

Report

ADE Ad Hoc Committee on Governance

Profession 2002

© 2002 by The Modern Language Association of America

All material published by the Modern Language Association in any medium is protected by copyright. Users may link to the MLA Web page freely and may quote from MLA publications as allowed by the doctrine of fair use. Written permission is required for any other reproduction of material from any MLA publication.

Send requests for permission to reprint material to the MLA permissions manager by mail (26 Broadway, New York, NY 10004-1789), e-mail (permissions@mla.org), or fax (646 458-0030).

Report



ADE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE

INTRODUCTION

The nature of academic governance in an institution helps determine not only the shape of decision making but also the ultimate possibilities of teaching and research. Once—when institutions were less vast, numerous, and complicated—a small group of administrators, in collaboration with the faculty, could make decisions about curriculum, hiring, and institutional policy. Now, given an enlarging cast of characters and increasing regulatory, legal, and financial pressures conflicting with ever-magnifying and multiplying senses of need, the appropriate patterns of governance are no longer agreed on.

Administrations and faculties have traditionally espoused different interests, even when administrators emerge themselves from faculties. Each group has a distinct point of view; each may find the other an obstacle to the realization of its visions. In recent years, the sense of disconnection between faculty and administration has intensified and negative criticism of the faculty strengthened as the size and responsibilities of administrations—often at perceived cost to the faculty—have increased. Faculties and administrations, each group wishing to assert its own point of view, frequently advocate conflicting models of governance.

In the course of its deliberations the committee identified three dominant models of institutional governance—models that are not necessarily exclusive but that represent different emphases and that, for the purposes of its discussions, the committee distinguished in a schematic way. The traditional forms of shared governance, often tacitly supported by faculty members who may not have given the matter much thought, contend increasingly

with corporate images of top-down arrangements, allegedly more efficient. As the administration asserts its view more aggressively, unionization offers one way for the faculty to affirm its values in an organized fashion, regularizing and legalizing the increasingly adversarial pattern of relations between the faculty and the administration that corporate arrangements promote. Under such conditions the traditional, collegial system of shared governance can no longer be taken for granted. This committee accepted the charge to investigate the possibilities of governance and to offer recommendations that might guide chairs and other administrators in confronting the new situation and in helping faculty members engage it.

Each mode of governance the committee described schematically has well-defined advantages. The corporate pattern carries the appeal of speed and perceived efficiency. It implies investing great power in the president and other top decision makers. It lends itself to organizational charts that display clearly differentiated, nonoverlapping institutional roles, suggesting that every member of the community will perform separate and well-defined functions: teachers will teach, deans will control hiring, provosts will assign funds. Given the intensifying complexity of legal, regulatory, and fiduciary demands, corporate arrangements enable people with detailed knowledge of such demands to implement decisions without time-consuming consultations with those deemed less well informed. Centralization of the budget process allows decisions to be made—or at least to appear to be made—for the perceived good of the entire institution rather than in response to special-interest groups. Administrators, however, are supposed to take due account of the needs and desires of specific groups, including students, who in this model are often figured as customers. Conflicting interests continue to flourish in the college or university, but the channels for dealing with them are clear. The corporate model implies accountability for all its members. It fosters strategic planning in every unit of the institution. It offers a clear account of itself. It responds to the needs and desires of certain accrediting bodies. The dominance of economic arguments in the model's rationales and the clarity of its organizational chart make it particularly comprehensible and appealing to state legislatures.

Collective bargaining influences or controls possibilities at many institutions. It empowers the faculty as a group and gives members of the bargaining unit more control collectively than they are likely to gain as individuals. It provides clear channels for negotiation, heightens faculty security, and often produces manifest institutional, financial, and psychological gains. Although unionization may involve heightened antagonism between the faculty (figured as labor) and administrators (in the role of management), it forces administrators to take account of many faculty interests. A

contract can ensure protection of faculty members as individuals and of the faculty's role in institutional decision making. In an era when graduate students have begun to turn to collective bargaining for their self-protection, many faculty members feel the appeal of allying themselves with their students. In the face of high-handed administrative action, unionization offers the promise of fairness, of equal distribution of resources, of personnel decisions removed from the realm of the personal. It systematizes institutional procedures and professionalizes negotiations.

Shared governance implies interdependence. It assumes that faculty members and administrators are peers who share common academic values. Its mode is deliberative and cooperative. It values the individual as well as the group voice. Horizontal in structure, the shared governance model disperses primary responsibility for decision making across the various components of the academic institution. Essential to this model, in the words of the *AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, are the following principles: "(1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand [. . .]." In other words, decisions are best made with the active and consequential participation of those who have academic responsibility and expertise as well as a direct interest in the area affected. Further, shared governance entails open communication. Informed by broad collective knowledge of the institution's history and traditions and by the scholarly expertise of the faculty rather than by a sense of short-term economic or political advantage, it values long-range considerations over speed in decision making. It recognizes that the university considered as an academic institution is more enduring and bears a social purpose greater than the university considered as a corporation. The shared governance model, which depends on appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action, emphasizes the standing that faculty members and other members of the institutional community have as stakeholders rather than contractually protected employees.

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS

In trying to assess the pressures on and future of institutional governance, the committee organized two roundtables of representatives of diverse institutions at the 1999 convention of the Modern Language Association. One meeting included recently tenured members of English departments; the institutions were chosen by the committee, and the specific participants

were recommended by their department chairs. For the other session, the committee invited more experienced administrators: directors of graduate studies, department chairs, deans, and one provost. Both roundtables involved lively discussion of the current shapes of governance and what arrangements might work best and illuminating accounts of individual experience. The two meetings helped the committee to achieve a higher degree of clarity in its perceptions and recommendations.

The self-descriptions of recently tenured participants revealed an extraordinary degree of administrative responsibility among faculty members who had held tenure only for a year or two. The group included a department chair, a director of undergraduate studies, and an associate dean, as well as many with heavy participation in important committees. Members of the group therefore spoke with informed passion about what academic service means and how it relates to matters of governance.

Some strong themes emerged. The first person to speak enunciated an issue to which many returned: heavy burdens of committee work and administration conflict with teaching. Several mentioned that they found themselves going to class without sufficient preparation; one talked about his inability to find time to think about a new course he was about to teach. At institutions that emphasize research, the clash between spending time on service and devoting it to research was revealed to be the most important conflict. Everyone reported that the newly tenured are especially vulnerable to demands for service; some added that heavy demands are also made on the untenured. As one member of the group put it, "As a junior faculty member you're placed in a pool of marginally sane people or the relatively sane, and then you're elected to committees until you go crazy." It is possible, of course, that this group was atypical, that the people who had been included were unusually active in their departments; in any case, their testimony points to the often uneven distribution of the load of departmental responsibility. It also reveals unmistakably how hard the faculty is willing to work and how much responsibility it assumes.

A second problem, articulated with intense feeling, concerns the experienced futility of some committee action. "We wrote up this report and gave it to the administration, and then it was never heard of again," one speaker said. "It might pop up again a couple years later, and they'll dust it off and say, 'Well, here we have this report.' That's frustrating." People take on jobs they don't necessarily know how to do, sometimes in order to protect others (especially the untenured), sometimes because no one else will do the necessary tasks. "The reasons that I haven't said no have to do with the structure of our department, but it also has to do with guilt and gratitude and attempting to continue this culture of protecting junior people."

The voices we heard described a complicated process of administration and governance, a process in which unsatisfactory trade-offs abound, a process that depends heavily on the goodwill, energy, and intelligence of an active faculty. The testimony of these relatively young but highly engaged faculty members demonstrated awareness not only of responsibility but also of opportunity. Those especially who inhabited departments with a strong sense of community found their service activities both personally enriching and empowering. “My experience,” a participant explained, “has been one of departmental autonomy and a high value placed on serving the community of the department in a very particular way, not in the abstract, and therefore not separated from serving our personal interests.” He went on to describe a process of systematically engendering a sense of responsibility in every member of the faculty: a process by which individuals learn they can have a real impact on the direction of the department and ultimately of the institution by thinking about the needs and possibilities for change. He spoke finally of “leadership that paradoxically turns over power.” An important task of the chair, according to this description of governance, would be to make even the most junior member of the department feel the potential for power.

The discussion made apparent the disparities among institutions. At one extreme, a faculty member from a research university reported that “one hundred percent research will get you tenure.” In other words, the institution sets no official value on service. But the other extreme also exists: institutions, ranging from community colleges to large universities, that assign high worth to the service component of faculty responsibility and will not award tenure to someone who neglects it. We discerned little correlation between the kind of institution participants inhabited and the value they placed on the service they performed. It was a teacher at a research university who articulated most clearly the personal rewards of committee service: “Power understood as materialization of one’s efforts, however curious those efforts might be at one moment or another. Getting to know other people and other fields.”

These personal rewards have institutional implications. Power becomes the materialization of one’s efforts in articulating possibility and developing large endeavors. Getting to know other people and fields implies the growth of interdepartmental networks that affect institutional goals. The close connection between service as a form of governance and service as faculty activity thus emerged from the recently tenured roundtable participants.

The second roundtable’s senior administrators, having already reflected extensively on practices and problems of governance and developed a broader perspective than that of their younger colleagues, talked about both theoretical and pragmatic difficulties facing twenty-first-century academics.

The most repeated term was *money*. Deans deal with budgets; the deans in that room wished that their faculties could also think fruitfully about budgets. “Anything that can be done to educate the faculty about how university budgets are actually structured would be a great move forward,” one dean observed. When the faculty has no connection with the budget, when department chairs remain ignorant of the budget’s intricacies, when committees try to make judgments about policy without knowing the financial implications of their judgments, all attempts at shared governance will necessarily prove ineffective. Yet people often become department chairs in such a condition of ignorance. “My hobbyhorse to the ADE and others is: Teach chairs about budgets,” a dean said, reporting her earlier experience as a chair who knew nothing at the outset but understood that “I had to know my budget and how to make it work, or I would not be able to do what I wanted to do.” Faculty governance remains strong, people seemed to agree, in the areas of curriculum and personnel. But there has never been a clear structure for faculty influence of or responsibility in money matters. “That’s where faculty governance doesn’t have a tradition of taking a powerful role. I think if we can’t find a way to do that, we will continue to have uneasiness and erosion of involvement.”

The problem has been complicated, several agreed, by widespread faculty reluctance to learn about financial matters. Faculty members often prefer to leave concern with money to other people; they simply want funds available to facilitate their own intellectual goals. One administrator speculated that the unwillingness of faculty members to grapple with financial problems implies that certain kinds of governance, after all, must be left to administrators, who accept the responsibility of incorporating financial knowledge and confronting its implications. There seemed general agreement, however, that chairs should be instructed in the ramifications of the budget and given the responsibility to decide how they should go about communicating to their departments the necessary facts and the importance of those facts.

Ignorance of the financial implications of its actions has far-reaching negative consequences for the faculty. One instance explored at some length involved the proliferation of interdisciplinary studies at a university. The situation had changed gradually, with no wide discussion of the organizational issues involved. One by one, new programs developed and interested faculty members turned to teaching in them. When the English department wished to reduce its collective teaching load to two courses a semester, it discovered that almost two-thirds of its members already taught such a load because they received released time for administering various interdisciplinary units. For the rest of the department, there was no

possibility of a diminished load: the department had no room to move, given its members' commitments. No one had previously considered the budgeting and workload outcomes of intellectual choices.

Such choices also shift loyalties and alter the meanings of service and governance. Considerable concern about fragmentation was expressed at the meeting. Interdisciplinary topics have engaged the interest of many faculty members and redirected or diffused intellectual commitments. Loyalty to a department and inclination to serve it diminish as a consequence. Institutional loyalty is likewise weakened by the tendency of ambitious academics to move among institutions. More and more frequently, it was perceived, people do not expect or want to remain at the college or university where they first find employment, and younger faculty members often feel more allegiance to their subdisciplines than to their institutions or departments. Moreover, the proliferation of part-time, non-tenure-track faculty members further attenuates commitment to service and administration. Men and women teaching for small wages, having no prospect of permanent employment, and often working in more than one institution can hardly be expected to feel institutional loyalty or provide service, even if the opportunity of service is offered to them. The result of these tendencies is an increasing burden on a decreasing cadre of institutionally involved faculty members. As fewer participate in the activities of service and governance, fewer also feel the responsibility to learn or care about the directions of their institution. "I am concerned," one administrator observed, "about how to bring up or bring back a generation into thinking that governance at the university level is something that the faculty should not give up."

The corporate model already exists in our universities, several said. "The corporation style of management, especially at the upper administration and perhaps especially at large universities, is really a fact of life. We have to learn to adjust to it," said one speaker. The question is how to adjust. One immediate consequence, another speaker pointed out, is increasing reluctance to assume departmental administrative positions. Such positions, some thought, now involve heightened responsibility with diminished control. Even if faculty members value the opportunity to take responsibility in a department, they feel dubious about their effectiveness beyond departmental boundaries. One department chair put the problem well. Junior faculty members, she said, "are eager to be elected or appointed to the executive committee because they understand that that committee in fact governs the policies and life of the department. Beyond the department, I work in a corporate university, and that's where I think faculty governance has almost disappeared. It's very difficult to encourage junior or senior faculty members to be involved in the university's supposedly

representative bodies.” The consequent insularity of life in departments makes it easier to solidify the top-down model of governance.

Considerable discussion focused on how junior faculty members could or should be socialized into an academic life including service and administration as essential components. Training should begin in graduate school but doesn’t, some said. When assistant professors arrive at their new jobs, some departments try promptly to induct them into an ethos of service. Other departments make the effort to protect them from service commitments. But such protection has negative consequences. It overburdens a dwindling senior faculty and trains junior colleagues to think of service as at best a necessary evil. As one chair put it, “The service workload has gone to our senior people, who are now beginning to get very weary and, some of them, rather resentful of these young people who have been protected from service. I worry, too, about how these protected younger faculty members will do when they are tenured and by then out of the habit of doing service.”

The matters of service and governance connect, the group thought, with the most profound issues currently facing the profession. Serious personal involvement and individual control allow faculty members to make a compelling case for the value of what they do. One administrator observed:

I think the issues about budgeting and committee work are very important, but I think the future of the profession in large part depends upon our ability to make what we do seem important, intelligible, and compelling to other people. That’s the way to win more resources, to win more respect, and to win more stature. There’s a kind of inertia, a passivity on the part of the faculty, and if they could see some of the dividends to be reaped, some of the rewards out there for reconceiving the mission of what they’re doing, that would be a step in the right direction.

Leadership and effective involvement demand communication: to trustees, to legislatures, to the public. The urgent tasks of communication include conveying the importance and the value of faculty responsibility in the running of the university. Changes are necessary in academic culture in order to allow all faculty members to understand this. One dean stated that effective communication means not only asking for money but also describing and even modifying “the larger cultural situation of higher education and the university.” She added, “We do want to think about money, but we need to think also about the larger values. We’re not corporations because we’re not for profit, most of us. We’re in it for other reasons. We have to think about academic community, academic freedom, and issues like the advancement of knowledge and teaching undergraduates. We need to keep value central to whatever we do.”

Such comments brought the concurrence with which the discussion concluded. Finally, everyone seemed to agree that, although educating people

about budgets remains important, “Problems arise when we forget that the culture that’s important to us is intellectual culture: that’s where the main focus should be.” This group of administrators argued that, for all its difficulties, shared governance provides the best way to defend that vital culture.

From the committee’s point of view, a striking aspect of both roundtables was the intensity of the commitment manifest in all the participants to preserving and improving their departments and their institutions. The participants embodied as well as articulated the importance of faculty involvement for maintaining and furthering the principles and goals of education. They encouraged the committee to believe that, among the available models for college and university governance, the best is that of shared governance.

Central to this conviction is the perception that this model alone allows an intellectual endeavor to be governed by internally coherent principles. Alternatives to shared governance import extraneous standards to organize an educational institution on the basis of systems that generate kinds of order that are sometimes dismissive or repressive of intellectual possibility. Shared governance often seems to waste time and effort in large amounts of discussion and deliberation, yet this deliberation belongs to the culture of engaged interrogation that lies at the center of the academic enterprise. As the members of the second roundtable pointed out, to communicate the significance of that culture inside and outside the institution is part of the obligation that faculty members must shoulder. To represent that culture in directing the institution’s affairs belongs to the same obligation.

From the faculty’s point of view, to engage in shared governance can be seen to further burden a group already loaded with increasing emphasis on both research and teaching. Yet, as many testify, the sense of efficacy and empowerment gained by participation in shaping the direction of an institution is enlivening in itself. Moreover, shared governance does not imply reaching beyond procedures traditionally in place. Shared governance calls for a process of decision making that involves individual stakeholders who have an investment in the history and goals of the institution as well as knowledge of the intellectual discourse outside. It recognizes that in the complex structure, enduring life, and social and intellectual values of institutions, expedient financial and political decisions and adversarial negotiations are not in institutions’ best interest.

CHALLENGES TO SHARED GOVERNANCE

In his essay “Reaffirming the Value of Shared Governance,” Larry G. Gerber writes:

At its core [. . .] a college or university is a unique form of community. The ties that bind teachers, researchers, and students into a community of scholars are qualitatively different from the ties that bind stockholders, managers, and employees in a private business. A college or university is less a hierarchical bureaucracy in which those at the top can claim authority based on superior training and technical expertise to others in the organization than it is a community in which faculty and administrators are in many ways peers who share a common educational background. (18)

Because of this communal structure, the various and complex tasks performed by institutions of higher education demand an interdependence among governing boards, administrators, faculty members, students, and others that is seldom if ever found in other kinds of organizations.

Many recent developments in the academy endanger the shared governance model. The committee has identified the following ones as especially troubling or problematic.

The Growth of the Corporate Administrative Model

A shift from collegial forms of university governance, which are consultative and participative, to top-down managerial forms of governance has been widely observed. Recent critics of higher education maintain that traditional forms of shared governance inhibit the academy's ability to respond rapidly to economic, social, political, and technological change. Such influential documents (see app.) as the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges' *Renewing the Academic Presidency: Stronger Leadership for Tougher Times* (1996) and *Statement on Institutional Governance* (1998) and the Commission on National Investment in Higher Education's *Breaking the Social Contract: The Fiscal Crisis in Higher Education* (1997) argue that academic presidents and governing boards should free themselves from the constraints and delays of the collegial decision-making process that has been the norm at most colleges and universities throughout the twentieth century. Instead, these reports prefer a model whose vertical decision-making structure centralizes power at the top of the administrative hierarchy. Calls for a diminished faculty role in academic governance are frequently accompanied by calls for a reformation of the tenure system, which is also cited as a hindrance to institutional transformation.

The Shift in Funding and Growth of Commitments for Higher Education

Throughout the 1990s, American higher education underwent a shift in funding from state subsidy to student tuition and other private sources such as donors and commercial initiatives and partnerships. At the same time, administrative and infrastructure commitments grew significantly to

respond to government regulatory mandates. Since the assumption on many campuses is that budget processes and budget information are the purview of administration, one impact of the move toward commercialization has been “a greater centralization of authority within the university” (Currie and Vidovich 120). According to Linda Ray Pratt, former interim dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Nebraska:

In general, faculty governance is at its weakest when addressing budget and planning issues. [. . .] The clear trend in administration is to encourage more participation at lower levels, such as the college, but to invest greater authority for final decisions at the higher levels of provosts and presidents. At the upper levels of administration, decisions about budget priorities are often openly political and designed to appease or inspire state, federal, and business interests. Whether the faculty and the administration can forge effective alliances at the college level to promote the academic agenda at the upper levels of administration is not yet clear. (42)

Because of this bifurcation in budgetary decisions, often faculty members in advisory committees spend much time and energy but enjoy very little influence over institutional policy matters.

The Growth of a Separate Managerial Class and a Change in the Way Administrators Are Selected

Traditionally, department chairs, deans, vice presidents, and presidents have come from the faculty and been selected by search committees on which faculty members played a key role. With the proliferation of new, extraintitutional pressures that have brought new administrative roles and titles, a different kind of administrator has emerged, one who enters administration early and who sees academic administration as a career path rather than as a temporary service to the institution before returning to the faculty. In an increasingly mobile society, in order to ascend the administrative ladder such administrators often tend to rove, moving from institution to institution in search of higher posts. (A similar tendency has been noted for faculty members.) These administrators are perceived to not always take the time to familiarize themselves with the institutional culture they are entering. The tendency of such administrators to move in and move on quickly and their lack of local institutional knowledge may threaten an institution’s sense of continuity. In addition, because roving administrators often bring specific agendas with them or are provided with agendas by governing boards and because they see it in their interest to implement these agendas quickly, they may prove impatient with established decision-making procedures, seeing these as impediments to the rapid transformations they hope to effect. Just as the recent shift from

shared governance to more authoritarian governance models has changed the nature of academic administration, so has the method for conducting administrative searches changed. As Dennis M. Clausen observes, “The search model that involved consensus-building among the various constituencies of the university community has been replaced on many campuses by a secretive, closed-door process controlled by trustees and administrators. Simultaneously, the faculty has been excluded from meaningful participation in these [. . .] searches” (20). *Renewing the Academic Presidency*, which urges that we view presidential searches as “personnel matters, which normally are not subject to public scrutiny” (Commission 33), maintains that shared governance, “however promising its original intent—often threatens gridlock” (18). Accompanying this shift in search procedures has been an increased reliance on consulting firms, which often displace meaningful faculty participation in the search process.

The Dramatic Decline in the Ratio of Tenure-Track to Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Positions over the Past Twenty-Five Years

Since 1975, the number of non-tenure-track faculty members in American colleges and universities has increased by 88% (“Statement” 55). Nearly half of all faculty members at the postsecondary level now hold part-time positions. By contrast, only 30% of today’s professoriat is tenured, with a diminishing 10% in probationary positions. Since most adjunct and part-time faculty members are ineligible to participate and not compensated for participating in institutional governance, the increased reliance on non-tenure-track faculty members has reduced the percentage of the faculty franchised in collegial decision making and increased its administrative and committee burden.

The Increased Emphasis on Scholarly Productivity

Many graduate students and junior faculty members abstain from or reduce the service component of their professional lives that makes shared governance possible because they have been led to believe that successful competition for a shrinking proportion of tenure-track positions and, eventually, for tenure itself depends almost exclusively on publications. Research, commensurate with institutional mission, is indispensable to quality education at all levels. Nonetheless, a disproportionate emphasis on research is counterproductive if it depletes the faculty cohort available for necessary committee work and other professional service obligations. Shared governance cannot succeed if a significant fraction of the faculty are not committed to, or are encouraged to refrain from, active involvement in efforts to identify and advance the interests of the entire institution, not merely the research interests of their own area of specialization.

The Growth of Interest in Collective Bargaining

Currently, over 250,000 college and university professors, non-tenure-track instructors, and technical staff are represented by collective bargaining units (Bargan). Collective bargaining may emerge in opposition to some version of the corporate model and may rightly win support for the way it protects faculty rights and responsibilities. But the committee sees collective bargaining as a mode different from and less desirable than traditional shared governance. While union contracts can include in their legal protections faculty involvement in governance and can prevent the alteration of institutional bylaws without faculty concurrence, the structure of collective bargaining is ultimately binary—a rule-based and often adversarial negotiation between two groups, one of which is considered labor, the other management. Placing key dimensions of faculty-administration relations in a legal framework, collective bargaining may work against the collegial ethos that encourages faculty members and administrators to address each other as peers and fellow stakeholders and that promotes a sense of governance as responsibility for the institution that is shared, cooperative, and deliberative.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The problems outlined above—administrative resistance to faculty involvement, scarcer funds, faster decision making among those less familiar with the institution, proportionately fewer tenure-track faculty members, more emphasis on research, and the introduction of union contracts and regulations—cause many faculty members to feel worn out. Given this situation, the reasons for service as a vital component of faculty governance may seem increasingly obscure. Both the administrators and newly tenured faculty members in our roundtables reported widespread disinclination among their colleagues to accept administrative and committee duties. Senior faculty members often feel cynical about the utility of such activity or exhausted by years of performing it with little sense of reward. Young faculty members see committee work and administrative responsibilities conflicting with the development of their research and teaching. Intellectual diversity in departments can lead to community fragmentation.

This set of problems is an immediate one for department chairs, directors of graduate study, and other administrators. Reflection about the situation, however, also suggests courses of action for administrators to encourage shared acceptance of communal commitments.

Community

A sense of community is the crucial element in inducing wide faculty participation in tasks that benefit the group as a whole. A chair can promote

an environment of shared responsibility by asking the department, collectively and individually, what it wants of itself and what its members want of it, what should be changed and what should remain the same. Recurrent or continuous articulation of common purpose creates a measure of active involvement in the faculty and heightens consciousness of community.

Training

Those entrusted with graduate education need to instruct students in the nature of the professional lives they seek. Research universities inevitably tend to emphasize the value of research, to encourage loyalty to a particular discipline, to urge prospective teachers always to protect time for “their own work.” Yet even in such institutions, faculty members face the need to fulfill responsibilities of participation in institutional life. Chairs in research universities should encourage discussion of how graduate students can be instructed about, and gain experience in, what lies before them. Early realization that service is part of an academic’s responsibility will help graduate students turn into better college and university citizens.

New Faculty Members

The departmental socialization of new faculty members will help determine their attitude toward institutional responsibility. Some institutions at present protect junior faculty members from committee and administrative duties; others, it appears, exploit young teachers who, working for tenure, do not feel in a position to say no. Neither course is productive in cultivating constructive attitudes toward institutional service. To protect those striving for tenure from communal obligations fosters the view that such obligations conflict with the fundamental work of teaching or research. To pressure the untenured to spend too much of their time doing the work of the department or the institution produces burnout and resentment. The chair should institute faculty discussion of appropriate policies—a kind of discussion that will again call general attention to the larger issue of communal responsibility—and ensure that new faculty members serve community functions consistently but not excessively and in ways useful to their own development. Efforts should be made to use faculty members as much as possible according to their individual talents and abilities. Mentoring of new faculty members should include ongoing discussion of the importance and value, personal as well as institutional, of service as a vital component of an academic career. New faculty members should also be urged to participate in institutional life beyond the department, to understand that they need to know the workings of the broad community in which they are stakeholders.

Rewards

At some institutions, the importance of service is registered in the official reward system: promotion and salary depend significantly on consistent participation in the structures that govern the college or university. More typically, official rhetoric declares the importance of service as well as scholarship and teaching, but promotion and large salary increases follow achievement only in teaching and scholarship—sometimes, in fact, in scholarship alone. Chairs should make an effort to call attention to the intangible but real rewards of serving on and chairing committees, of becoming a departmental administrator, of participating in the faculty senate. Among such rewards are an enlarged sense of, and investment in, community; increased knowledge of the operations and methods of the institution and its members; often unexpected forms of intellectual stimulation; and a new apprehension of power—power to think in unexpected ways, to make things happen, to change minds, to move the institution forward in fresh directions.

Vision

A sense of futility often attends extensive participation in departmental and institutional enterprises. Results are often slow in coming or hard to perceive, while the process seems inefficient. Yet the most persuasive argument for universal involvement is the difference it makes. Service is governance, governance is service. On the participation of faculty members in the life of the institution, not simply in the life of the classroom, depend curriculum, hiring and firing, goals and policies. To give up such participation and leave it to a few whose sense of obligation or desire for change encourages them toward responsibility is to relinquish influence over the institution, justifying the kind of policy that treats colleges and universities as simply a form of business. If faculty members do their job in class, office, and library but do not participate in the making of policy, they will find their collective voice and values increasingly weak and ineffective. A limited view of committee and administrative service may declare it ineffective; a broad and experienced view must register its crucial importance to the long-term survival of colleges and universities as venues for intellectual experience and community aspirations. Chairs should carry their broader institutional experience and vision to faculty members in their departments.

Information

Part of the experience of chairing a department entails acquiring large quantities of new knowledge. A prevalent attitude among faculty members has it that chairs know a lot precisely so that the faculty members don't have

to know. But sharing the knowledge has far-ranging positive effects. Chairs should communicate information to faculty members about departmental, college, and institutional budgets. In addition, facts about the functioning of the institution as well as the larger community discussions of higher education can remind individuals how much their fates depend on forces beyond the immediate departmental context. The appendix to this report gives an annotated bibliography of some recent reports on higher education that faculty members should be aware of, especially when communicating faculty concerns to administrators, trustees, legislators, and the community.

Anne Breznau, chair, Elizabethtown Community College, KY
Charles Harris, Illinois State University
David Laurence, ADE
James Papp, ADE
Patricia Meyer Spacks, University of Virginia

WORKS CITED

- American Association of University Professors. *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*. 1996. 24 May 2001 <<http://www.aaup.org/govern.htm>>.
- Burgan, Mary. E-mail message to James Papp. 18 July 2001.
- Clausen, Dennis M. "University Presidential Searches: Exercises in Secrecy or Shared Governance?" *Academe* Sept.-Oct. 1997: 20-29.
- Commission on the Academic Presidency. *Renewing the Academic Presidency: Stronger Leadership for Tougher Times*. Washington: Assn. of Governing Boards of Univs. and Colls., 1996.
- Currie, Jan, and Lesley Vidovich. "The Ascent toward Corporate Managerialism in American and Australian Universities." *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University*. Ed. Randy Martin. Durham: Duke UP, 1998. 112-44.
- Gerber, Larry G. "Reaffirming the Value of Shared Governance." *Academe* Sept.-Oct. 1997: 14-18.
- Pratt, Linda Ray. "Negotiating Agendas? Academic Management for Quality and Control." *Profession 1996*. New York: MLA, 1996. 37-43.
- "Statement from the Conference on the Growing Use of Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty." *Academe* Jan.-Feb. 1998: 54-60.

APPENDIX

COMMISSION REPORTS AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The past few years have witnessed a proliferation of commission reports aimed at lawmakers and the governing boards of America's colleges and universities. While these reports have different focuses—the role of the university presidency, faculty roles and rewards, the financial health of higher education in America—they are linked by common themes. They emphasize the importance of higher education to our nation's econ-

omy, acknowledge that changed government spending priorities have shifted public funds away from education to entitlements and prisons, and insist that traditional forms of shared governance inhibit the academy's ability to respond rapidly to change. Accordingly, these reports often recommend that academic presidents and governing boards dispense with the collegial decision-making process. These recommendations are frequently accompanied by calls for a reform of the tenure system, which is also seen as a hindrance to institutional transformation. Among the more influential of these reports are the following:

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. *Facing Change: Building the Faculty of the Future*. Washington: Amer. Assn. of State Colls. and Univs., 1999.

Tenure should be retained and a "substantial proportion" of the faculty remain tenure-eligible, but "rigorous evaluation and innovation" are also recommended. Forty-nine policy recommendations include provisions for "stopping the tenure clock," implementation of posttenure review, strengthening of the sabbatical process, greater emphasis on the value of teaching in tenure and promotion decisions, and a national study of the effects of early retirement incentive programs. The report contains nine policy recommendations regarding non-tenure-track faculty members. The AAUP's response to this report may be accessed at www.ilaaup.org/comments_by_the_aaup_on_aascu_st.htm.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. *AGB Statement on Institutional Governance*. Washington: Assn. of Governing Boards of Univs. and Colls., 1998.

A significant modification of the 1966 American Association of University Professors' *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* (www.aaup.org/govern.htm), which the statement commends to the attention of AGB members but does not endorse. "This new statement, which addresses institutional decision making from the governing board perspective, takes into consideration some of the changes in the landscape of American higher education."

Breneman, David W. *Alternative to Tenure for the Next Generation of Academics*. Working Paper 14. Washington: Amer. Assn. for Higher Educ., 1997.

One of the more influential working papers in the AAHE project New Pathways: Faculty Careers in the Twenty-First Century, which promotes alternatives to tenure. The former college president Breneman argues that tenure in the contemporary "entrepreneurial institution" is "largely dysfunctional" and should be replaced with a system that allows faculty members to opt out of tenure in return for higher salaries.

Commission on the Academic Presidency. *Renewing the Academic Presidency: Stronger Leadership for Tougher Times*. Washington: Assn. of Governing Boards of Univs. and Colls., 1996.

In its call for a strengthened academic presidency, the report attacks collegial decision making as inefficient and encourages presidents to free themselves from the constraints and delays of consensus building.

Commission on National Investment in Higher Education. *Breaking the Social Contract: The Fiscal Crisis in Higher Education*. RAND. June 1997. 10 May 2001 <www.rand.org/publications/CAE/CAE100/>.

Among this report's major conclusions is that the university's "outmoded" and "dysfunctional" system of shared governance is the major impediment to necessary

institutional reform. The report recommends that “institutional restructuring [. . .] be made a national priority” and exhorts “academic leaders to actively involve the business community in their restructuring” because of that community’s “extensive experience in such matters.”

Institute for Higher Education Policy. *Cost, Price, and Public Policy: Peering into the Higher Education Black Box*. New Agenda Ser. 1.3. Indianapolis: USA Group Foundation, 1999.

Most calls for alternatives to tenure and shared governance are based on changing economic factors, especially the contemporary university’s perceived vulnerability to market forces, from which universities were allegedly buffered throughout much of their history. This comprehensive analysis of the cost-and-price structure of American colleges and universities has already begun to affect the conversation about the future configuration of American higher education. It implicitly encourages state policy makers to “examine [. . .] price-to-cost ratios for various groups of students attending public institutions in order to evaluate whether the distribution of subsidies actually reflects their states’ funding goals.”