

**“Developing a History of the Future”  
Wake Forest Faculty Senate  
November 2015**

**Scenario:**

Year: 2030

Event: Carnegie Foundation gives WFU an award for being a model of cooperative faculty/administration/Board of Trustees governance.

Setting: 2 Carnegie members are interviewing the officers of the WFU Senate to hear how it happened, for their report.

**4:15: Step 1:**

Take 10-20 minutes to construct an outline of key events that “occurred” between 2015 and 2030

Consider the following (or other) threats:

- Nationwide decline of tenure-track positions; corresponding rise in “teaching professional” faculty
- Nationwide rise of online education
- Possible declines in sources of funding for students (reduction of government loan programs)
- Decline of intellectual climate at University level
- Increasing work load of faculty

Consider these questions:

- What does the Senate do now that it did not do in 2015? What role does it play in campus life? How is it regarded by the faculty, administration, and the Bd. Of Trustees?
- When was there an “ah-ha” moment, when someone said, “Why doesn’t the Senate do *this*?”

The following events may have played a role

- Presidential Search
- Provost Search
- Development of Innovation Quarter

**4:30: Step 2: Begin the Interview**

2 ExComm members act as interviewers from Carnegie, 4 Senate members act as 2030 Senate Officers

Consider some of the Following Questions: (request specificity, e.g., names of people, places, dates, where a key meeting took place)

- What was the specific event that you think brought attention to WFU collaborative arrangements?
- What went well because the administration listened to the faculty?
- Was the president helpful?

- Were there any big conflicts that happened between you and the administration?
- What is your current relationship with the Board of Trustees?
- How did you maintain high quality tenured faculty in a situation where other schools were going the other way?
- How often did you meet as a Senate?
- Was there a time when the administration tried to make a major decision or decisions unilaterally?

As things develop during the discussion, the following questions may help you get back on track:

- What was the Senate's role in that event?
- How did you come to an agreement with the administration on that?
- How did the Senate get the faculty behind that?
- What changes to the structure of the Senate happened?
- How did faculty involvement in governance change?
- What was the key event?
- Who was a key person in that?
- Why was the University better off for that?

#### **4:45-5:00: Step 3: Reflection**

Compare the resulting story to what people wrote originally in their initial outlines.  
 What was different, what was similar?  
 How plausible is the story?

#### **5:00: Step 4: Each Table reports their story to the group**

#### **5:30: Step 5: Identification of themes; Identification of action steps or plans**

#### **6:00: Conclusion**

**Introduction**

The state of any organization at some future time is a function of the interplay of three forces: its history, any specific interventions between now and the time in question, and serendipitous events that may be positive or negative in their impact. If the time horizon is short or the environment is stable then the future state will be similar to the past. In fast-changing situations or when organizations face developmental moments, future states may vary enormously.

One technique for exploring these possible future paths involves having people develop histories of the future. Weick (1979) reported on research that suggests people develop more vivid, interwoven stories when asked to think about a situation in the past tense than when asked to develop similar stories in the future tense. Hence, when people are asked to imaginatively leap out to a specific time and think about the system that they would like to see emerge, then to work backwards in writing a developmental history of how they got to that state of affairs, they often think more concretely, weaving together planned and coincidental events, as well as linking political and technical events together into a narrative structure.

This process resembles the creative use of scenarios as described by deGeus in his article, "Planning as Learning." The aim is to vividly imagine alternative futures and what one would do in them so that one can explore the interplay between actions under one's control and the wider environment. DeGeus argues that Shell coped better than its competitors with the collapse of oil prices in the mid-'80s because through scenarios they had visited the world of \$15 per barrel of oil. Whereas other firms were shocked and less able to think clearly about strategies, Shell had thought things through in advance, made decisions that were robust against a variety of futures and were more emotionally prepared to face this situation. In light of the research that suggests many organizations respond to novel threats by becoming more rigid, processes that decrease surprise may increase adaptability and coping.

This technique of constructing histories of the future is a useful antidote to the rational/analytical paradigm that is so prevalent in planning and management. Fussell, in reflecting on strategic choices in wartime, contrasts two sensibilities as follows:

Four Penn Center  
1600 John F. Kennedy Blvd.  
Suite 600  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2812  
215.320.3200 tel  
215.320.3204 fax  
center@cfar.com

44 Brattle Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
617.576.1166 tel  
617.576.3015 fax  
center@cfar.com

## Two Sensibilities/Worlds

### *Ironic/Ambiguous*

- literary, artistic, historical
- complicates problems
- messy
- both/and
- narrative
- ambivalent

### *Straightforward/Certain*

- social, scientific, political
- solves problems
- tidy
- either/or
- logical
- clear

In looking at the second guessing of important decisions and at poor decisions made far away from the front, he comments on “error occasioned by remoteness from experience.” In a sense, vivid histories of the future enable people to construct rich narratives, to look at imagined actions, mistakes, successes, moves and countermoves, and then to step back and connect up current choice points to these more complex imagined experiences.

## Process Strategies for Creating Future Histories

Creating stories that balance both plausibility and surprise is difficult to do by oneself. The following process can help construct interesting histories of the future.

1. Assemble an interested and interesting group of people to do the thinking. It can help to have a variety of perspectives as long as people are relatively free from political jockeying and can be candid with one another.
2. Explain the rationale for doing histories of the future. Set a plausible scenario and time horizon. For example, when working with an organization that advocated health prevention and was looking at choices it had in beginning a new grant with major cities, we imagined it was five years from the present and that this program had been a solid success. In fact, it was being given an award by the Kennedy School of Government for its effectiveness. The scene was a seminar after receiving the award in which several sharp professors of public management were going to interview the winning team to extract some of the important lessons from this case.
3. Explain the groundrules that people will have some initial quiet time to think about some of the key elements in their story but, when the interactive questioning begins, they will have to make up responses on the spot, even if they had not thought about that aspect of the future. So, for example, if someone in the above situation had thought about the main outlines of a successful entry into one of the cities and a questioner asked about an unsuccessful case, the individual would simply have to make up a response on the spot.

4. Give each person 10 – 20 minutes to begin to construct an outline of key events.
5. Reset the stage and when this encounter is taking place. Have two – three people take the roles of the panelists or presenters and have one – two take the role of inquirers, e.g., investigative reporters, case writers, professors, colleagues trying to learn from their experience, McArthur Foundation agents interviewing to see if the leader should receive a genius award, etc. Then have the role play begin, with others taking notes. When several people are being interviewed simultaneously each must follow the lead of the others, like improvisational theater, rather than sticking to their particular storyline. Thus, if one person responds that Boston was the most successful city that the health-prevention initiative linked into, then the others must sustain that storyline, even though they might have been thinking of a different city.
6. The inquirers must intervene early to keep it from being a presentation with a few questions. It should become a rich, interactive conversation. Some advice on better types of inquiries follows:
  - ◆ Request specificity, e.g., names of people, places, dates, where a key meeting took place. The more vivid, the better.
  - ◆ Ask about surprises, counterexamples, e.g., if the story is about people resisting, ask who were the strongest supporters and what did they do?
  - ◆ Link the focal issue to the wider context, for example, asking how the presidential elections in 1992 influenced the issue, who won, was this an issue in the campaign? Ask local questions about related events—turnover in leaders, crises, unexpected events, etc. Ask questions that link the issue to what else was going on in the people’s lives, e.g., the children graduating from college, people’s career moves such as who was the first member of the team to leave, the amount of time on this issue versus on their other responsibilities, etc.
7. After letting a story unfold for 15 – 25 minutes, the group stops and reflects on what the interaction has created. How different was it from what they had set down on paper? Why did they think of the responses that they gave? Those observing might reflect on how plausible the story sounded. If someone had walked in without knowing whether this had actually happened or was simply imagined, what would be the clues that it was imagined? What were choice points where the history might have taken a different path?
8. After processing the first case, the group can deliberately try another significantly different storyline or if there are many people, they can break into threes or fours and do the exercise in parallel. A closing plenary can look at themes.

## Some Observations on the Use of this Process

1. The technique is powerful when people are pulled in multiple directions. For example, in a program for hospital executives, a manager was feeling pressure to reorganize his department from his superiors, but his staff was comfortable with the current situation. He used the history of the future technique to examine his response to this dilemma. The scene was half a year after the program was over and some fellow participants had met him at an airport. The opening line was “what ever happened with that reorganization you were considering.” The inquirers were able to push him into telling a rich story about how he reached the decision to reorganize and then how he managed the issues up and down to implement it. In reflecting on this encounter, he noted that he connected with the dilemma emotionally by imagining living through it versus simply analyzing the situation. In this form, the technique is a little like the process of deciding between two choices by assigning one to heads, one to tails, flipping a coin and then following one’s instinct when you see the outcome. If you are disappointed, do the opposite of the coin toss. If you are pleased, follow the coin’s result.
2. A group of predominantly technical types in reflecting on their use of the process commented that the stories were much more filled with people, interpersonal dynamics and politics, rather than abstract discussions of projects, deadlines and tasks accomplished.
3. Another individual in an executive-development program found that it broke the usual dynamic in telling and listening to war stories. Usually, as one hears a story, one is already thinking of a story of one’s own to top the other person’s. In using the history of the future technique, this person found he was able to enter the world of the other and be helpful to them versus giving advice or competing via telling something from his own world.
4. In looking at complex projects that run over many years, it is a useful process to help people confront the complexities and the competing time demands. As the story unfolds, people work with what they explicitly thought about but, in response to questions begin to adjust the schedule and the numbers of different fronts that they were working on such that they create a plausible story.
5. Part of the power of the technique is that it helps to break the frames within which we think. Once in asking an individual to do a history of the future around child-welfare reform, I set the following scenario that he (a reform-oriented lawyer who headed up a juvenile-advocacy agency) had been out of the country for five years and upon his return, he was told by someone that there had been major progress in many of the areas he had fought for. What did he imagine would be the story behind this substantial progress? He thought for a few minutes, then mentioned civil-service reform because of its importance in allowing line workers to be held accountable. It is highly unlikely starting from the many different projects that he was working on in the present that he would have made the link to civil-service reform that was outside of the frame of his substantive reform programs.

## **Related Resources**

The following resources or techniques are related:

1. Hirschhorn on Developmental Scenarios. In this article Hirschhorn sets forth a method of constructing scenarios that has many similarities to the history of the future technique. Of particular use is his failure analysis in which a group looks at their strategies and then explicitly thinks about how they might fail. Then for each failure, they imagine their countermove. They can go one more round, looking at the failure of the countermeasure and their next response. By filling out a chart of the interplay between their strategies, others' reactions, and their countermeasures, they create a rich story.
2. Armstrong's "Role Playing." Armstrong has powerfully used role playing to forecast the outcomes in conflict situations. This technique, like the history of the future, links the head and the heart in ways that are superior to purely analytical methods.
3. Kaplan, "The Narrative Structure of Policy Analysis." A useful article that looks at the power of narrative logic.

For more information on this or related materials, contact CFAR at [center@cfar.com](mailto:center@cfar.com) or 215-320-3200, or visit our Web site at <http://www.cfar.com>

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/01/05/new-book-argues-more-effective-collaborative-methods-shared-governance>

**Review: *Locus of Authority*:**

***The Evolution of Faculty Roles in the Governance of Higher Education***

January 5, 2015

By Colleen Flaherty

The idea of shared governance probably conjures different notions for trustees, administrators and faculty members. But let's say it's a spectrum, with faculty advocates who want a say in major (or minor) institutional decisions while hoping trustees and administrators will stay out of the curriculum on one side. On the other side, think of administrators and governing boards who desire more involvement in curricular and other decisions long considered to be primary faculty domains, who are happy to be left alone on finance and management.

Now imagine somewhere right in the middle: that's where *Locus of Authority: The Evolution of Faculty Roles in the Governance of Higher Education*, a new book by William G. Bowen and Eugene M. Tobin from Princeton University Press, aims to land. From neither a wholly faculty- nor administration-driven perspective, it seeks to deliver a friendly but urgent message about the importance of shared decision-making to higher education's future.

Bowen, president emeritus of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and Princeton University, and Tobin, a senior program officer of higher education and scholarship in the humanities at the Mellon Foundation and former president of Hamilton College, argue throughout the book that college and university shared governance structures are generally staid, slow if not ineffective, and suboptimal for addressing the challenges facing higher education and society generally in the 21st century. Of particular concern are "plateauing" completion rates, increased time to degree and college affordability, and their implications for income inequality later on.

"We must ask whether it is reasonable to expect a century-old structure of shared governance to enable colleges and universities of all kinds to respond to new demands for more cost-effective student learning," Bowen and Tobin say. "Will institutions that educate growing numbers of students from first-generation, under-represented, and disadvantaged backgrounds be able to make the organizational and pedagogical changes that can preserve higher education as an engine of social progress? And can those institutions regarded as pacesetters in both the public and private sectors do more than maintain their positions in the higher education hierarchy?"

While shared governance is hardly a sexy topic, they say, better institutional mechanisms for making important decisions – sometimes quickly – can help address such

concerns. And for that to happen, boards, administrations and faculty members all must prioritize the institutional mission above their own interests and actively create more nimble, effective and collaborative means of making important choices and changes.

“Going forward, we suspect that a much more horizontal structure is going to be required, because decisions of many kinds are going to transcend departmental structures,” Bowen and Tobin say. “We have in mind decisions about the deployment of technology, about new approaches to teaching at least some kinds of content, and about the reallocation of teaching resources.”

They continue: “ ‘Horizontal thinking’ will require both effective leadership from senior officers and a much less compartmentalized and, perhaps, a more ‘networked’ way of approaching issues; an essential element is the willingness of key faculty to think broadly about institutional needs, without expecting to control outcomes.”

### **Cost-Effectiveness and Online Education**

Bowen and Tobin discuss some controversial ideas, saying that cost-effectiveness has been for too long considered “sacrilegious.” For example, they say, a hypothetical teaching method that yields “the best” results but costs significantly more than another good but less effective teaching method might not be best for the institution over all, since resources saved in adopting the latter method may be spent elsewhere.

They go further in this vein, particularly in regard to online learning, saying that “it is time for individual faculty to give up, cheerfully and not grudgingly, any claim to sole authority over teaching methods of all kinds.” That’s in exchange for an “important seat at a larger table” in discussions about online pedagogies – which they say hold largely untapped value. (In his 2013 book, *Higher Education in the Digital Age*, Bowen, a labor economist, proposes online education as a possible solution to the “cost disease” many colleges and universities suffer.)

Controversy aside, the status quo simply isn’t pleasing anyone, the book says.

“A growing number of trustees are frustrated by the slow, deliberative nature of institutional decision-making,” Bowen and Tobin argue. “They want clearer boundaries between decisions that affect the curriculum (narrowly defined) and those that involve the institutional mission and budget.”

Many faculty members, meanwhile, “categorically reject the values, vocabulary, theories and methods of ‘corporate’ approaches,” the book says. “Faculty nominally endorse the concept of ‘shared governance,’ a concept we interpret as presuming the absence of an inherently adversarial relationship between faculty and administrators/trustees and the embrace of a collaborative approach to achieving common goals. But even within the faculty ranks, cherished notions of debate, consultation, deliberation and the search for consensus

have been diminished by the compartmentalized nature of the academy and by faculty members' loyalties to their disciplines rather than to their institutions."

Bowen and Tobin chronicle the evolution of the faculty's role in institutional decision-making to the "golden age" of the 1960s, when the American Association of University Professors published its *Statement on Government in Colleges and Universities*. The history attempts to demonstrate that while the faculty role in governance always has been "highly iterative," it has failed to evolve to meet today's biggest challenges. The authors are careful not to include direct recommendations, saying they'd instead like to participate in a "conversation" with their readers – ultimately in the hope that it will bear real-life discussions and changes tailored to individual institutions.

### **New Concepts of Faculty Input**

*Locus of Authority* argues that it's time to rethink the faculty role in various institutional decisions: selection and tenure of a president; faculty appointments and dismissals; general "advice-giving"; budgetary and staffing questions, including those about the status of non-tenure-track faculty; maintaining academic standards; and authority to determine teaching methods, including for online courses.

Regarding choosing and working with a president, Bowen and Tobin say that faculty members have a "definite" role to play, since a leader's success is closely linked to his or her "fit" with an institution, including the faculty. But they say that a "poorly understood risk" of too much faculty involvement in the search process is misleading a governing board about institutional needs. Contrary to what many faculty advocates have called for, Bow and Tobin also caution against ever giving a faculty member a seat on the governing board, as it "creates conflicts of interest and can put a faculty representative in an awkward position."

For decisions about fellow faculty members, *Locus of Authority* argues that faculties "have an essential role to play in selecting new colleagues, evaluating the professional competence of peers on an ongoing basis and providing proper procedures for ensuring that individuals are not dismissed for wrong reasons," as long as they adhere to "institutional norms." Bowen and Tobin reject what they call the "unqualified use" of the term faculty "rights," and say that presidents, deans or provosts reserve the right to "upgrade faculty quality" when needed.

"The most successful colleges and universities pride themselves on enjoying a strong partnership between administrators and faculty in rejecting candidates for promotion who are not up to high standards, in tying advancements in rank and salary to stellar performance, and in insisting that searches for new faculty aim high enough," they say. To that end, "we think there is much to be said for appointing, not electing, departmental chairs – albeit, after close consultation with the departmental faculty."

Bowen and Tobin also support serious peer-to-peer post-tenure-reviews and strong consideration of “creative contributions” to online pedagogy in personnel decisions.

In general, they call for a more regularized sense of faculty input, saying that while some campuses have dozens of faculty committees on everything from student life to library matters, a strong faculty voice is sometimes missing on arguably the most important questions. They cite what they perceive to have been a lack of faculty outcry last year during what has been elsewhere dubbed “disinvitation season,” when a number of controversial convocation speakers withdrew amid student protests. The topic is close to Bowen’s heart, as he filled in for a speaker Haverford College in May and chastised students for not living up to the ideals of free speech.

“Here is an instance in which a firm voice, expressed by the faculty collectively, would have served institutional purposes very well indeed,” Bowen and Tobin say. “Odd as it may seem to those concerned about too much faculty power, both sizeable parts of the academic community and the public at large seem to be more troubled by the lack of clear expressions of faculty sentiments on core principles [...] than by concerns about faculty overreaching.”

The authors acknowledge the difficulty of achieving a strong central voice among as heterogeneous a group as a faculty, and of knowing when enough consultation is, in fact, enough – even on campuses with strong faculty senates. But they argue that ultimately “there should not be too much ambiguity” on individual campuses about where rests “the locus of authority for decisions of various kinds.”

Perhaps most notably, the authors make the case for “sensible policies and regularizing procedures” regarding non-tenure-track faculty, and call for the establishment of a “professional teaching staff” with a “regularized, respected, decently paid way of toiling in their chosen teaching vineyards” – similar to the professional staff researcher ranks that swelled after World War II. Bowen and Tobin predict that the trend toward majority non-tenure-track faculties will continue, and cite several institutions that already have taken steps to regularize this new class of teacher. They say the University of Michigan’s 183-page contract with its Lecturers’ Employee Organization is worthy of study, as it contains nine titles for adjuncts based on their exact jobs, a “presumption of renewal,” detailed salary information and other information. The authors endorse the idea of three-year appointments with the expectation of renewal, a well-defined evaluation process and “basic organizational protections (such as appeal processes) for the core elements of academic freedom.” (Over all, they endorse a limited definition of academic freedom that protects faculty academic utterances.)

Bowen and Tobin say that tenure-line faculty members should “cooperate with such efforts and not simply bemoan reductions in their relative numbers,” as there should surely be a “respected place” in academe for “talented individuals who do not aspire to publish the truly

distinguished work of scholarship that would make them top candidates for a tenured position at a university that prides itself on producing Ph.D.s, or at a college committed to inculcating scholarly skills among undergraduates.”

Faculty generally should not lose their “Horatio at the Gate” status concerning academic standards and curriculum, the authors add. Even when “entire courses of study” are being considered, they say, it’s important to seek faculty consultation and support. Bowen and Tobin cite the demise of the Global Campus initiative at the University of Illinois as an example of how “risky” it can be to “impose a new curricular initiative if faculty harbor serious doubts about its academic value.”

On the flip side, however, they argue, “negative” decisions about closing programs or courses of study should be the “province of administrative decision-makers and trustees, who are ultimately responsible for priority-setting, as well as what are always difficult decisions about resource allocation and fundraising.” Faculty consultation is desirable, they say, but faculty members should not be given a “veto” over decisions to discontinue programs. That contradicts the AAUP’s stance, which was recently revisited to prescribe the involvement of peer-elected faculty members at all levels of decision-making, among other protocols, and to more clearly link program closures and resulting layoffs with financial exigency.

#### **Case Studies at Princeton and CUNY**

Bowen and Tobin bolster their 360-page argument with a handful of case studies about what they consider to have been strong institutional decisions or institutions with strong methods of making decisions. Among them is Princeton University, where the authors say there is very little “we-they” thinking between the faculty and the administration and where the Faculty Advisory Committee on Appointments and Advancements collaborates closely with the president on personnel decisions before they are passed on to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Bowen, who as president of Princeton chaired the committee for many years, said in an interview that such a committee could have prevented some of the continuing controversy stemming from the rescinded appointment of Steven Salaita, a would-have-been tenured professor of American Indian studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, in August.

“In 16 years [as president] there was never a disagreement between me and the committee,” Bowen said, noting that a committee-approved candidate once asked him what would happen if the board didn’t approve his appointment. “In that case, the two of us will be looking for jobs,” Bowen recalled saying.

Beyond concerns about personnel matters, Bowen said, the book seeks to challenge higher education’s “aversion” to talking frankly about costs, since “very unfortunately, I don’t believe we will see a return to the glory days of yore, in terms of public funding. ... We have

to find way to improve, revise and change the production function in higher education. I think there's just no choice if we're serious about reaching various national achievement goals and reducing disparities in outcomes."

Tobin also said much is riding on institutions' improved ability to make effective decisions, sometimes quickly.

"I don't think anyone ever sits down and says, 'Let's write a book about faculty governance' unless there are compelling societal issues at stake," he said via email. "Right now, if we look at rates of educational attainment, average time to degree, the growing disparities in educational outcomes by race and socioeconomic status, and rising costs, we're not getting the job done."

Tobin added: "In addition to skepticism about the flexibility of existing governance structures, we have been struck by the contentiousness with which faculty members, deans, provosts, presidents, trustees, regents, and students question each other's prerogatives, motives, and legitimacy. These divisions are magnified by the steady fragmentation and stratification within higher education that make it much more difficult to find common ground."

In another case study, Bowen and Tobin endorse the City University of New York's adoption of the Pathways general education curriculum as an important means of increasing student transfer rates across the massive system. Bowen acknowledged that the decision remains controversial, especially among the CUNY faculty, who voted no confidence in Pathways and launched a lawsuit against the administration, alleging insufficient faculty involvement. (The lawsuit was dismissed.) But he said he thought Pathways was still "absolutely essential to stopping the problem," and said the decision was a prime example of "key leadership" from "people who weren't looking for another job" – in other words, they were working with the institution's interest in mind, not their own.

Not everyone agrees with that assertion, or others included in the book.

Barbara Bowen (no relation to William Bowen), president of CUNY's Professional Staff Congress, the independent faculty union that launched the lawsuit against the administration, said Pathways does not solve the system's most pressing attainment problems, since more students have trouble transferring upper-level courses in their majors, not lower-level courses. She also said the general curriculum "water[s] down" required courses and unique curricular offerings at individual colleges.

"They generally named the problem and created a solution that increased centralized control and degraded the quality of education," Barbara Bowen said. "It's completely the opposite of what universities should be doing and is not an example to emulate."

Larry G. Gerber, professor emeritus of history at Auburn University and former chair of the AAUP's Committee on College and University Governance, also took issue with some of Bowen and Tobin's points – including that Gerber's recent book on shared governance

arguing that “corporate-driven market practices have eroded faculty's historic role as professionals and as equal participants in shared governance is oversimplified and a misreading of his own scholarly analysis.”

Gerber, who could only read the new book’s publicly available introduction prior to its full publication this month, said that Bowen and Tobin “identify important issues confronting higher education today.” But he said it’s “telling” that the authors explicitly say that they do not consider questions of educational “quality.” (In the introduction, they say the topic is important but too “complex” and “tricky” to deal with in a discussion about shared governance.)

“This is a serious flaw in their approach,” Gerber said. “It would be very easy to increase the number of students getting degrees, and to decrease the cost of higher education, if all considerations of quality were put aside. Lower standards could obviously lead to higher completion rates, but is that the way we want to go?”

It can be dangerous to remove faculty primary responsibility in decisions about instructional technology, for example, he said, arguing that administrators and politicians “tout the cost-saving possibilities of instructional technology, but often do so without fully appreciating the quality issues involved,” or the capital costs. Problems are particularly apparent at some for-profit institutions, he added.

Bowen and Tobin in their book also include a note of skepticism regarding a recent report from the American Council of Trustees and Alumni. They ask if it’s wise to advocate for more trustee activism in curricular decisions and in protecting the academic freedom of students, as the report suggests.

Benno Schmidt, chair of the board of the CUNY and former president of Yale University, led the panel that issued the report. In an interview, he said he thought it would be appropriate for a board to intervene in traditional faculty domains “only in very rare situations.” But, he said, “I think there are some cases where the collective result of a faculty decision may not reflect the best interest of the students.”

In a hypothetical example, Schmidt said a board or administrators might need to “step in” if a history department continued to appoint professors who didn’t allow the department to “cover the full breadth and depth of the subject.” He also defended the Pathways decision as necessary to increase student success.

Adrianna Kezar, director of the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success at the University of Southern California, was also unable to read the book in full but said she was enthusiastic about Bowen and Tobin’s recommendation to establish a professional, non-tenure-track teaching force with clearly defined protections of academic freedom.

“I have made both those arguments myself in books and articles,” she said, saying that few other publications have offered a meaningful discussion of how to include non-tenure-track faculty in “meaningful ways.”

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/07/29/new-book-argues-faculty-governance-under-threat>

**Review: *The Rise and Decline of Faculty Governance: Professionalization and the Modern American University***

July 29, 2014

By Colleen Flaherty

Strong shared governance hasn't always been a defining feature of the American higher education system – powerful external governing boards and presidents differentiated American colleges from the European university early on. But slowly, over several centuries, American faculty members gained primary control over the curriculum and personnel matters, and a seat at the table during other important institutional discussions. Shared governance as an ideal and a practice peaked in the mid-20th century, just as American colleges and universities achieved world-class status. And although faculty input wasn't the only reason for the system's preeminence, it was a major factor, since professors are best-positioned to make academic decisions.

So begins a new, extensive history of faculty governance from Larry G. Gerber, professor emeritus of history at Auburn University and former chair of the American Association of University Professors' Committee on College and University Governance. But along with this detailed accounting of the past comes Gerber's warning about the future: Shared governance is eroding due to the rise of adjunct faculty employment and an increasingly corporate style of management – both of which threaten the entire U.S. system.

"Key questions for the future are whether current challenges to the practice of shared governance will only intensify and whether such challenges will affect the quality and purpose of American higher education," Gerber says in *The Rise and Decline of Faculty Governance: Professionalization and the Modern American University* (Johns Hopkins University Press). "It remains to be seen whether American colleges and universities will be able to continue to pursue a broad approach to the purposes of higher education in an increasingly market-driven environment or to retain their position of global preeminence if the system of governance that helped make that broadly conceived mission and preeminence possible is fundamentally altered."

Gerber says that American college and university professors started off as tutors but over time became increasingly professionalized, seeking advanced degrees, doing research and performing various kinds of service. This new brand of professor helped establish the modern university in the late 19th century, when faculty members were granted more and more influence in institutional decisions – particularly those regarding instruction, coursework and tenure. Shared governance continued to evolve through the post-war enrollment boom

and reached a high, perhaps, with the publication of AAUP's 1966 *Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities*. The statement, backed by the Association of Governing Boards and the American Council on Education, codified and made a gold standard of this new faculty role.

But in the last several decades, shared governance has been on the decline, Gerber says, noting a series of drawn-out faculty-administrative battles over how to balance budgets, lay off faculty or introduce curricular changes since the 1970s at colleges and universities of all types. Gerber says public disinvestment from higher education triggered many of these conflicts, but he also attributes them to two other, major factors: an emerging management model that prioritizes institutional "efficiency" and "flexibility" over academic values, and the decline of tenure and related rise of adjunct faculty employment.

Gerber is critical of the market-oriented approach to higher education, which he sees as part of a larger cultural trend toward seeing public goods as commodities. And he's particularly skeptical of "outcomes-based" or "bottom-line" approaches to education, from No Child Left Behind to President Obama's new college ratings plan. They devalue the liberal arts mission, which is what makes American colleges and universities great, he says.

But the explosion of part-time faculty appointments – now 70 percent of professorial slots across academe, according to some estimates – poses the biggest threat to shared governance, Gerber says, since the "development of shared governance in the 20th century was premised on the emergence of a professionalized faculty with the expertise required to make informed academic judgments and with a career-long commitment to advancing academic values that served the public interest."

He continues: "Most faculty members on contingent appointments, however, have little prospect of developing full-time careers at a college or university and they are typically appointed without an expectation that they will engage in the full panoply of professorial activities, but rather with an expectation that their only job responsibility will be teaching."

That poses a conundrum for involving the new faculty majority in governance, Gerber says. Should adjuncts be included on faculty bodies, even though they might not be at the institution next semester? The issue became a flashpoint and resulted in the censure of the administration at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 2011, after the institution's governing board rejected a move by the faculty to allow clinical, non-tenure-track faculty members to serve on its faculty senate. AAUP recently published a statement endorsing adjunct faculty involvement in governance, but with new protections of academic freedom for them. But whether or not institutions take the statement to heart remains to be seen.

While governing boards and administrations are primarily responsible for the fall of faculty governance, tenure-line professors aren't entirely without blame, Gerber says; professors sometimes shy away from service on faculty committees, since their workloads

and research pressures are ever-increasing. And that leaves room for administrative creep into faculty domains.

Blame aside, Gerber says, the implications of this fall are dire.

“In the coming years, if current trends continue, the global preeminence of American colleges and universities is at risk,” he says. “This is true not only because of the cutbacks in government funding for higher education at both the state and federal levels that have occurred in recent years. It is true also because the narrowing of the mission of American colleges and universities and the subsequent downgrading of the critical role of the humanities and liberal arts will lead to the elimination of the American academic tradition: namely, the assumption that a college education should seek to foster the growth of the whole individual.”

Next comes Gerber’s clarion call. The faculty must take up the fight for higher education’s future, he says, and “make the case to the American public that current trends, including the deprofessionalization of the faculty and the retreat from the practices of shared governance, pose a danger to the future well-being of American society.” Professors, too, must talk explicitly with their graduate students about the importance of academic freedom and shared governance to ensure those values are passed on to the next generation of academics, he says. Because without shared governance, academic rigor and educational quality suffer.

In an email interview, Gerber said he was “not overly optimistic” that the decline of faculty governance could be reversed. But he said that organizations that are fighting the fight, such as the AAUP, deserve support.

“In order to maintain the quality of American higher education, I believe we must put greater pressure on administrations and legislators to reverse the trends toward the greater use of faculty on contingent appointments and toward deprofessionalization more generally,” he said.

Echoing arguments he makes in his book, Gerber noted that the “faculty must also do a much better job of inculcating the values of professionalism (including the importance of governance activities) in those who are just joining the professoriate. I would like to see graduate programs do a better job of teaching prospective faculty members what the responsibilities of the profession are.”

Administrators also should do more to recognize and reward “effective governance service,” he said.

Hopefully, he said, “I think at some point the argument that deprofessionalizing the faculty undermines the quality of education that colleges and universities provide our students may take hold and help turn public opinion against what is now happening.”

The AGB declined to comment on the premise of *The Rise and Decline of Faculty Governance*. But the book already has received praise from some well-known scholars of higher education, including Benjamin Ginsberg, professor of political science at Johns Hopkins University and author of *The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters*. (In a blurb for Gerber's book, Ginsberg called his colleague "the official historian of the end of the academic world.")

Via email, Ginsberg said he agreed with Gerber's assertion that "American universities were the best in the world because they were faculty-directed with most administrators drawn from and ultimately planning to return to the faculty."

Now, Ginsberg said, "American universities have begun to decline because of the emergence of a clique of 'professional' administrators with weak, if any, faculty qualifications and little or no commitment to or even knowledge of academic values. At most schools shared governance has been reduced to administrative governance with the faculty learning of new initiatives when the administration issues a press release."

As for adjunct employment, Ginsberg called it "more a symptom than a cause of this phenomenon. Adjuncts are preferred by college administrators because they are cheap and easily fired if they become troublesome."

Gerber said he wrote the book for anyone concerned about the future of higher education. He said he hopes readers – particularly those involved in governance on all sides of institutions – continue to think and talk about the idea "that a greater role for faculty members in college and university governance went hand in hand with the process of professionalization, and that professionalization of the faculty itself was directly tied to the improving quality of American colleges and universities."

He continued: "I hope my book will contribute to a discussion of the dangers of current trends toward deprofessionalization. I also aimed to show how the development of what came to be called 'shared governance' was a gradual historical process and not a sudden or chance development."

## The Corporatization of Higher Education

Nicolaus Mills  
Dissent Magazine  
Fall 2012

In 2003, only two colleges charged more than \$40,000 a year for tuition, fees, room, and board. Six years later more than two hundred colleges charged that amount. What happened between 2003 and 2009 was the start of the recession. By driving down endowments and giving tax-starved states a reason to cut back their support for higher education, the recession put new pressure on colleges and universities to raise their price.

When our current period of slow economic growth will end is anybody's guess, but even when it does end, colleges and universities will certainly not be rolling back their prices. These days, it is not just the economic climate in which our colleges and universities find themselves that determines what they charge and how they operate; it is their increasing corporatization.

If corporatization meant only that colleges and universities were finding ways to be less wasteful, it would be a welcome turn of events. But an altogether different process is going on, one that has saddled us with a higher-education model that is both expensive to run and difficult to reform as a result of its focus on status, its view of students as customers, and its growing reliance on top-down administration. This move toward corporatization is one that the late University of Montreal professor Bill Readings noted sixteen years ago in his study, *The University in Ruins*, but what has happened in recent years far exceeds the alarm he sounded in the 1990s.

### Rank Tyranny

The most visible sign of the corporatization of higher education lies in the commitment that colleges and universities have made to winning the ratings war perpetuated by the kinds of ranking *U.S. News and World Report* now offers in its annual "Best Colleges" guide. Since its relatively modest debut in 1983, the "Best Colleges" guide has grown in influence. For any number of small colleges, getting traction from the "Best Colleges" guide may be a dream, but for a wide range of middle-tier and upper-tier colleges and universities, winning a good "Best Colleges" ranking is considered so essential to success that it shapes internal policies.

Robert Morse, who heads the team that makes up the college and university rankings for *U.S. News*, says the "Best Colleges" guide never sought to shape higher education policy, but that claim no longer matters. Colleges and universities continue to do whatever they can to boost their *U.S. News* ranking, especially when it comes to whom they admit.

It is now a standard practice for many schools to solicit applications from students who have done well on their SAT tests, even though they know there is no room for most of these students. Admissions officers don't mind this waste of their time. The more students a college or university gets to reject, the higher it is ranked on the all-important *U.S. News* selectivity scale. Having a student body with impressive SAT scores is great; having a student body with impressive SATs and rejecting more applicants than a rival is better still. The closer a college or university comes to Harvard's nationwide low of taking just 5.9 percent of its applicants, the happier parents are.

Instead of backfiring, the make-it-as-hard-as-possible-to-get-in strategy has pushed more and more high school students to go to extremes to win the attention of admissions officers. Recent cheating scandals at New York City's elite Stuyvesant High School and the Great Neck high schools on Long Island's Gold Coast show how desperate even "gifted" high school students are these days. Everyone is telling them they need to find an edge. Middle-

class families as well as the rich are as a result spending thousands of dollars to hire private college advisers, SAT tutors, and sports coaches for their college-age sons and daughters.

The students who succeed in getting into our highest-ranked colleges and universities are thus far wealthier than the population as a whole. At elite schools, 74 percent of the student body come from the top quarter of the socioeconomic scale, while just 3 percent come from the bottom quarter. What follows from this skewed demographic pattern is a second layer of college spending. In the eyes of college administrators, students, especially those who are not on scholarship, have become customers who need to feel satisfied with the campus experience bought for them at prices that now top \$50,000 per year at many elite schools.

Food courts, spa-like athletic facilities, and elaborate performing-arts centers are increasingly common on college and university campuses. Whether this emphasis on the amenities is much more than a throwback to such a nineteenth-century Harvard extravagance as having a student room come with extra space for a valet to live is open to debate, but not open to debate is how so many colleges and universities with four-year residential campuses have increased spending for student services that on a percentage basis outpace their increases in academic instruction and financial aid.

Equally telling, winning the higher-education prestige battle no longer involves just changing the internals of college and university life. Prestige—and with it the prospect of new cash infusions—also comes these days from increasing educational market share. We are currently witnessing the rise of the imperial university with campuses around the globe, particularly and ironically in countries with authoritarian regimes willing to invest in a brand-name university. As of 2010, thirty-eight American schools had sixty-five branches in thirty-four countries, all with the authority to grant degrees.

Colleges and universities that don't have a foreign campus worry about getting left behind. As Brown University's outgoing president, Ruth Simmons, complained in an interview she did for the *Brown Alumni Magazine*, "Our competitors are internationalizing at a much faster rate than we are. As a consequence, they are making themselves more attractive on the global stage."

Not all university officials are as candid as Simmons, but what they are willing to give up in order to open a foreign campus is considerable. In starting its new campus in Singapore, Yale University has not only ignored protests by its faculty over civil rights abuses there. It has also ignored the warnings of Human Rights Watch, which classifies Singapore as a "textbook example of a politically repressive state."

New York University, which has started a campus in Abu Dhabi, where free speech is also limited, has been equally cavalier about the toll its venture will take, but there is no doubt about who is ignored as NYU builds its global empire. Half of NYU's faculty, compared to 20 percent at Columbia or Harvard, is part time, and scanty financial aid leaves the average NYU graduate with \$35,000 in debt (the average college debt is \$23,000 nationwide).

### **The Rise of the Administrators**

Not surprisingly, those administrators who occupy the highest ranks in our college and university bureaucracies are those who have professionally benefited the most from corporatization. Running a corporatized college or university is not easy. The professor who takes time out from teaching and research to devote him- or herself to administration for a few years increasingly is an anachronism. A new, permanent administrative class now dominates higher education. At the top are the college and university presidents who earn a million dollars or more a year and serve on numerous corporate boards (Shirley Ann Jackson, the president of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, earned a reported \$1.38 million in a single year from her multiple directorships). Thirty-six private college and university

presidents, according to the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, fall into the million-dollars-a-year category, and many more are close behind.

Not surprisingly, those administrators who occupy the highest ranks in our college and university bureaucracies are those who have professionally benefited the most from corporatization.

A still bigger change in how higher education is managed lies in its growing number of administrators in its ranks. As political scientist Benjamin Ginsberg, the leading authority on this subject, has pointed out, administrators have become a greater presence in colleges and universities while faculty have been in decline. Between 1998 and 2008, private colleges increased their spending on instruction by 22 percent while they increased their spending on administration and staff support by 36 percent.

If we go further back in time, the rise in administrators becomes even more striking. In the last forty years the number of full-time faculty at colleges and universities has grown by 50 percent—in line with increases in student enrollment—but in this same period the number of administrators has risen by 85 percent and the number of staffers required to help the administrators has jumped by a whopping 240 percent. Small wonder, then, that so many policy decisions at colleges and universities are made without—or despite—faculty input.

Small wonder, too, that when colleges and universities think of economizing, their target is all too often those who are already their most vulnerable employees—part-time faculty and service workers. The administrators who run our leading colleges and universities are unwilling, the record shows, to downsize themselves. In the 1970s, 67 percent of faculty were tenured or on a tenure track. Today that figure is down to 30 percent, and for those who run higher education such a low number is ideal. Whether they are adjuncts or teaching assistants (TAs), those without the claim to permanent jobs cost less and are easy to get rid of in a period of contraction. Unionization efforts by teaching assistants in graduate programs at public universities throughout the country have rectified some of the worst abuses in what is in essence an academic temp system. But the TA union successes have not changed the fact that, at our largest universities, an academic underclass is at work: the faculty having the greatest amount of contact with individual students are those on the lowest rung of the academic ladder.

The corporatization of higher education has placed similar burdens on the employees who do the brunt of the janitorial and food-service work. In the case of food-service workers, whose median wage in 2010 was \$17,176, these burdens are often made even worse because the workers are actually hired by a contractor, whom the school then pays. This hiring distinction is an artificial one that simply adds a bureaucratic layer, but colleges and universities like it. Hiring through a contractor allows them breathing room when, as is bound to happen, their workers complain about their wages and benefits and win the support of students and faculty. The schools can then promise to deal with the contractor while insisting that they are caught in the middle of a crisis not of their making.

This claim of being trapped is a fig leaf worth paying attention to, however. It reminds us that those responsible for the corporatization of our colleges and universities are aware that they face limits on their own power. Whether they will be able to erode these limits further, as they seem to want, or forced to deal with a pushback is an unanswered question. “It is easy to criticize the corporatization of education,” social critic Thomas Frank warned in a *Harper’s* essay, (“The Price of Admission,” June 2012). “But criticizing it is actually different from halting its progress—a political step we seem unable to take.”

### **Beyond the GI Bill**

The corporatization of higher education began to take its present form in the early 1980s at the same time Ronald Reagan was dominating American politics. *U.S. News’s* “Best

Colleges” guide came into existence then, as did the willingness of college and universities to increase their prices at a faster rate than the cost of health care or inflation was rising. In an age of deregulation, a built-in restraint that had been in place for years was suddenly gone, and no effective resistance movement by parents and politicians rose to counteract it.

Today, by contrast, critiques of higher education abound. Columbia University literature professor Andrew Delbanco’s book *College: What It Was, Is, and Should Be* has won widespread praise within the academic world for its old-fashioned defense of liberal education and its insistence that today’s students are being betrayed by being “relentlessly rehearsed and tested until winners are culled from the rest.” Criticism from within colleges and universities by professors such as Delbanco, even when accompanied by union organizing, is still limited, though, in the actual reform it can bring about.

For starters, faculty are going to have to take back much of the power they have surrendered over the years to professional administrators to see real change.

In addition, the federal government will also need to play a bigger role in higher education. The Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, which in the middle of the Civil War gave the states federal land they could sell and use to start state universities, was transformative. The GI Bill, which Franklin Roosevelt signed into law in the summer of 1944 while the Second World War was still going on, opened up educational opportunity for the nation’s military. By 1947, veterans accounted for 49 percent of the students in American colleges and undid the Great Depression notion that higher education was only for the rich.

Barack Obama, faced with Republican and Tea Party opposition at every turn, has acted cautiously with respect to higher education. At a time when, according to the Education Department and the Consumer Protection Bureau, outstanding student loan debt is over \$1 trillion, the president has nibbled at the edges of reform, calling for keeping down the interest rate on student loans and insisting that colleges and universities need to make their actual costs clearer to families. But the Obama administration’s caution should not be a guide for the future.

According to a 2011 Pew Research Survey, 75 percent of Americans believe college is too expensive. There has never been a better time for proposing major reform in higher education. Allowing students to pay for their college educations by having a small percentage of what they earn following graduation deducted from their income tax could make a difference in reducing the burden of student debt, and so could a loan-forgiveness system that allowed students to write off their government loans in exchange for working at a public service job, such as high school teaching, at subsistence wages for the same number of years they were in college.

The only thing out of the question when it comes to higher education is continuing to do business as usual.

**Nicolaus Mills** is professor of American Studies at Sarah Lawrence College.

## Appendix 1

<http://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>

---

### **1966 AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities**

*The statement that follows 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 inter-institutional arrangements. However, it is hoped that the statement will be helpful to these agencies in their consideration of educational matters.*

*Students are referred to in this statement as an institutional component coordinate in importance with trustees, administrators, and faculty. There is, however, no main section on students. The omission has two causes: (1) the changes now occurring in the status of American students have plainly outdistanced the analysis by the educational community, and an attempt to define the situation without thorough study might prove unfair to student interests, and (2) students do not in fact at present have a significant voice in the government of colleges and universities; it would be unseemly to obscure, by superficial equality of length of statement, what may be a serious lag entitled to separate and full confrontation.*

*The concern for student status felt by the organizations issuing this statement is embodied in a note, "On Student Status," intended to stimulate the educational community to turn its attention to an important need.*

*This statement was jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). In October 1966, the board of directors of the ACE took action by which its council "recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations," and "commends it to the institutions which are members of the Council." The Council of the AAUP*

*adopted the statement in October 1966, and the Fifty-third Annual Meeting endorsed it in April 1967. In November 1966, the executive committee of the AGB took action by which that organization also “recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations,” and “commends it to the governing boards which are members of the Association.” (In April 1990, the Council of the AAUP adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.)*

---

## **1. Introduction**

This statement is a call to mutual understanding regarding the government of colleges and universities. Understanding, based on community of interest and producing joint effort, is essential for at least three reasons. First, the academic institution, public or private, often has become less autonomous; buildings, research, and student tuition are supported by funds over which the college or university exercises a diminishing control. Legislative and executive governmental authorities, at all levels, play a part in the making of important decisions in academic policy. If these voices and forces are to be successfully heard and integrated, the academic institution must be in a position to meet them with its own generally unified view. Second, regard for the welfare of the institution remains important despite the mobility and interchange of scholars. Third, a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems.

## **2. The Academic Institution: Joint Effort**

### ***a. Preliminary Considerations***

The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.

Joint effort in an academic institution will take a variety of forms appropriate to the kinds of situations encountered. In some instances, an initial exploration or recommendation will be made by the president with consideration by the faculty at a later stage; in other instances, a first and essentially definitive recommendation will be made by the faculty, subject to the endorsement of the president and the governing board. In still others, a substantive contribution can be made when student leaders are responsibly involved in the process. Although the variety of such approaches may be wide, at least two general conclusions regarding joint effort seem clearly warranted: (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, as developed hereinafter.

### ***b. Determination of General Educational Policy***

The general educational policy, i.e., the objectives of an institution and the nature, range, and pace of its efforts, is shaped by the institutional charter or by law, by tradition and historical development, by the present needs of the community of the institution, and by the professional aspirations and standards of those directly involved in its work. Every board will wish to go beyond its formal trustee obligation to conserve the accomplishment of the past and to engage seriously with the future; every faculty will seek to conduct an operation worthy of scholarly standards of learning; every administrative officer will strive to meet his or her charge and to attain the goals of the institution. The interests of all are coordinate and related, and unilateral effort can lead to confusion or conflict. Essential to a solution is a reasonably explicit statement on general educational policy. Operating responsibility and authority, and procedures for continuing review, should be clearly defined in official regulations.

When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine the appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction.

Special considerations may require particular accommodations: (1) a publicly supported institution may be regulated by statutory provisions, and (2) a church-controlled institution may be limited by its charter or bylaws. When such external requirements influence course content and the manner of instruction or research, they impair the educational effectiveness of the institution.

Such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis to be given to the various elements of the educational and research program should involve participation of governing board, administration, and faculty prior to final decision.

### ***c. Internal Operations of the Institution***

The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community.

Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or university. The channels of communication should be established and maintained by joint endeavor. Distinction should be observed between the institutional system of communication and the system of responsibility for the making of decisions.

A second area calling for joint effort in internal operation is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, president, and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.

A third area is budgeting. The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections. The function of each component in budgetary matters should be understood by all; the allocation of authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions.

Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president. The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon a cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty, taking into consideration the opinions of others who are appropriately interested. The president should be equally qualified to serve both as the executive officer of the governing board and as the chief academic officer of the institution and the faculty. The president's dual role requires an ability to interpret to board and faculty the educational views and concepts of institutional government of the other. The president should have the confidence of the board and the faculty.

The selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of, and in consultation with, the appropriate faculty.

Determinations of faculty status, normally based on the recommendations of the faculty groups involved, are discussed in Part 5 of this statement; but it should here be noted that the building of a strong faculty requires careful joint effort in such actions as staff selection and promotion and the granting of tenure. Joint action should also govern dismissals; the applicable principles and procedures in these matters are well established.<sup>1</sup>

#### **d. *External Relations of the Institution***

Anyone—a member of the governing board, the president or other member of the administration, a member of the faculty, or a member of the student body or the alumni—affects the institution when speaking of it in public. An individual who speaks unofficially should so indicate. An individual who speaks officially for the institution, the board, the administration, the faculty, or the student body should be guided by established policy.

It should be noted that only the board speaks legally for the whole institution, although it may delegate responsibility to an agent. The right of a board member, an administrative officer, a faculty member, or a student to speak on general educational questions or about the

administration and operations of the individual's own institution is a part of that person's right as a citizen and should not be abridged by the institution.<sup>2</sup> There exist, of course, legal bounds relating to defamation of character, and there are questions of propriety.

### **3. The Academic Institution: The Governing Board**

The governing board has a special obligation to ensure that the history of the college or university shall serve as a prelude and inspiration to the future. The board helps relate the institution to its chief community: for example, the community college to serve the educational needs of a defined population area or group, the church-controlled college to be cognizant of the announced position of its denomination, and the comprehensive university to discharge the many duties and to accept the appropriate new challenges which are its concern at the several levels of higher education.

The governing board of an institution of higher education in the United States operates, with few exceptions, as the final institutional authority. Private institutions are established by charters; public institutions are established by constitutional or statutory provisions. In private institutions the board is frequently self-perpetuating; in public colleges and universities the present membership of a board may be asked to suggest candidates for appointment. As a whole and individually, when the governing board confronts the problem of succession, serious attention should be given to obtaining properly qualified persons. Where public law calls for election of governing board members, means should be found to ensure the nomination of fully suited persons, and the electorate should be informed of the relevant criteria for board membership.

Since the membership of the board may embrace both individual and collective competence of recognized weight, its advice or help may be sought through established channels by other components of the academic community. The governing board of an institution of higher education, while maintaining a general overview, entrusts the conduct of administration to the administrative officers—the president and the deans—and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty. The board should undertake appropriate self-limitation.

One of the governing board's important tasks is to ensure the publication of codified statements that define the overall policies and procedures of the institution under its jurisdiction.

The board plays a central role in relating the likely needs of the future to predictable resources; it has the responsibility for husbanding the endowment; it is responsible for obtaining needed capital and operating funds; and in the broadest sense of the term it should pay attention to personnel policy. In order to fulfill these duties, the board should be aided by, and may insist upon, the development of long-range planning by the administration and faculty. When ignorance or ill will threatens the institution or any part of it, the governing board must be available for support. In grave crises it will be expected to serve as a champion. Although the action to be taken by it will usually be on behalf of the president, the

faculty, or the student body, the board should make clear that the protection it offers to an individual or a group is, in fact, a fundamental defense of the vested interests of society in the educational institution.<sup>3</sup>

#### **4. The Academic Institution: The President**

The president, as the chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, is measured largely by his or her capacity for institutional leadership. The president shares responsibility for the definition and attainment of goals, for administrative action, and for operating the communications system that links the components of the academic community. The president represents the institution to its many publics. The president's leadership role is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty.

As the chief planning officer of an institution, the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate. The degree to which a president can envision new horizons for the institution, and can persuade others to see them and to work toward them, will often constitute the chief measure of the president's administration.

The president must at times, with or without support, infuse new life into a department; relatedly, the president may at times be required, working within the concept of tenure, to solve problems of obsolescence. The president will necessarily utilize the judgments of the faculty but may also, in the interest of academic standards, seek outside evaluations by scholars of acknowledged competence.

It is the duty of the president to see to it that the standards and procedures in operational use within the college or university conform to the policy established by the governing board and to the standards of sound academic practice. It is also incumbent on the president to ensure that faculty views, including dissenting views, are presented to the board in those areas and on those issues where responsibilities are shared. Similarly, the faculty should be informed of the views of the board and the administration on like issues.

The president is largely responsible for the maintenance of existing institutional resources and the creation of new resources; has ultimate managerial responsibility for a large area of nonacademic activities; is responsible for public understanding; and by the nature of the office is the chief person who speaks for the institution. In these and other areas the president's work is to plan, to organize, to direct, and to represent. The presidential function should receive the general support of board and faculty.

#### **5. The Academic Institution: The Faculty**

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.<sup>4</sup> On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the

faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board.

Budgets, personnel limitations, the time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

The chair or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and of related departments; appointments should normally be in conformity with department members' judgment. The chair or department head should not have tenure in office; tenure as a faculty member is a matter of separate right. The chair or head should serve for a stated term but without prejudice to reelection or to reappointment by procedures that involve appropriate faculty consultation. Board, administration, and faculty should all bear in mind that the department chair or head has a special obligation to build a department strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.

Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved, and established by joint action of the

components of the institution. Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.<sup>5</sup>

The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, college, division, or university system, or may take the form of faculty-elected executive committees in departments and schools and a faculty-elected senate or council for larger divisions or the institution as a whole.

The means of communication among the faculty, administration, and governing board now in use include: (1) circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administration, and faculty committees; (2) joint ad hoc committees; (3) standing liaison committees; (4) membership of faculty members on administrative bodies; and (5) membership of faculty members on governing boards. Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed.

### **On Student Status**

When students in American colleges and universities desire to participate responsibly in the government of the institution they attend, their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university. Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness. The obstacles to such participation are large and should not be minimized: inexperience, untested capacity, a transitory status which means that present action does not carry with it subsequent responsibility, and the inescapable fact that the other components of the institution are in a position of judgment over the students. It is important to recognize that student needs are strongly related to educational experience, both formal and informal.

Students expect, and have a right to expect, that the educational process will be structured, that they will be stimulated by it to become independent adults, and that they will have effectively transmitted to them the cultural heritage of the larger society. If institutional support is to have its fullest possible meaning, it should incorporate the strength, freshness of view, and idealism of the student body.

The respect of students for their college or university can be enhanced if they are given at least these opportunities: (1) to be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views, (2) freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation, (3) the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations, and (4) the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution.

### **Notes**

1. See the 1940 "[Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure](#)," AAUP, *Policy Documents and Reports*, 11th ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015), 13–

19,, and the 1958 “[Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings](#),” *ibid.*, 91–93. These statements were jointly adopted by the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) and the American Association of University Professors; the 1940 “Statement” has been endorsed by numerous learned and scientific societies and educational associations. [Back to text](#)

2. With respect to faculty members, the 1940 “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure” reads: “College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution” (*ibid.*, 14). [Back to text](#)

3. Traditionally, governing boards developed within the context of single-campus institutions. In more recent times, governing and coordinating boards have increasingly tended to develop at the multi-campus regional, systemwide, or statewide levels. As influential components of the academic community, these supra-campus bodies bear particular responsibility for protecting the autonomy of individual campuses or institutions under their jurisdiction and for implementing policies of shared responsibility. The American Association of University Professors regards the objectives and practices recommended in the “Statement on Government” as constituting equally appropriate guidelines for such supra-campus bodies, and looks toward continued development of practices that will facilitate application of such guidelines in this new context. [Preceding note adopted by the AAUP’s Council in June 1978.] [Back to text](#)

4. With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process. [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 2002.] [Back to text](#)

5. The American Association of University Professors regards collective bargaining, properly used, as another means of achieving sound academic government. Where there is faculty collective bargaining, the parties should seek to ensure appropriate institutional governance structures which will protect the right of all faculty to participate in institutional governance in accordance with the “Statement on Government.” [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 1978.]

## November Senate Meeting Materials

The Corporate University (e.g. [http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/13/magazine/why-we-should-fear-university-inc.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/13/magazine/why-we-should-fear-university-inc.html?_r=0)): (RR)

- Sheldon Krinsky, *University Inc.: The Corporate Corruption of Higher Education*, (Book review 2 pages) <http://www.tufts.edu/~skrimsky/PDF/Univ%20Inc.PDF>
- Jana Kasperkevic, *The harsh truth: US colleges are businesses, and student loans pay the bills*, *The Guardian*, Oct. 7, 2014 (6 pages) <http://www.theguardian.com/money/us-money-blog/2014/oct/07/colleges-ceos-cooper-union-ivory-tower-tuition-student-loan-debt>
- Robert Iosue, *Colleges And Universities Should Operate More Like Businesses*, *Forbes*, Aug. 16, 2011 (2 pages) <http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2011/08/16/colleges-and-universities-should-operate-more-like-businesses/>
- Kathleen Cawsey, *End the Era of the C.E.O. College President*, *The New York Times*, June 24, 2014 (1 page) <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2014/06/23/are-college-presidents-overpaid/end-the-era-of-the-ceo-college-president>

The Purpose of College (e.g. <http://harpers.org/archive/2015/09/the-neoliberal-arts/>; <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/13/magazine/what-is-the-point-of-college.html>): (Rachel & Mia)

- Jeffrey J. Selingo, *What's the purpose of college: A job or an education?*, *The Washington Post*, Feb. 2, 2015 (3 pages) <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2015/02/02/whats-the-purpose-of-college-a-job-or-an-education/>
- John Cassidy, *What is College Worth?*, *The New Yorker*, Sept. 7, 2015. (10 pages) <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/09/07/college-calculus>
- Dan Berrett, *The Day the Purpose of College Changed*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Jan. 26, 2015 (16 pages) <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Day-the-Purpose-of-College/151359/>
- *What is College For?*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 22, 2013 (9 pages) <http://chronicle.com/article/What-Is-College-For-/138683/>
- Roy Y. Chan, Gavin T.L. Brown, Larry H. Ludlow, *What is the purpose of higher education?: A comparison of institutional and student perspectives on the goals and purposes of completing a bachelor's degree in the 21st century* (2014) [http://www.dal.ca/content/dam/dalhousie/pdf/clt/Events/Chan\\_Brown\\_Ludlow\(2014\).pdf](http://www.dal.ca/content/dam/dalhousie/pdf/clt/Events/Chan_Brown_Ludlow(2014).pdf)
- Roy Chan, Gavin Brown, Larry Ludlow, and Juan Noguera, *The Public and Civic Purpose of Higher Education: Exploring The "Non-Economic" Benefits for Completing a College Degree* (July 2015) [http://www.academia.edu/2626994/What\\_is\\_the\\_purpose\\_of\\_higher\\_education\\_Comparing\\_student\\_and\\_institutional\\_perspectives\\_for\\_completing\\_a\\_bachelor\\_s\\_degree\\_in\\_the\\_21st\\_century](http://www.academia.edu/2626994/What_is_the_purpose_of_higher_education_Comparing_student_and_institutional_perspectives_for_completing_a_bachelor_s_degree_in_the_21st_century)

Faculty Senates (What do good ones do, what do bad ones do, etc) (e.g.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/1982064>; <http://www.aaup.org/issues/governance-colleges-universities/legal-aspects>):

- Steven Krause, *Hey EMU-AAUP & Faculty Senate: Quitting the Presidential Search Committee is a bad idea*, [stevendkrause.com](http://stevendkrause.com), Oct. 14, 2015,

<http://stevendkrause.com/2015/10/14/hey-emu-aaup-faculty-senate-quitting-the-presidential-search-committee-is-a-bad-idea/>.

- Kenneth J. Sufka, *How to Make Faculty Senates More Effective*, American Association of University Professors, Nov.-Dec. 2009, <http://www.aaup.org/article/how-make-faculty-senates-more-effective#.VjOYrM5Lall>.
- Alexandra Tilsley, *Building a Better Faculty Senate*, Inside Higher Ed, Oct. 29, 2012, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/10/29/faculty-discuss-ways-improve-senate-effectiveness-aaup-conference>.
- Nancy D. Campbell & Jane F. Koretz, *The Demise of Shared Governance at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute*, AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom, 2010, <http://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/JAF/2010%20JAF/CampbellKoretz.pdf>.
- Janice Broach, *Ole Miss Faculty Senate votes to remove state flag*, WMC Action News 5, Oct. 22, 2015, <http://www.wmcactionnews5.com/story/30330787/ole-miss-faculty-senate-votes-to-remove-state-flag>.

#### More than An Advisory Role for Faculty Senates:

Do Faculty Senates have anything other than advisory authority (as in they actually set the policy regarding something rather than advising on the policy already set). Look to the ByLaws of the following institutions (often found in the Faculty handbooks made available online): UNC, Duke, Notre Dame, Vanderbilt, UVA, Emory, Washington U. (St. Louis), Georgetown, GW, and NYU. (e.g. <http://provost.duke.edu/faculty-resources/faculty-handbook/>).

#### Overview

With the exception of UNC Chapel Hill, each of the above listed Faculty Senates serve primarily in an advisory role to the President, Chancellor, and/or Board of Trustees of the respective schools, and do not have the power to set or enforce major policies of the University on their own. UNC Chapel Hill does not necessarily have more policy making power than the other Universities, but their Constitution is not as explicit about their role being exclusively an advisory one.

Below are a list of Bluebook cites (or at least as good as I could do, as there is no specific guidance for how to cite Faculty bylaws/constitutions in the Bluebook). Below those cites are the relevant materials themselves. The bold portion is the main takeaway, the regular face font is the quoted material itself, and the brief citation at the end signifies where I found it, relevant date or dates, and a hyperlink to the source itself.

#### **Bluebook Cites**

Emory Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article III: Functions, Procedures, and Jurisdiction (last amended June 6, 2014).

The Faculty Code of University Government, § 2.8 Powers (UNC Chapel Hill, 2010).

Faculty Senate Constitution, Art. II: Jurisdiction, Duties, and Powers (Vanderbilt University, last visited Oct. 29, 2015).

Faculty Senate Constitution: Art. II: Functions of the Senate (Georgetown University, last visited Oct. 29, 2015).

The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan, Art. III, § 1: Functions (1987).

Handbook of the Academic Council: Duke University, Actions and changes in policy that have historically involved Academic Council input or formal approval (Duke University, 2015).

Bylaws of New York University, Ch. 7, § 60: Functions (2015).

Notre Dame Faculty Senate Bylaws, Introductory Paragraph, (Notre Dame, Revised April 2009).

UVA Constitution and Bylaws, Purpose (last amended April 25, 2014).

WUSTL Faculty Senate and Senate Council Constitution, § 3 (last amended Feb. 3, 2012).

**UNC Chapel Hill's Faculty Council has the power to determine the educational policies of the University, and to prescribe the requirements for admissions, programs of study, and the award of academic degrees.**

“§ 2-8. Powers.

(a) The Council exercises the legislative powers of the General Faculty:

- (1) to determine the educational policies of the University and the rules and regulations under which administrators and faculty will conduct the educational activities of the University;
- (2) to prescribe the requirements for admissions, programs of study, and the award of academic degrees by the University in the context of the basic educational policies of the University and the special competencies of the faculties of particular colleges and schools;
- (3) to recommend persons for honorary degrees and special awards; and
- (4) to advise the chancellor and other officers of administration and the student body in matters of student conduct and discipline, and to approve any rules and regulations governing student conduct that affect academic standards or performance.” [UNC Faculty Code of University Government, [07/01/2010](#)]

**According to Duke's “Christie Rules,” all major decisions and plans of the administration that significantly affect academic affairs are submitted to the Council for expression of its views before implementation or submission by the Board of Trustees.** “As noted in the Faculty Handbook, “Except in emergencies, all major decisions and plans of the administration that significantly affect academic affairs are submitted to the Academic Council for an expression of its views at some time before implementation or submission to the Board of Trustees. The Council's views are transmitted, along with the administration's proposals, to the trustees when the board considers the plans and decisions.” This is known within Duke as the Christie Rules and signifies the trust between the Administration and Faculty that decisions affecting the University will be brought to the faculty before they are enacted. The following is a list of some common action items and the usual number of meetings required for approval.” [Handbook of the Academic Council: Duke University, [April 2015](#)]

**Notre Dame's Faculty Senate is responsible for representing faculty opinion on matters affecting the academic process of the University, and to initiate proposals and recommendations of the University's development.** “The Faculty Senate of the University of Notre Dame is an assembly elected to represent the faculty as a whole in the formulation of policy affecting the entire life of the University. It shall be the responsibility of the Senate to represent faculty opinion on matters affecting the academic process of the University, the welfare of the faculty, and student life. It shall be the responsibility of the Senate to receive and study proposals that may be initiated by other groups within the University community and that require faculty consideration. It shall be the responsibility of the Senate to initiate proposals in the interest of the University's development and to evoke and utilize the knowledge and experience of the faculty in whatever way necessary in the formulation of such proposals. According to the provisions of the Academic Articles of the Faculty Handbook, the recommendations of the Faculty Senate shall be submitted to the Academic Council, the Advisory Council on Academic and Student Life, the Graduate Council, the Campus Life Council, or to a

University officer or committee whose responsibility is relevant to the concerns of particular recommendations.”  
[Notre Dame Faculty Senate Bylaws, [Revised April 2009](#)]

**Vanderbilt’s Faculty Senate advises and recommends policies to the Chancellor, but does not implement them.**

“Jurisdiction, Duties, and Powers

1. The Senate is the representative, deliberative, legislative body of the Faculties. [1967]
2. The Senate may discuss and express its views about any matter affecting the University. [1967]
3. The Senate shall have the power to review and evaluate the educational policies and practices of the University and may make recommendations concerning them to any individual, Faculty, or other group within the University. It may provide for appropriate Faculty discussion of any educational policy or practice. It may advise and consult with the chief administrative officers and inform them of Faculty opinions about such matters. It shall facilitate and encourage communication within the University, among the several Schools, and reciprocally among Faculty, students, and administration. It is each Faculty's responsibility to devise internal procedures for facilitating communication between that Faculty and its representatives in the Senate. [1971]
4. The Senate shall act in a consultative capacity when the establishment of new schools or colleges is considered or when new degrees are proposed. Its approval is necessary for the granting of honorary degrees. [1967]
5. The Senate is responsible for defining policies and procedures to be applied in cases involving conscience or academic freedom. [1967]
6. Senate actions which require affirmative implementation by the Chancellor shall be either accepted or rejected. In case of rejection, the Chancellor shall then follow the procedures specified in Section 2a of Chapter IV of the Code of By-Laws of The Vanderbilt University. The Chancellor shall report at least annually to the Senate on the status of pending Senate recommendations. Should there be a disagreement between the Senate and a School or College as to the jurisdiction of the Senate, the Chancellor shall make a ruling to resolve the issue. [1981]
7. The Senate may request the Chancellor to call meetings of the Faculty Assembly and take such other steps as it deems wise in carrying out its duties of providing for discussion and furthering communication as described in section 3c above. [1982]
8. The Senate may establish such committees and subcommittees as it chooses to aid in the performance of its duties, and may invite persons not members of the Senate to serve on these committees and subcommittees. [1967] [Faculty Senate Constitution Art. II, last visited [10/29/2015](#)]

**UVA’s Faculty Senate advises the President and the Rector and Board of Visitors concerning educational and related matters affecting the welfare of the University.** “The Faculty Senate represents all faculties of the University with respect to all academic functions such as the establishment and termination of degree programs, major modifications of requirements for existing degrees, and action affecting all faculties, or more than one faculty, of the University. Additionally, the Senate shall advise the President and the Rector and Board of Visitors concerning educational and related matters affecting the welfare of the University.” [UVA Constitution & By-Laws, [last visited 10/29/2015](#)]

**The Emory Faculty Senate has the power to advise and make policy recommendations concerning the academic affairs of the University, subject to the powers vested in the President of the University, and the Board of Trustees.**

“ARTICLE III: Functions, Procedures, and Jurisdiction

SECTION 1: Functions The University Faculty Council, subject to the powers vested in the President of the University and/or the Board of Trustees, shall serve as the chief representative body of the University faculty. The Council shall:

- (a) consider and make recommendations to the President concerning the academic affairs of the University, as distinguished from those affecting a single school or division thereof, or upon any other matter referred to it by the President, the Board of Trustees, or its own members or constituencies;
- (b) review all changes in existing policies or the establishment of new policies relating to matters of general interest to the University faculty, either at the initiative of its own members or constituencies or when these policies are brought before the Council by the President of the University or the Board of Trustees;

(c) monitor and review, in its regular deliberations or by the appointment of special committees, the terms and conditions of faculty employment, the state of facilities and administrative policies that affect scholarship and teaching, the budgetary commitments and general financial condition of the University, the relationship between faculty and administration, and the faculty handbook; and

(d) consider any suggestions or problems raised by any recognized faculty group. In addition, any ad hoc university-wide committee formed by the President of the University or the Provost should normally have at least one faculty representative selected from, or by, the Faculty Council. Unless decided otherwise by the ad hoc committee, the faculty representative shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the committee.” [Emory Faculty Senate Bylaws: Article III, last amended [06/06/2014](#)]

**The Washington University in St. Louis Faculty Senate may advise and make recommendations regarding academic policies to the Chancellor, though not implement them.**

“3. The Senate Council shall also exercise the following functions:

- a. At its discretion, it shall reappraise present University policies relating to matters of University-wide concern and to academic personnel and make such recommendations as it deems advisable to the executive vice chancellor or one of the vice chancellors, who shall inform the Senate Council of the actions taken with respect to such recommendations.
- b. All changes in existing policies or the promulgation of new policies relating to matters of University-wide concern and to academic personnel shall be regularly presented to it by the executive vice chancellor, one of the vice chancellors, or any other representative appointed by the chancellor for its consideration, and if the Council so desires, for its recommendations. If the Council disapproves a policy proposed by the executive vice chancellor, one of the vice chancellors, or any other representative appointed by the chancellor, a written statement of the grounds of its disapproval will be transmitted to the chancellor and shall be considered by him or her or the Board, if necessary, before the policy is promulgated.” [WUSTL Faculty Senate and Senate Council Constitution, last amended [2/3/2012](#)]

**The Georgetown Faculty Senate has the authority to discuss and express its views on any matters of general university interest, and to make residents to the President, and the Board of Trustees.** “The Senate shall have authority to discuss and express its views on any matter of general University interest, and to make recommendations to the President and Board of Directors, and to the University Faculties. The Senate shall discharge its functions as a body or through committees or persons duly delegated to act for it.” [Faculty Senate Constitution: Article 2, last visited [10/29/2015](#)]

**The George Washington University Faculty Senate provide advice and counsel to the President and Board of Trustees on such matters as they may request.** “The Faculty Senate, on behalf of the Faculty, shall, with respect to matters that are of concern to more than one college, school, or division, or to the Faculty: (1) Formulate principles and objectives and find facts, so as to recommend policies to the President; (2) Provide the President and the Board of Trustees with advice and counsel on such matters as they may request...” [The George Washington University Faculty Organization Plan, [1987](#); last visited [10/30/2015](#)]

**The New York University Faculty makes recommendations regarding the policies and practices of the University to the President and Chancellor, and through the President and Chancellor to the Board.** “60. Functions The University Senate will serve the following functions: (a) The Senate will be the deliberative body for the discussion of Universitywide policies and proposed changes in University practices and structure. The Senate will set its agenda with particular concern for academic programs and structure, personnel and budgetary policies, development of facilities, and community, professional, and educational relations of the University. The Senate will make any recommendations regarding the policies and practices of the University to the President and Chancellor and, through the President and Chancellor, to the Board.” [Bylaws of New York University, Effective [06/08/2015](#)]