chapter of Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance, William Tierney (2004a) posits that the failures of shared governance often result from different individuals on campus having different concepts about what shared governance is supposed to mean. Tierney specifies four common but distinct interpretations of shared governance:

1. A Legislative Model, which emphasizes formal structures, such as the faculty senate, and other formal mechanisms for faculty participation in administrative decisionmaking.
2. A Symbolic Model, which downplays the formal rules and structures themselves, while emphasizing how those rules are interpreted and implemented in practice, both by individuals and through the broader culture and symbolism of the institution.
3. A Consultative Model, which focuses on the range of issues discussed and the constituencies who participate in the discussion. This model emphasizes the importance of faculty having a voice.
4. A Communicative Model, which focuses on the degree to which important ideas are understood and agreed upon. This model is less concerned about formal agreement (as measured by a vote count, for example), and more concerned with broad agreement on the strategic direction of the institution.

Tierney (2004a) cautions against trying to reach consensus on which model to pursue.

"Trying to dissuade individuals from their perceptions about organizational life is likely to fail and consume great amounts of time. Individuals posses deeply held beliefs about the way the world works which inform their models of shared governance. Although I have seen examples in which someone is persuaded by an alternative proposal, most often what happens is that a standoff occurs, or rather, faculty disengage from the process." (p. 209)

Rather than seek consensus on a single model of shared governance, university communities should strive to work creatively within multiple models to achieve the goals of the institution. Tierney (2004a, 209-214) asserts that working with multiple models is possible if the campus community can achieve the following four cultural conditions:

1. Trust. "In essence, the underlying assumption is that men and women of good will may have differing opinions about a particular topic, but such differences do not negate the importance each brings to promote the common good." (p. 211)
2. A Common Language. Are the people who pay tuition students or customers? What is the meant by the term community?
3. *Walking the Talk.* "To keep one’s words in sync with one’s actions." (p. 212)

Tierney (2004, 214-15) concludes "Paradoxically, the way to improve governance is usually not through an intensive restructuring of the organization but through paying attention to the culture of the organization... Quality comes about not because higher education has finally designed the one best governance system but because an organization’s participants are able to effectively interpret the culture of the organization."

Birnbaum (2004) invokes the concepts of procedural justice, social capital, and trust to argue that these "soft" aspects of governance, which are based on psychological models of individual behavior, are more consequential than any proposed changes in the "hard" structural aspects of governance, which assume a rational-actor model of behavior. Hard aspects include, for example, the composition of governing board, voting rights and procedures in the academic senate, and official university policies on governance. The relative importance of cultural versus structural aspects is reiterated in essays by Kezar (2004) and Pope (2004), and generally corroborated by Kaplan’s (2004a) quantitative analysis of institutional outcomes in higher education.

**Little Consensus on What Works Best**

There is little consensus nationally about what form of shared governance works best.

Brown (2001) found statistical support for the distributed decision-making model, in which faculty wield more control over types of decisions where they have better information and stronger incentives compared to administrators; and where administrators wield more control over other types of decisions.

Keller (2004b) argues that faculty advice on administrative matters should be solicited mainly through ad hoc committees:

"Faculty participation in all-university governance should be largely through special task forces or Kleenex structures that help solve a major problem or provide advice on a significant issue and then dissolve. Many professors are superb analysts, first-rate thinkers, and exceptionally knowledgeable persons, so when their attention is captured for a special purpose and for a limited period, and they are given adequate and detailed information about the topic and reasons for a decision on the topic, their counsel and suggestions can be invaluable." (p. 173)
Birnbaum (2004) describes the trend, which began in the 1990s, of reducing faculty’s roles in governance under the assumption that faculty senates are too slow, cumbersome, and obstructive to respond to changes in the external environment in a timely fashion. This transition from "collegial" to "managerial" models of governance is as evident in Europe as it is in the United States (de Boer and Denters 1998; Kovac 2003; Mora 2001; Shattock 2002). Birnbaum (2004) goes on to argue for maintaining active faculty participation in governance. "Faculty involvement in shared governance may slow down the decision-making process, but it also assures more thorough discussion and provides the institution with a sense of order and stability."

Duderstadt (2004, 142) makes one of the most forceful pleas for stronger management:

"The increased complexity, financial pressures, and accountability of universities demanded by the government, the media, and the public at large require stronger management than in the past... (p. 142)

Broad participation in university governance is hampered by bureaucratic policies, procedures, and practices, as well as by the anarchy of committee and consensus decision making... The academic tradition of extensive consultation, debate, and consensus building before any substantive decision is made or action taken poses a particular challenge in this regard because this process is frequently incapable of keeping pace with the profound changes occurring [in] higher education... (p. 143)

A quick look at the remarkable pace of change required in the private sector—usually measured in months, not years—suggests that universities must develop the capacity to move rapidly. This will require university leaders to occasionally make difficult decisions and take strong action without the traditional consensus-building process." (p. 149-150)

While advocating strong management, Duderstadt also forcefully describes the importance of recruiting faculty into the administration:

"I believe it absolutely essential that experience with academic values and the activities of teaching and scholarship must permeate all levels of university governance. Furthermore, this experience can be provided only by those who have toiled in the vineyards of teaching and research as faculty members." (p. 151)

Kezar (2005) provides an overview and assessment of several recent trends in university governance, including organizational learning, the learning organization, total quality management, benchmarking, and accreditation.
Ramo (1998) developed a detailed monograph on standards for shared governance for the American Association of University Professors. He later developed a much shorter assessment instrument to help faculty gauge how well their own institution measures up against a list of necessary conditions for sound shared governance (Ramo 2001).

Mortimer and Sathre’s (2007) book The Art and Politics of Academic Governance includes a chapter devoted to shared governance in strategic planning. The chapter discusses effective strategies at each stage of the process from convening through implementation.

Wergin (2004; 2007a; 2007b) outlines a "neo-collegial" model of collaborative leadership that he calls leadership in place.

"Effective leaders in place, whether they hold formal leadership positions or not, do the following:
• They recognize the potential for leadership throughout the institution.
• They build relationships of trust that transcend organizational boundaries.
• They frame problems in ways that challenge conventional thinking while also acknowledging the need to work within the existing structure and culture.
• They are not afraid to take reasonable risks.
• They give voice to a sense of shared purpose and future.
• They exhibit both patience and persistence, knowing that real change is neither predictable nor linear."

Considering the great institutional diversity that exists from one university to the next, it is not possible to prescribe a one-size-fits-all solution for shared governance (Minor 2003, 975). Universities vary widely in terms of their history, the structure of the senate, and the central mission of the institution (e.g. research, teaching liberal arts and sciences, vocational training). "Given the new kinds of institutions and new kinds of faculty, the period ahead should be one of experimentation and innovation in campus governance" (Keller 2004, 171).
4. The Role of Faculty Senates in Shared Governance

By one estimate, approximately three-quarters of all college campuses have academic or faculty senates (Birnbaum 1989, 423), but relatively little empirical research exists on these governing bodies. Three recently published studies are reviewed below (Kaplan 2004c; Lascher 2000; Minor 2003; Tierney and Minor 2003).

Diversity in Structure and Authority

Faculty senates vary widely in their structure and authority. Tierney and Minor (2003) provide descriptive data regarding how senates are structured, based upon a survey of several hundred universities. Mortimer and Sathre (2007, 31, 35-38) discuss jurisdictional issues that arise when faculty senates and unions coexist on the same campus. They also review Ramo’s (1998) observations on the differences between academic senates (in which administrators participate and vote on senate resolutions) versus pure faculty senates (which exclude administrators to deny them a “double-dipping” role in campus decisionmaking).

Minor (2003, 964) provides a descriptive typology of senates according to their scope of influence.

Traditional. Traditional faculty senates function primarily to preserve and represent the interests of the faculty during decision-making processes. They maintain control in areas that have traditionally been the domain of the faculty (i.e., curriculum, program requirements, and tenure and promotion). Their influence over nonacademic issues (i.e., budget, strategic planning, and external relations) is minimal due to limited legal authority…

Influential. …[These senates also] influence decision making on nonacademic matters such as budget, athletics, and development… These senates are assertive and take the initiative on issues that extend beyond faculty matters to those that concern the entire institution. Other governing constituencies view influential senates as a legitimate integrated governing body of the campus and as having the ability to create change.

Dormant. Dormant faculty senates are usually marked by inactivity and exist largely as a ceremonial pastime for faculty…Although these senates do not play a role in decision making, they may serve latent functions that are important to faculty or for maintaining the existing power structure. Dormant senates are not considered a factor in major university decision making. As a result, faculty may participate in governance through alternative means.
Cultural...[T]he faculty’s role in campus governance is dictated by fluid cultural dynamics more than structural qualities. As the cultural dynamics of the senate change (e.g., turnover in a key position), so does the role it plays in decision making... For example, informal processes such as the provost making a determination on an issue based on the advice of well-respected senior faculty members may weigh more heavily on decision outcomes than the formal proceedings of the senate. In many instances, structural ineffectiveness can lead to informal processes or “deal cutting” that circumvents formal processes of the senate.

Kaplan (2004b, 183) reports that two thirds of faculty view their senate as having "policy influence" on budgetary matters, while 16% viewed the role as "advisory" and 18% believed the senate had "policymaking" authority.

Prevalent Underperformance

Many senates across the nation appear to be underperforming. The Tierney and Minor (2003) survey documents widespread dissatisfaction with faculty senates among faculty and administrators.

"[One out of five] respondents reported that the Senate was not an important governing body, 53 percent indicated a low level of interest in Senate activities, 43 percent stated that involvement in the Senate was not highly valued, and 31 percent felt the goals of the Senate were not clearly defined, even though there appeared to be clarity about the domains of faculty influence—that is, there was clarity about areas of decision-making where faculty have authority...

Challenges to successful faculty participation were cultural and structural. In an open-ended response, participants noted that faculty workload and bureaucratic obstacles such as committee work or untimely processes dissuade faculty from participating in governance. Respondents also reported cultural obstacles to participation, including faculty apathy and cynicism about the process."

A national survey conducted a decade earlier "found that 70 percent of campus faculty, staff, and administrators believed that decision-making processes were working ineffectively" (Diamond 1991 quoted in Kezar 2004).

Keller (2004, 163) observes:

"Except for emergencies or cataclysmic events, faculty senate meetings are widely reported to be sparsely attended... Acrimony is not unusual at
Lascher (2000) documents how a series of procedural reforms in the senate at California State University, Sacramento apparently improved how senators view its performance. Contrary to expectations, senators actually had been more disenchanted with the operation of the senate before the reforms than were faculty in general. In 1999, the senate adopted a number of rules to structure senate meetings more tightly, prevent unanticipated changes in the agenda, and curb the influence of a few vocal individuals. The new rules led to much greater insider satisfaction.

Calls for Genuine Influence

A number of scholars have lamented the lack of genuine authority vested in many faculty senates. A common theme is that effective shared governance requires faculty to have sufficient voice and influence to participate meaningfully in policy matters. For example, in a regression analysis based on his survey of 2,053 faculty and administrators at 588 institutions, Minor (2003, 971) finds that the five strongest predictors of perceived senate effectiveness are "(a) high levels of faculty involvement in the senate, (b) high levels of faculty interest in senate activity, (c) having significant influence over issues related to tenure and promotion, (d) having significant influence in the selection of the provost and president, and (e) having significant influence in setting strategic and budget priorities." According to Tierney and Minor (2004), the influence of faculty senates will continue to languish until they improve their modes of communication, including written, oral, and symbolic forms.

In 2001, members of the faculty senate at the University of Notre Dame were so disenchanted with their lack of authority they voted to dissolve the senate. Of course, being a purely advisory body, the senate lacked the authority to dissolve itself, and when the senate reconvened the following year, it revoked its prior decision (Kellogg 2001).

Notwithstanding his reservations about faculty intruding into certain decisions best left to administrators, Duderstadt (p. 149) also argues forcefully for endowing faculty senates with greater substantive authority:

"Advisory bodies, paid only lip service by the administration or the board of trustees, will rarely attract the attention or engage the participation of those faculty most actively engaged in scholarship and teaching. Hence a key to effective governance is to provide faculty bodies with executive
rather than merely advisory authority, thereby attracting the active participation of the university’s leading faculty members."

Gaff (2007) similarly argues for revamping the committee system so that committee work is more influential, addresses more important issues, and makes better use of each faculty member’s expertise and interests.

In 2002, Brown University reduced the number of campus committees by 40 percent, and vested the remaining committees with more power. According to Faculty Executive Committee chair William Beeman,

"We’re operating on a much more cooperative basis… We don’t want the faculty to be administrators. We want to do our teaching and research. But at the same time, most faculty have been here longer than most administrators. We want a stake in creating the community in which we live" (Boutilier 2003).
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Appendix 1.

Examples of Successful Shared Governance

Alfred State University

In 2006, SUNY’s systemwide faculty group commissioned a committee of faculty to assess governance and climate on the campus of Alfred State University. The committee’s "highly critical report offered both stinging criticism (for all parties) and a set of recommendations for improving campus governance, one of which called for a seasoned administrator to spend six months on the campus as a mediator" (Lederman 2006). The assessment came in response to conflicts between the president and faculty. Believing that President Uma G. Gupta had become "a domineering leader who either ignored or punished dissenters" faculty began organizing a no-confidence vote. The assessment process deflected the pressure for the special referendum, and helped the campus refocus on constructive dialogue.

Portland State University

Ramaley and Holland (2005) describe the success of Portland State University in overcoming a major fiscal crisis. They attribute this success to leaders and others who were willing to view change as "a scholarly act strongly rooted in a culture of organizational learning."

"Academic organizations are often resistant to major changes. Yet between 1991 and 1996 (the date of its fiftieth anniversary), PSU leadership, faculty, students, and external stakeholders worked together to absorb serious budget cuts, redesign the undergraduate curriculum, revise the institutional promotion and tenure guidelines, and grow to become the largest university in Oregon. To achieve such sweeping changes, PSU had to develop a capacity to learn as an organization in order to guide and inform change and come up with fresh strategies after the near exhaustion of so many years of retrenchment and budget constraint."

The Democracy Imperative at the University of New Hampshire

In the summer 2006, a small group of scholars and civic leaders from around the country formed a national network of individuals to advocate for advancing deliberative democracy as an educational goal and institutional practice in higher education. To date, the main products of this endeavor have been a national conference in June 2007 and a statement of principles and practice (Guess 2007).
The Promise and Peril of Parallel Governance Structures

Hartley (2003) recounts the story of a small liberal arts college with 1,000 students in the Midwest (referred to by thy pseudonym "Summit College"), between 1989 and 1999.

- School in trouble in time of economic crisis.
- Strained relations between board of trustees, administration and faculty.
- President was perceived as aloof, disconnected, and autocratic.
- There was a racial incident that the president did not handle well. The president resigned after graduation that year.
- A new and “different” president was recruited from outside the institution.
- New president immediately met with faculty and staff members himself.
- He organized a faculty retreat where they began to tackle the problems at hand. He developed a new multi-constituent committee. They brainstormed ideas, devised a list of competencies and solutions. There was a vote in the end. People felt that they knew which solution the president preferred yet they didn’t feel like he forced his agenda.
- Committees were established to advance the “Summit Plan.”
- However, eventually people began to grow tired of this push for change.
- President delivered a pseudo threat claiming that if they did not like what the university was doing then they could leave.
- Tensions built, lack of trust grew. Faculty felt that the ownership of their plan was taken away when the President handed too much responsibility to the dean of faculty. Eventually the “angry mob” turned on the dean (not president) and organized a no confidence vote.

- Positive Outcomes:
  - They focused attention
  - Improved communication
  - Fostered stronger relationships
  - Developed political support for the change effort

- Draw backs:
  - Could they have been too efficient?
  - The task force reduced the authority of the president
  - Changing the decision making process can be a slippery slope.
Appendix 2.

Case Study. The Democracy Imperative

June 12, 2007

A More Deliberative Democracy

Some educators think they’ve found the perfect metaphor for political deadlock in Washington: university governance.

“Universities are renowned for deliberations that take a long, long time,” pointed out Bruce Mallory, provost of the University of New Hampshire. Committees, task forces, the student government, the faculty senate, the board of trustees: Academe is full of representative bodies with mandates that sometimes conflict and competing interests that can lead to contentious disputes, bitter debates and long, drawn-out proceedings.

Mallory and others believe that divisive, adversarial politics are also being played out on the national stage, at an unprecedented level of intensity. He is a proponent of what is being called “deliberative democracy,” a process of informed and civil political discourse that ideally leads to a greater consensus and more rational collective decisions.

But sometimes, civilized political behavior needs to be learned. And that’s where universities come in, Mallory suggested, as nascent laboratories of democratic engagement.

“I think ... the fundamental principles are [a commitment] to civil discourse, and listening, and speaking. Oppositional or special-interest democracy degenerates to adversarial [politics], in the sense that there’s a win-lose kind of goal,” he explained. “A university is a good place to experiment with that.”

The university held a conference last week that established a national network focusing on the role of higher education in fostering deliberative democracy — working to improve the political discourse and, in the process, changing the decision-making culture in academe. The conference, “The Democracy Imperative: Mobilizing Higher Education for Deliberative Democracy,” included representatives from institutions such as the University of Maryland and University of Michigan, which are on the network’s advisory board.
“Common political discourse today tends to be polarized and positional, rather than being deliberative,” Mallory said, while deliberative democracy leads to “considering multiple points of view in a sustained fashion over a period of time, so that we don’t make decisions impulsively and without sufficient data. Deliberative democracy aims to be sure that all parties are represented at the table and come with an equal voice.”

At New Hampshire, Mallory said, campus-level efforts are already paying off. The Democracy Imperative, as the project is called, has helped to organize “study circles” of concerned students, faculty members and others to discuss and deliberate over key issues — alcohol and drug use, free speech, making a safe environment on campus.

“What we found is that much larger numbers of faculty, students and staff participate in the deliberations because they don’t have to be a member of a formal elected body,” Mallory explained. He found that the process resulted in “very rich and thoughtful recommendations. Then those recommendations go to a number of places” — the faculty senate, the trustees, the president and all the other traditional elected bodies — “for implementation. So what you have is higher levels of participation and much more concrete and feasible recommendations.”

There’s another side effect, too, he said. To think: Deliberative democracy, at least in his experience at New Hampshire, speeds up the whole process.

An example of that process at work was a series of study circles about the university’s diversity and inclusion policies. Recommendations from the sessions led to a strategic plan that incorporated the participants’ proposals, such as suggestions on how to recruit and retain minority faculty, altering the campus climate and revising curriculums “to ensure that students from diverse backgrounds would feel engaged,” Mallory said.

The benefits of the process, he pointed out, included an increased sense of accountability among participants, who felt their recommendations were being listened to. It also allowed them to focus on a specific issue and do so in a way that was reported publicly and actually carried out, in part, using the outcome of their deliberations — in essence, a “thicker” democracy, in which anyone can participate, as opposed to a “thin” one relying on self-interested representatives. (The study circles didn’t replace existing governance processes — they supplemented them.)

Besides instilling the characteristics its proponents say form the backbone of healthier democratic habits — they hope, to be used after students graduate — the idea is also to cooperate with the local communities surrounding the participating universities, going beyond the boundaries of the campus. At the same time, the initiative supports research and scholarship into ways that democratic institutions locally and nationally can be strengthened. (It can’t hurt that New Hampshire will host the first presidential primary next year.)

James S. Fishkin, director of the Center for Deliberative Democracy at Stanford University, has been engaged in similar work, although he has not been involved with New Hampshire’s Democracy Imperative. His center cooperates with local and foreign governments to implement a specific type of deliberative democracy, hosting
one- or two-day sessions with statistically representative groups of people who listen to competing policy ideas and become informed about a particular topic.

And that effort is also spreading to colleges through the American Democracy Project, co-sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and The New York Times. Perhaps its most visible accomplishment is the Democracy Plaza, an open space located at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis — essentially, a place where students can openly express and exchange ideas.

“The idea is that that initiative ... was about spreading deliberative democracy to as many college campuses as possible so they could do local projects, and it seems to have been very warmly received,” Fishkin said.

At the AASCU democracy project’s national meeting — also last week — Thomas Ehrlich, a senior scholar at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and a proponent of civic engagement, spoke to representatives of almost 220 participating campuses.

“I was enormously impressed by the depth of work that’s going on at these campuses,” Ehrlich said, and by “how many faculty and administrators were really dedicated to trying to ensure that their students gained the knowledge, skills and motivation to be engaged, responsible, active participants in the democratic process.”

— Andy Guess

The original story and user comments can be viewed online at http://insidehighered.com/news/2007/06/12/democracy.
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How are 21st-century state universities perceived? How would I fit into a specific university and its leadership position? What should I expect in the selection process? What should I be sure to know - - about the university’s programs, key people, money, priorities? Among the topics covered are critical first steps, and when, where, and how to take them; steps the appointing authority or one’s predecessor can take that will help ease the transition; and other issues one will surely face. The book explores management concepts and practices specifically applicable to universities, offers examples that will help the reader prepare, and outlines the relationships that are most critical to success--and how one keeps them positive and helpful. Equally important, it explains where state university money comes from, and in what proportions, as well as ways to manage those sources to get needed funds. Finally, it covers ways in which one can handle a demanding management job and still enjoy good family relationships and good health.

This book discusses the overlooked relationship between evil and public administration, as well as other fields and professions in public life. The authors argue that the tendency toward administrative evil, as manifested in acts of dehumanization and genocide, is deeply woven into the identity of public administration, as well as other fields and professions in public life. The common characteristic of administrative evil is that ordinary people within their normal professional and administrative roles can engage in acts of evil without being aware that they are doing anything wrong. Under conditions of moral inversion, people may even view their evil activity as good. In an age when "bureaucrat bashing" is fashionable, this book seeks to move beyond such superficial critiques and lay the groundwork for a more ethical and democratic public life, one that recognizes its potential for evil and thereby creates greater possibilities for avoiding the hidden pathways that lead to state-sponsored dehumanization and destruction.
American Association of University Professors (1967). *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*. Formulated jointly with the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). The statement is directed to governing board members, administrators, faculty members, students, and other persons in the belief that the colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage calling for appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the components of the academic institution. The statement is intended to foster constructive joint thought and action, both within the institutional structure and in protection of its integrity against improper intrusions. It is not intended that the statement serve as a blueprint for governance on a specific campus or as a manual for the regulation of controversy among the components of an academic institution, although it is to be hoped that the principles asserted will lead to the correction of existing weaknesses and assist in the establishment of sound structures and procedures. The statement does not attempt to cover relations with those outside agencies that increasingly are controlling the resources and influencing the patterns of education in our institutions of higher learning: for example, the United States government, state legislatures, state commissions, interstate associations or compacts, and other interinstitutional arrangements. However, it is hoped that the statement will be helpful to these agencies in their consideration of educational matters.


The relative powerlessness of most faculty senates and the independence of unions suggest that the time may be propitious to raise the possibility that, if unions choose to become involved in governance issues, there is a chance to reverse the long-term trend toward faculty disempowerment.


This report addresses the challenges posed to the college presidency in the current and near-future higher education environments, and presents its conclusions concerning the president’s leadership role. Among the challenges anticipated for higher education are: diminishing resources; dwindling research funds; advancing information technology; the need to provide access and accommodate diversity; conflicting public expectations; and accelerating change. Problems posed by shared governance for the president, governing board, faculty, and state political leaders are outlined; and recommendations for rebuilding shared governance are made for each of these constituencies. These recommendations specify actions, approaches, and policies that exemplify both leadership and collaboration. Appended materials include data on the composition of single-campus and multi-campus trustee
boards, notes on contractual and compensation agreements between the president and board, information on three states' approaches to reforming the trustee selection process, and a list of commission meetings in 1995 and 1996.


Proposals to make governance be more efficient by reducing or limiting the faculty role in shared governance are likely to diminish institutional effectiveness.

This paper examines the relationship between faculty participation in university decision-making and university performance. Using an aggregated measure of faculty participation, McCormick and Meiners [The Journal of Law and Economics 31 (1989) 423] find that increased faculty control in decision-making is associated with lower levels of institutional performance. Building on the existing university governance literature, this paper argues that the optimal level of faculty participation varies by decision type. Disaggregating the data by faculty participation into different decision types produces results that are consistent with this hypothesis. Increased faculty participation may be good or bad; the effects vary by the type of decisions in which faculty participate.

The outstanding contributors to this book share their experiences about the kind of leadership situations senior administrators face and the moral decisions they are called upon to make. Among them are: Mary Sue Coleman, President, University of Michigan; Molly Corbet Broad, President, University of North Carolina System; William Kirwan, Chancellor, University of Maryland System; Edward S. Malloy, President, University of Notre Dame; Steve Sample, President, University of Southern California; Graham B. Spanier, President, Pennsylvania State University; Larry K. Faulkner, President, University of Texas, Austin; and E. Gordon Gee, Chancellor, Vanderbilt University. The passion that these university leaders bring to their jobs and the moral imagination that their roles require were all readily apparent at the forums and are captured here. The Smith-Richardson Foundation
gave Wake Forest University and the Center for Creative Leadership a grant to address the question of leadership in American universities and to run a series of three forums. Thirty-six of America’s busiest and most visible university presidents swapped and shared success stories, and reflected upon the lessons they had learned on the job.

Burgan, M. (2006). What Ever Happened to the Faculty? Drift and Decision in Higher Education. Baltimore, MD, The John Hopkins University Press. Mary Burgan surveys the deterioration of faculty influence in higher education. From campus planning, curriculum, and instructional technology to governance, pedagogy, and academic freedom, she urges far greater consideration for the perspective of the faculty. Burgan evokes the pervasive atmosphere of charge and counter-charge on U.S. campuses, where competition trumps reason not only in athletics but also in research, faculty recruitment, and fund-raising. Relating this "winner-take-all" mentality to the overspecialization of faculty and to overreliance on non-tenure track instructors, Burgan suggests that improving life on campus depends on faculty members’ successful engagement with their administrative colleagues as well as their students. Informed by experience, fueled by conviction, and full of practical, strategic advice for the future, What Ever Happened to the Faculty? is an excellent resource for administrators and faculty who are eager to change the tone and trajectory of contemporary higher education.

Campbell, D. (2003). "Leadership and academic culture in the senate presidency: An interpretive view." American Behavioral Scientist 46(7): 946-959. This article utilizes current interview data from 42 senate presidents to analyze patterns of leadership orientations. The language and symbols that faculty leaders use reflects their beliefs and behaviors about shared governance. Three themes that arose from the interviews are discussed. References to citizenship, skepticism about faculty governance, and a desire for personal career gain were dominant themes. The study suggests that the various dimensions of academic culture influence leadership and that thinking of shared governance through a cultural lens rather than a bureaucratic or political standpoint enhances our understanding about how to improve shared governance.


This article examines the relationship between faculty and administrators in colleges and universities as partners in a shared governance enterprise. It addresses a gap in knowledge around the value of this particular relationship and factors motivating its nurturance in the interest of institutional ends. Three theoretical concepts are offered from the sociology and management literatures capable of deepening our understanding of this relationship--social exchange, social capital, and network forms of organizations. Study of the social interactions between faculty and administrators will provide insights into improving collaborative activity and the decision-making systems of which they are a part.


From the former president of one of America’s leading universities comes a comprehensive analysis of the challenges and opportunities facing higher education in America as we enter the twenty-first century. James J. Duderstadt discusses the array of powerful economic, social, and technological forces that are driving the rapid and profound change in American social institutions and universities in particular. Change has always characterized the university as it has sought to preserve and propagate the intellectual achievements, the cultures, and the values of our civilization. However, the capacity of the university to change, through a process characterized by reflection, reaction, and consensus, simply may not be sufficient to allow the university to control its own destiny. Not only will social and technical change be a challenge to the American university, Duderstadt says, it will be the watchword for the years ahead. And with change will come unprecedented opportunities for those universities with the vision, the wisdom, and the courage to lead in the twenty-first century. The real question raised by this book is not whether higher education will be transformed, but rather how . . . and by whom.


This book debunks prevailing modern management theories and fashions as applied to higher education. At the same time it provides practical guidance for a clear and easily understood set of principles as to how universities and colleges can be re-energized and their staff mobilized to be effective in meeting the growing and changing needs of the global knowledge society. It is anchored in knowledge of management and organizational theory and in the literature about higher education which is critiqued from a clear theoretical perspective based on and tested through long experience of university management and leadership.
The ability of colleges and universities to implement strategic academic decisions is constantly challenged by a variable external environment, mounting public expectations, and evolving academic priorities. Although academic decision making is often dismissed by critics both inside and outside higher education as slow, parochial, and ineffective, institutions can and have developed processes to effectively address today’s complex challenges. With the proper attention by administrative, faculty, and trustee leaders, academic decision making can comprise a robust set of processes essential to defining the mission, priorities, and activities of colleges and universities. This book explores the intersection of academic decision making with contemporary, cutting-edge challenges for which no simple solution exists. It moves the issue of decision making outside the contested arena of stakeholder responsibilities, and presents a series of distinct and unique chapters that illustrate how colleges and universities are creating and sustaining dynamic and effective decision-making processes.

Public concern over sharp increases in undergraduate tuition has led many to question why colleges and universities cannot behave more like businesses and cut their costs to hold tuition down. Ronald G. Ehrenberg and his coauthors assert that understanding how academic institutions are governed provides part of the answer. Factors that influence the governance of academic institutions include how states regulate higher education and govern their public institutions; the size and method of selection of boards of trustees; the roles of trustees, administrators, and faculty in shared governance at campuses; how universities are organized for fiscal and academic purposes; the presence or absence of collective bargaining for faculty, staff, and graduate student assistants; pressures from government regulations, donors, insurance carriers, athletic conferences, and accreditation agencies; and competition from for-profit providers.

The chief academic officer must be the voice for the campus’s academic purposes and a source of energy in supporting the activities of others. Collaboration with colleagues across the institution is key to Ferren and Stanton’s approach. Their experiences in administrative roles, ranging from department chair to provost, have provided them with the ability to conduct and utilize many studies, including budget adequacy modeling and salary equity studies. These are issues for which the authors have been responsible for implementation and decision-making, allowing them to understand that collaborative processes and partnerships—such as chairs with deans, deans with vice presidents, faculty with administrators, or the
CAO with members of the president’s cabinet--are as important as informed decision-making. Because CAOs are less likely to read what business officers and vice presidents for administration read, this book attempts to integrate differing institutional perspectives and explain processes and criteria. CAOs can tailor their decisions to institution circumstances and solve problems with greater insight.

Fisher, J. L. and J. V. Koch (2004). The Entrepreneurial College President. Westport, CT, American Council on Education and Praeger Publishers. The most successful presidents of today are primarily defined by entrepreneurial attitudes and behavior. This landmark empirical study is substantially an update of the groundbreaking 1988 ACE Series book by Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler, The Effective College President. Taken from the largest sample ever of college presidents (more than 700), including presidents from all nine of the Carnegie classifications located in all regions of the United States, James Fisher and James Koch clearly demonstrate that common ground exists between the classic and tested characteristics of the leader and those of the entrepreneur. This book centers on key questions: Do college presidents often behave in an entrepreneurial fashion and does this behavior pay off for them and their institutions; and why are some presidents more likely to exhibit entrepreneurial attitudes than others? In addition to examining presidential attitudes and values, Fisher and Koch focus on actual presidential behavior.

Gaff, J. G. (2007). "What If the Faculty Really Do Assume Responsibility for the Educational Program?" Liberal Education 93(4): 6-13. Faculty members, administrators, and trustees have an opportunity to reinforce traditional academic and educational values by revising the traditional structures and processes that once supported those values, but that now interfere with them.

Gayle, D. J., T. Bhoendradattand, and A. Q. White, Jr. (2003). Governance in the Twenty-First Century University: Approaches to Effective Leadership and Strategic Management, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Explores approaches to effective leadership and strategic management in the twenty-first century university that recognize and respond to the perceptions and attitudes of university leaders toward institutional structures. It examines the differences between treating universities as businesses and managing universities in a businesslike manner, what kinds of leadership will best address challenges, and how to gain consensus among constituents that change is needed. From historical background to modern e-learning techniques, we look at governance to find systems that are effectively structured to balance the needs of students, educators, administrators, trustees, and legislators.

A recent survey of 146 postsecondary institutions found that 55% formed change task forces in the past 5 years. This article presents a detailed case of one private college that utilized task forces as a key strategy during a comprehensive change effort. Analysis describes the promise and peril of these innovative decision-making structures. Unburdened by day-to-day operational issues, the task forces focused on the change agenda, provided a "change friendly" environment, and became powerful change coalitions. The case shows how parallel governance structures devolve into "shadow" governance structures. Included are factors that determine how task forces enhance or compromise shared governance.

Helms, R. M. and T. Price (2005). "Who needs a faculty senate?" Academe 91(6): 34-36. This article discusses results of a survey commissioned by the Boston College to explore faculty participation in the local level. As higher education shifts toward market models of organization, boards and administrators increasingly apply bureaucratic modes of decision making to areas that used to be the domain of faculty members. All too often, administrators seem to sidestep faculty senates in favor of more efficient and accountable decision making that does not reflect faculty opinion or expertise. Boston College, which has more than 600 faculty members and 14,000 students, including 4,500 graduate students, is unusual among research universities. It has no formal arrangements for faculty participation in university decision making beyond that available within individual schools. The survey found that most professors at Boston College believe that faculty engagement in institutional governance is important: more than 90 percent of faculty respondents said they view participation in shared governance as a worthwhile faculty responsibility. In terms of their satisfaction with the current level of faculty involvement in governance, the results were mixed.

Hollinger, D. A. (2001). "Faculty governance, the University of California, and the future of academe." Academe 87(3): 30-33. Explores the role and importance of faculty governance based on personal experience at the University of California, Berkeley (which has one of the country’s strongest faculty governance systems) and the University of Michigan (with a weaker system more representative of national norms). Discusses the increasing market-related obstacles to solidarity among faculty and the implications for university governance.


Keohane, N. O. (2006). Higher Ground: Ethics and Leadership in the Modern University. Durham, NC, Duke University Press. Nannerl O. Keohane, a political theorist who served as President of Wellesley College and Duke University, has firsthand knowledge of the challenges facing modern universities: rising costs, the temptations of “corporatization,” consumerist students, nomadic faculty members, and a bewildering wave of new technologies. Her views on these issues and on the role and future of higher education are captured in Higher Ground, a collection of speeches and essays that she wrote over a twenty-year period. Keohane regards colleges and universities as intergenerational partnerships in learning and discovery, whose compelling purposes include not only teaching and research but also service to society. Their mission is to equip students with a moral education, not simply preparation for a career or professional school. But the modern era has presented universities and their leadership with unprecedented new challenges. Keohane worries about access to education in a world of rising costs and increasing economic inequality, and about threats to academic freedom and expressions of opinion on campus. She considers diversity as a key educational tool in our increasingly pluralistic campuses, ponders the impact of information technologies on the university’s core mission, and explores the challenges facing universities as they become more “global” institutions, serving far-flung constituencies while at the same time contributing to the cities and towns that are their institutional homes.

Kezar, A. (2004). "What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, trust, and leadership, or structures and formal processes?" New Directions for Higher Education 2004(127): 35-46. Changing structures may be a less important factor in creating an effective approach to governance than leadership, relationships, and trust.

Kezar, A. (2005). "Editor’s notes." New Directions for Higher Education 2005(131): 1-6. Explains that some core debates in organizational learning are explored in this issue, with specific focus on how these concepts emerge within the higher education context in the United States. Belief by some scholars that only individuals, not organizations, can learn; Definition of organizational learning and what constitutes learning; Strategies or approaches for creating learning in higher education.
Kezar, A. (2005). "What campuses need to know about organizational learning and the learning organization." New Directions for Higher Education 2005(131): 7-22. This chapter provides an overview of the literature on organizational learning and the learning organization, sets out key concepts in each area, and reviews the way that organizational learning and the learning organization have been applied within higher education.


Kezar, A., J. Lester, et al. (2007). "Where Are the Faculty Leaders? Strategies and Advice for Reversing Current Trends." Liberal Education 93(4). The results of a recent study of “bottom-up” faculty leadership across all sectors of higher education show that certain campus practices and policies can reverse or slow the several trends impeding faculty leadership.

Kovac, V., J. Ledic, and B. Rafajac. (2003). "Academic staff participation in university governance: Internal responses to external quality demands." Tertiary Education and Management 9: 215-232. Higher education in Croatia is confronted with new trends and quality demands mostly connected with Bologna processes. It is assumed that Croatian universities with their existing governance structures, characterized by strong state regulation and weak institutional administration, cannot respond effectively to new demands. Findings of the survey on conceptions of governance at the Croatian universities are presented in the paper, with its main aim to explore academic staff’s perception of university governance. The idea of the university as a “learning organization” with strong leadership and engaged academic staff is taken as the desired model. Mapping the opinions of academic staff on the present governance structures, their role in governance issues, and making an inventory of their perceptions of strengths and weaknesses of governance processes, forms important background for reflections on adequate modifications in academic governance.

Lascher, E. L. (2000). "Two types of procedural dissatisfaction with institutions: Lessons from faculty senate reform." PS: Political Science & Politics 33(4): 853-856. Faculty and senators at California State University, Sacramento were surveyed in 1998 and 1999 before and after a series of procedural changes in the faculty senate. Contrary to what might have been anticipated, senators were actually more disenchanted with the operation of the faculty senate than were faculty in general. Among those serving on the senate in 1998, much of the disenchantment within the body was traceable to how business was conducted. The most common response to an open-ended question about needed changes were recommendations that meetings be more tightly structured and that a few very vocal individuals be reined in. In response to evidence of this kind, the senate adopted a series of
changes on a trial basis for the spring semester of 1999. The modifications were enacted primarily to improve the flow of senate business, prevent unanticipated changes in the agenda, and curb the ability of a few to dominate discussions. Reform of the rules for conducting business led to much greater insider satisfaction.

Twenty-first century conditions are adding new dimensions to the relationship between states and higher education.


Research centers and institutes are one example of how institutional governance has become increasingly disjointed; as the suburbs of the university expand, core governance structures lose influence.

The purpose of this talk is threefold. First, I will ask you to join me in thinking about what the particular challenges and opportunities are with respect to the exercise of leadership in an academic institution. Universities share many similarities with other forms of large, complex, bureaucratic institutions. But we also have particular, some might say peculiar, characteristics that place special demands on leaders. Second, I will suggest some core values that I believe are essential to the practice of academic leadership. When I refer to academic leaders, I don’t only mean those who are concerned with delivery of the curriculum and the pursuit of scholarship. I mean all of you who are here today—leaders whose work is critical to the fulfillment of the university’s core mission, regardless of how proximal or distant you are from what goes on in classrooms, laboratories, studios, or seminar rooms. I will emphasize that a shared set of core values among all of us
is necessary to sustain and advance our academic goals. Third, I will describe the principles of shared governance that we must honor and operate within if we are to collectively serve the university. I will advocate for the concept of shared leadership as a means to achieving the sometimes elusive goals of shared, collegial governance.

Based on a national study of 750 four-year institutions, this study assesses the current state of senates and identifies factors that contribute to senate effectiveness. Findings show that although cultural elements of campus governance are positive, faculty are dissatisfied with the quality of their involvement in decision making. Regression analyses show that high levels of faculty involvement in the senate and influence in particular areas of decision making are significant predictors of senate effectiveness. Based on the findings, the study raises questions aimed at advancing the study and practice of institutional governance with particular attention to the role of faculty senates.

The author argues that the U.S. needs a commitment to deliberate democracy in American campuses. He says that the most obvious democratic measures have been faculty senates and elected committees. However, the most important factor promoting deliberative democracy in higher education has been tenure. He adds that tenure has also often afforded faculty enough job protection to risk open criticism of, and even opposition to, administrative decisions and policies.

Over the last thirty years, universities have moved towards a universal system of higher education, their objectives have changed significantly and, consequently, they are looking at making changes to their systems of governance and management. These changes can only be fully understood in the context of university tradition and culture. In this paper, concepts such as autonomy, collegial democracy and the status of teaching staff will be discussed from the perspective of the new developments, which have taken place in European higher education. Finally, new trends in university governing and management will be presented and discussed.

Focuses on the manner in which technological and environmental changes affect the model of shared governance between faculty and administrators, which plays
a role in our conception of the collegiate ideal. Causes of the complexity of U.S. colleges; Reason for the uniqueness of the notion of college as an organization and community; Traditions of shared governance.

Morimer and Sathre have gone beyond a discussion of faulty/administrative behavior by focusing on what happens when the legitimate governance claims of faculty, trustees, and presidents clash. They place these relationships in the broader context of internal institutional governance and analyze the dynamics that unfold when advocacy trumps collegiality. The book closes with a defense of shared governance and offers observations and practical suggestions about how the academy can share authority effectively and further achievement of its mission.

Discussions of diminishing faculty influence in higher education usually begin by citing the slow but relentless shift from full-time to part-time instructors in the academy. And indeed, that is the single worst problem we face at present and will continue to face over the next decade. But it is no longer an isolated phenomenon. Selectively vilified in the culture wars, put on notice by periodic legislative demands for accountability, the embattled professoriate has become a target of opportunity for competing interests and constituencies, all of which seek to remove faculty members from the center of higher education.

The author's plan follows three circles that overlap to form its basic framework: 1. The university as a complex organization; 2. Leadership - its patterns, theories, and commonalities; and 3. Case studies of exemplary leaders, which highlight their early experiences and actions. The overlap of the three circles defines the conclusions and synthesis. Each leader's story covers four areas: Childhood background; formal schooling/education; senior leadership roles and major defining events, successes, and failures; and forecasts for higher education and its leadership. The book includes an assortment of public and private universities, which provides a diversity of leaders who face significant differences in terms of control, financing, and oversight. This diversity allows for more useful comparisons and contrasts. The author explains the enormous role that persuasion (rather than domination or power) plays in successful leadership. It is clear that persuasion is effective in many settings, and not just in the university environment, but it is particularly effective in the university environment because stakeholders are so varied, and there are so many of them.
The article reports on the campus-visitation system at Alfred State College which averted a no-confidence vote by scheduling an official visitation to deal with a conflict between the faculty and the college administration. The conflict involved new president Uma Gupta, who had promised to bring progressive change to the campus. The dismissal of two vice presidents precipitated the conflict. A few days before the Alfred State Faculty Senate was slated to discuss a resolution calling for a campus-wide vote of no confidence in president Gupta, the University Faculty Senate informed members of the Alfred State Faculty Senate about the visitation process.

There is a link between faculty trust of administration and their subsequent levels of participation in the governance process.

What follows is the Portland State University story, a reflection on change as a scholarly act within a learning community using techniques from organizational learning.

The AAUP’s Committee on College and University Government has approved this instrument as a tool for assessing the extent to which practices at your institution comport with national standards for shared governance in higher education. We believe that each of the items on the questionnaire reflects necessary conditions for sound shared governance. On the other hand, we don’t intend the items to constitute an exhaustive representation of ideal conditions for sound governance. Furthermore, we don’t intend the instrument to measure opinions or satisfaction; we designed it to help you compile informed responses. Therefore, a good method for completion would be for a committee of faculty members who are experienced in governance on your campus to complete the instrument consensually.

Since the early 1990s, higher education reformers have pointed to the faculty’s role in shared university governance as an obstacle to effective institutional management. This volume summarizes AAUP policies relating to shared faculty governance and analyzes the implication of those policies for questions that arise
at individual institutions. Those who want to assess and protect the faculty's role in institutional governance will find this volume helpful.

Focuses on the democracy in higher education in the United States, Decentralization, legitimacy and accountability in higher education; History of the Georgia Board of Regents; Standardization of the curriculum; Vision statements of the board of regents.

Higher education is becoming destabilized in the face of extraordinarily rapid change. The composition of the academy’s most valuable asset—the faculty—and the essential nature of faculty work are being transformed. In recent years, however, a new order has surfaced, organized around a globalized, knowledge-based economy, powerful privatization and market forces, and stunning new information technologies. These developments have transformed the higher education enterprise in ways barely imaginable in generations past. At the heart of that transformation, but largely invisible, has been a restructuring of academic appointments, academic work, and academic careers—a reconfiguring widely decried but heretofore inadequately described. The authors’ portrait, at once startling and disturbing, provides the context for interpreting these developments as part of a larger structural evolution of the national higher education system. They outline the stakes for the nation and the challenging work to be done.

In an atmosphere of "crisis", the American Association of University Professors convened a conference on "Shared Governance vs. Corporate Management", from September 6-8, 1996 in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Faculty from AAUP chapter campuses and individual AAUP members from all over the United States convened to compare notes on the relative health of faculty governance.

The report summarizes responses of faculty members in the California State University (CSU) system and faculty at comparable institutions throughout the country concerning faculty workload, activities, and attitudes. The data were collected to allow an assessment of the workload of faculty in the CSU system, and compare that workload to that of faculty in comparable institutions. This report gives focus to comparisons between CSU faculty and faculty at other comparable institutions across the United States, and shows how differences in the CSU system
between 1990 and current data (2001 and 2002) compare to those of other institutions across this same time period. The report contains an account of the data and methods, a description of the results, and a summary of the key findings.

The paper considers the corporate-dominated and the academic-dominated forms of university governance, and the extent to which the position of these models has fluctuated over time. It argues that it is now time to move back to the concept of 'shared governance', but that this requires some reform of academic decision-making and that the corporate and the academic sides need to create machinery to realise effectively their respective contributions to university governance.

California State University, Sacramento (CSUS), is a regional, comprehensive university located in the capital city of the nation’s largest state. CSUS, part of the 23-campus California State University system, is a relatively young university, celebrating its 50th anniversary in 1997. The historic organizational culture of the CSU was that of a very large state agency, complete with formulas for all aspects of budget and rules for every management circumstance. Individual campuses were viewed almost as bureaus within the agency with little differentiation in mission. Strategic planning, with its emphasis on defining a university’s unique character and identity, was anathema to that culture when it came onto the higher education horizon in the early 1980s. This paper describes the evolution of a planning process from a non-strategic infancy, to an adolescence that has achieved significant linkages among planning, assessment, and resource allocation. When, or even if, the age of maturity will be reached is uncertain. The principal lesson learned in this evolution is that planning is always in a state of development. There is no one best planning process, even for a single institution. At CSUS, the planning process continues to evolve as we learn from experience how to best build the linkages among planning, assessment, and resource allocation.

As colleges and universities become more entrepreneurial in a post-industrial economy, they focus on knowledge less as a public good than as a commodity to be capitalized on in profit-oriented activities. In Academic Capitalism and the New Economy, higher education scholars Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades detail the aggressive engagement of U.S. higher education institutions in the knowledge-based economy and analyze the efforts of colleges and universities to develop, market, and sell research products, educational services, and consumer goods in
the private marketplace. Slaughter and Rhoades track changes in policy and practice, revealing new social networks and circuits of knowledge creation and dissemination, as well as new organizational structures and expanded managerial capacity to link higher education institutions and markets. They depict an ascendant academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime expressed in faculty work, departmental activity, and administrative behavior. Clarifying the regime’s internal contradictions, they note the public subsidies embedded in new revenue streams and the shift in emphasis from serving student customers to leveraging resources from them. Defining the terms of academic capitalism in the new economy, this groundbreaking study offers essential insights into the trajectory of American higher education.


William G. Tierney brings together faculty members, administrators, and policy experts to discuss differing views of academic governance at institutional, state, and international levels. Topics include the effects of globalization and the prospect of international accreditation; balancing the entrepreneurial and philosophical goals of higher education; the interaction between state governments and public universities; and the conflicting interests and roles of boards of trustees, administrators, and faculty. Carefully weighing various models and strategies, the book provides new ways of understanding and addressing the changes that are transforming higher education.


The article presents author's views on the September 1, 2004 issue of the journal "New Directions for Higher Education." The purpose here is neither to side with those who celebrate shared governance nor with those who seek its demise. Rather, authors offer a variety of viewpoints that will bring to light various ways one may think of shared governance. Governance is the means to implementing ideas that either respond to problems or provide new strategies. If academic governance is ineffective, then it needs to be reformed. The shape of those reforms is what the authors of this issue consider. Authors intend to stimulate thought and conversation about a key academic topic and how it might change in the coming years.

Many colleges and universities across the country are dealing with fiscal crises and other pressures by renewing their commitment to strategic planning, clarifying their institutional missions, and reexamining their governance structures. This report is designed to help policymakers, administrators, faculty, and researchers address the challenges of institutional governance by providing empirical data on the current role of faculty in institutional governance. In this monograph we describe the results of a survey of more than 2,000 faculty and provosts across the country that addressed the ways faculty participate in governance, the degree and effectiveness of that participation, and faculty attitudes toward it.


Cultural and symbolic processes—that is, communication—quite frequently play as important a role as structural issues in enabling effective governance.


The article discusses the importance of building trust and communicating purposefully to averting a faculty vote of no confidence. University presidents run into trouble because of conflicts with the faculty. When such conflicts arise, faculty senates frequently precipitate an institutional crisis by voting (or threatening to vote) no confidence in the president. Everyone doubtless would prefer a headline announcing that a president has taken a bold initiative that faculty applaud to one that says that a faculty and president are headed for a showdown.


A faculty vote of no-confidence is the “nuclear option” no president wishes to face. Building trust and communicating purposefully will avert such showdowns.


Veit, R. (2005). "Some branches were more equal than others." *Academe* 91(6): 42-45. This article discusses findings of a survey which examined shared governance within the campuses of the University of North Carolina. Shared governance was thriving on most of the campuses, however, it was considerably less robust at some of the smaller schools in the system. Some faculty members complained that administrators routinely made curricular decisions on their campuses without any faculty consultation. Some first heard about changes to tenure policies only after
the changes had been ratified by their institution’s board of trustees. Some lamented that the recommendations of grievance and appeals panels were regularly ignored. The Faculty Assembly of the University of North Carolina has little authority over the individual campuses that make up the state university system. If the faculty senates on the sixteen campuses can be compared to the parliaments of national governments, then the assembly is the United Nations—a forum that permits members to consult with one another, share information, and seek to sway opinion but not to exercise direct control over the internal affairs of any of its member states. Lacking power to intervene directly, the assembly used its more indirect tools.


Waugh Jr., W. L. (2003). "Issues in university governance: More professional and less academic." The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 585(84). The pressures for efficiency and the achievement of performance goals are encouraging college and university presidents to focus more on the management of their institutions and less on the more collegial processes of academic decision making. Presidents are being held more accountable to external constituencies, particularly the public officials and business leaders involved in hiring them and the foundations and businesses that supplement their salaries and benefits, and, therefore, feel less accountable to the faculty and other internal constituencies. To increase efficiency and meet goals, presidents are increasingly hiring professional administrators without academic experience, who feel more accountable to their administrative superiors and less accountable to faculty, students, and others within the institution. The focus on managerial values is also filtering down to academic departments and nonacademic offices. The net effect is that the faculty role in university governance is decreasing and may be extinguished if current trends continue.


Wergin, J. F., Editor. (2007). Leadership in Place: How Academic Professionals Can Find Their Leadership Voice. Jossey-Bass. Ten academic leaders reflect from personal experience on leadership in place—an emergent mode of leadership that brings people together in order to effect organizational change. Leadership in Place calls for a shift in attitude about leaders and leadership. It departs from the hierarchical view that academic leadership flows from a leadership position, and instead embraces a more lateral view where leadership roles are available to everyone. It calls for a rethinking of how our colleges and universities are led and organized by discussing the following:

• Importance of strong academic communities in preserving the integrity of academic programs
• Empowerment of part-time faculty by combining adaptive and transformative learning models
• Opportunities for, benefits of, and challenges in collaborative leadership
• Problems that can emerge in times of leadership transitions and possible solutions
• Concept of leadership as an attribute of the many rather than the few

Zemsky, R., G. R. Wegner, and W. F. Massy. (2005). Remaking the American University: Market-Smart and Mission-Centered. Rutgers University Press. Provides a penetrating analysis of the ways market forces have shaped and distorted the behaviors, purposes and ultimately the missions of universities and colleges over the past half-century. The authors describe how a competitive preoccupation with rankings and markets published by the media spawned an
admissions arms race that drains institutional resources and energies. Equally revealing are the depictions of the ways faculty distance themselves from their universities with the resulting increase in the number of administrators, which contributes substantially to institutional costs. Other chapters focus on the impact of intercollegiate athletics on educational missions, even among selective institutions; on the unforeseen result of "outsourcing" a substantial share of the scholarly publication function to for-profit interests; and on the potentially dire consequences of today's zealous investments in e-learning. A central question extends through this series of explorations: Can universities and colleges today still choose to be places of public purpose? In the answers they provide, both sobering and enlightening, the authors underscore a consistent and powerful lesson--academic institutions cannot ignore the workings of the markets. The challenge ahead is to learn how to better use those markets to achieve public purposes.