

**A STATEMENT ON**

**SHARED GOVERNANCE AND FACULTY SENATE IN ACADEMIA**

**Submitted to**

**Chairman of Drexel's Board of Trustees**

**By**

**The Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate**

**Drexel University**

**August 23, 2002**

## A STATEMENT ON SHARED GOVERNANCE AND FACULTY SENATE IN ACADEMIA

### I. Executive Summary

This document examines the purpose of shared governance and the importance of having an effective Faculty Senate. It also addresses the role of the Senate in moving a University to a position of prominence. The positions included herein are supported by the recommendations of the University's accrediting agency (i.e., The Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools) and by the Association of University Professors; Furthermore, this statement: a) provides suggestions for building communication, sharing information and developing trust; b) lists key principles for faculty support of a Senate; c) demonstrates the commitment of Drexel's faculty to shared governance; and d) discusses the importance of effective governance in a time of change. For this document to be self-contained, the reader can find in the Appendices the complete texts of all major sources used in the preparation of this Statement.

Key ideas are summarized below. A full discussion of these ideas and others is embedded in the accompanying document.

#### a. Introduction to the Principle of Shared Governance and its Role at Drexel:

- A Senate, with its accompanying Charter, enables shared governance by outlining the roles and responsibilities of the three principal parties: the Faculty, the Administration, and the Board of Trustees.
- Shared governance is an essential right and responsibility of a scholarly community.
- The merged faculties of Drexel and MCPHU, supported by the Report of the Merger Transition Team, suggest *The Charter of Drexel Faculty Governance* as the appropriate model for a combined Faculty Senate and as the basis of true shared governance in the 'new' Drexel.

#### b. Shared Governance as an Arm of a Respected University:

- The purpose of shared governance is to provide a sound structure and procedures through which the Faculty, the Administration, and the Trustees can communicate with each other about the issues and decisions facing the University community.
- A University is a democratic community of scholars that is also part of a wider democratic society. The University prepares young people for careers and educates them in the vital arts of citizenship, including self-responsibility, self-government, critical and independent thought, and the commitment to promote healing, justice, and hope.
- Consultation with the faculty, and mutual approval of agreed-upon goals, strengthen the Administration's and the Trustees' leadership.
- The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges states that non profit institutions differ from business in many aspects; one difference is that they include a form of stakeholders' participation in governance that is not common in the business world.

#### c. Positions on Shared Governance by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) and the American Council on Education (ACE):

- The concept of shared governance is embedded in academia in the United States and is supported by all key associations of higher learning, including AAUP, AGB, and ACE.
- The joint statement (as stated by the AAUP Policy Documents & Reports) of the AAUP, AGB and ACE calls for joint effort of governing board, Administration and faculty prior to final decisions being made in academia.

- Faculty consultation is suggested on major changes in student bodies, relative emphasis given to various elements of the education and research program, communication in framing and executing long-range plans, decisions regarding physical resources, allocation of resources among competing demands, etc.
  - Active faculty participation is suggested for determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.
  - Clear and varied channels of communication should exist that are understood by all constituents and observed.
  - AGB believes that faculty should be consulted whenever resources are to be reallocated in ways that could lead to the reduction or elimination of a program.
- d. Support for Shared Governance in the Key Recommendations of the Report of the Middle States Association:**
- The faculty, especially the Faculty Senate, needs to be involved in and consulted about all major curriculum initiatives and curricular innovation.
  - The faculty needs to be more involved in institutional planning, especially with regard to resource allocations.
  - A comprehensive planning process should adequately provide for participation by faculty.
  - The University should adhere to the Charter of Faculty Governance as fully as possible.
  - Improving communication should be a University priority.
- e. Building *Communication Through Sharing Information and Creating Trust* (C.I.T.):**
- Decisions in academia are made collegially, following extensive and elaborate review of numerous ideas, proposals, and demands that, at times, involve multiple stakeholders (faculty, administrators, students, parents, alumni, local community, and others).
  - Competing models of overall academic practice must be discussed and understood.
  - Trust can only be achieved when organizational change occurs in the context of diffused authority and responsibility that accompanies shared governance.
  - University-wide goals need to be established collaboratively, with input from the governing board, Administration, faculty, and staff. Shared goals foster attention and action and build trust.
  - Peer evaluation is an essential component of the process of change and an essential ingredient in restoring trust in academic planning, decision making, and management.
- f. Key Principles for Support of an Effective Faculty Senate:**
- Serves as a forum for developing consensus across faculties, disciplines and Colleges.
  - Becomes, through its deliberations and records, an institutional memory of actions.
  - Allows for a forum in which faculty can express concerns about the institution.
  - Provides the Board of Trustees with reliable and trustworthy knowledge of the faculty's stance on vital questions and is a mechanism for formal interaction on critical issues.
  - Enables the Administration to gain knowledge of the faculty stance on vital questions and provides a mechanism through its Steering Committee for gaining information about faculty responses to policy changes or impending crises.
  - Helps faculty develop positions on critical issues.
  - Enlarges community knowledge of faculty positions (for students and the broader University community).
  - Assists Administration in shaping modern and competitive offerings to attract talented students.

- Demonstrates the importance of cooperative citizenship for students.
- Relies on a home and structure within which critical academic matters, such as curriculum and course development, can be assessed against institutional standards and values.
- Looks for the development of campus leadership through a Faculty Senate.
- Enables faculty and Administration to develop productive personal working relationships that are vital to the health of the institution.
- Encourages effective decision making at all levels.
- Anticipates and forecasts.
- Allows for progress in manageable pieces.
- Acts as a gatekeeper of ideas, a defender and integrator of academic values, a monitor and watchdog of change, and one of the providers of checks and balances in the governance of the University.

**g. Some Key Responsibilities of an Effective Faculty Senate:**

- Reviews and approves new curriculum.
- Reviews and approves proposals for creating or disestablishing all new or existing academic programs, departments, schools, and other units served by the faculty.
- Participates in all decisions pertaining to academic resource allocation, including the determination of faculty salaries and benefits.
- Participates in the recruitment and selection of academic senior administrative officers.
- Approves all policies pertaining to faculty workload, working conditions, academic appointments, and the award of tenure.
- Participates in the preparation and approval of comprehensive and long-range plans for the University.
- Works with the administration to resolve faculty grievances and complaints, and to ensure openness, full participation, and equity across the University community.

## II. Introduction

Shared governance in academia is a principle adopted by most major universities in the United States. With the merger of Drexel University and MCP/Hahnemann University, a blueprint for continuing effective shared governance of the combined Faculty, Administration, and Board is needed. The Drexel Senate and the MCP/Hahnemann University Council have determined that the *Charter of Faculty Governance of Drexel University (The Charter)* is the appropriate model for constructing a combined Faculty Senate for the merged institution.

*The Charter* states that:

“Governance is an essential right and responsibility of a scholarly community. It is a means of self-determination and self-regulation; through duly constituted legislative processes, it provides for the exercise of the faculty's fundamental role in academic decisions, the protection of legitimate faculty aspirations, the implementation and preservation of academic standards, and the promotion of the welfare of the students. Because a university is a complex entity, the tasks of governance must be diversely apportioned and delegated, but the interdependence and cooperation of administration, faculty, and governing board are essential to legitimate and effective governance.” (Article I: Preamble)

*The Charter* has been supported by the Drexel Board of Trustees, the President, the Drexel Administration, and the Drexel Faculty since 1989 and continues to be strongly supported by the faculty. This document, prepared by the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate, addresses the continuing importance and relevance of a strong shared governance system at Drexel University.

There is widespread recognition that shared governance is the fundamental ingredient of a healthy academic institution. The concept is supported by the American Association of University Professors and is a guiding principle for the nation's leading universities. Shared governance allows the university to benefit from the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of its faculty and provides a venue, namely the Faculty Senate, for faculty and administrators to work together to solve the increasingly complex problems facing higher education.

Drexel University has a robust and respected Charter. *The Charter* clearly delineates the authority and responsibility of the Faculty on numerous issues related to the welfare of the University. However, the strength and effectiveness of any such ‘contract’, or ‘covenant’, lies in the willingness and commitment of the partners to abide by the letter and spirit of its provisions.

The Faculty Senate at Drexel recognizes the legitimate right, responsibility, and authority of the Administration and of the Board of Trustees to make and execute appropriate decisions on behalf of the University. *The Charter* recognizes the benefits that will accrue to the institution if shared governance is enhanced by: 1) establishing a complete information sharing mechanism; 2) having effective communication lines; and 3) having the Administration consider the advice and recommendations put forward by the Faculty throughout the decision making process. Reliable and timely information sharing will enable the Faculty Senate to offer sensible advice and recommendations. Improved communication was advocated by the Middle States Association Accreditation Evaluation Team to help Drexel move more effectively to the higher levels to which it aspires.

Since the merger of Drexel University with MCP/Hahnemann University on July 1, 2002, the Faculty Senate (Drexel) and the University Council (MCPHU) have been moving forward to establish an effective, unified Faculty Senate. This occasion provides a unique opportunity for the Faculty, the Administration, and the Board of Trustees to engage in discussions that will lead to a more effective shared governance system that will benefit the unified University.

### III. Why Shared Governance?

The purpose of shared governance is to have a sound structure and procedures through which the Faculty, the Administration, and the Trustees can communicate with each other about the issues and decisions facing the University. Each sector of the university community has the opportunity to present its views and perspectives. Properly configured, shared governance allows the Faculty to provide its advice and recommendations to the Administration and the Board of Trustees on the academic affairs and the welfare of the University. It becomes a vehicle for the University Faculty, the Administration, and the Board of Trustees to proceed with substantive consultation with the Faculty, and substantive consideration of advice provided by the Faculty prior to the execution of policy changes.

In May 1989, the Board of Trustees unanimously approved the “*The Charter of Faculty Governance at Drexel University*,” and reaffirmed it twice, through the approval of two *Charter* revisions: in May 1992 and February 1998. This is consistent with the experience of most highly ranked academic institutions in the country, such as the top 100 universities in the *U.S. News & World Report* rankings, the universities with Carnegie classification *Research Extensive*, and the National Research Council rankings of organizations based on discipline, most of which have a University Senate or its equivalent.

A university is a democratic community of scholars that is also part of the wider democratic community. It trains young people for skills and careers, but more importantly, it educates them in the vital arts of citizenship: self-responsibility and self-government; critical and independent thought; the ability to assess and analyze the world around them; the desire and capacity to pass on its heritage; the will to right its wrongs; the commitment to promote healing, justice, and hope. The faculty are the central actors in this enterprise, and the interaction between faculty and students in classroom and laboratory is the central relationship. Academic freedom protects this relationship; academic governance nurtures and defines it. Without these twin pillars a university cannot be what it ought to be: a place that lives by its principles and models them so students can learn by example, not just by rote. It is therefore essential that the faculty determine, develop, and control the curriculum of a university, and that they be assured of the resources necessary to implement it. Shared university governance, through an elected Faculty Senate, is the appropriate instrument to achieve this vision of a vibrant and inclusive institution.

A wise Administration and Board of Trustees will cherish faculty governance and work to develop the conditions in which faculty creativity can flourish. Consultation with the faculty, and mutual approval of agreed-upon goals, will strengthen the Administration and the trustees’ leadership. Anything less and anything other is destructive, and whatever short-term success it may seem to achieve can only be at the expense of its nature and purpose.

The *Charter*, Article 4.1, states that: “*The Senate shall be the legislative and executive agency of the University Faculty. The Senate is empowered to legislate in academic matters affecting more than one college or school of the University and to advise and make recommendations to the President in those areas of collegial governance enumerated in Article III, above.*” The implication of this Article is that effective and constructive shared governance requires consultation through the Faculty Senate, rather than through selected individual faculty members. This issue is further stressed in Article 9.4 of the *Charter*: “*whenever the President or the Vice Presidents appoint committees that include faculty members “the President and the Vice Presidents shall consult with the Senate in determining the charge, scope, membership, and method of operation of such committees, and shall receive such nominations of members from the faculty as may be appropriate from the Steering Committee acting on behalf of the Senate...”*”

The term “Consultation” is frequently interpreted differently by the Administration and the Faculty. An important definition of this term is given in a survey, sponsored by the American Association of University Professors and the American Conference of Academic Deans, entitled, 2001 Survey on Higher Education Governance. It defines the term ‘consultation’ as follows: “*Consultation means that there is a formal procedure or established practice which provides a means for the faculty (as a whole or through authorized representatives) to present its judgment in the form of a recommendation, vote or other expression sufficiently explicit to record the position or positions taken by the faculty. This explicit expression of faculty judgment must take place prior to the actual making of the decision in question. Initiative for the expression of faculty judgment may come from faculty, the administration, or the board.*”

#### **IV. The Position of the American Association of University Professors, the Association of the Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and the American Council on Education**

The concept of shared governance is well embedded in academia in the United States. It has been supported and promoted by all key associations of higher education, including the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB).

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), in its 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, defines university faculty as follows: “*College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution.*” [1]. Since 1916 the AAUP formulated various statements regarding faculty participation in institutional governance [2]. The first statement was formulated by the Committee on College and University Government in 1920, “*emphasizing the importance of faculty involvement in personnel decisions, selection of administrators, preparation of the budget and determination of educational policies.*” That statement was modified and refined several times in 1938, in 1958-1964, and culminated in a joint statement with the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) in the 1966 Statement on *Government of Colleges and Universities* [2]. “*This Statement, with its call for shared responsibility among the different components of institutional government and its specification of areas of primary responsibility for governing boards, administrations, and faculties, remains the Association’s central policy document relating to academic governance.*” This joint statement (of AAUP, ACE, and AGB) was adopted in 1966 by the AAUP Council and was endorsed at the Fifty-third Annual Meeting in 1967. (This Policy Statement remains in effect and it is contained in the 9<sup>th</sup> Edition of the AAUP *Policy Documents & Reports*, 2001.) Furthermore, in 1966 the executive committee of the AGB also “*recognized 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 the *joint statement* key areas where *joint effort* (of the governing board, administration, and faculty) is necessary prior to final decisions being made in academia were delineated:

- a. Faculty consultation is needed on “*such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis given to various elements of the educational and research program*”;
- b. Since “*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,*” it “*demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or university*”;

- c. *“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.”*
- d. *“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 authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions.”*
- e. *“Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president. ...The selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of, and consultation with, the appropriate faculty.”*

Furthermore, key provisions in the *joint statement* (of AAUP, AGB, and ACE) addressing faculty responsibilities include:

- a. *“The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and these aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.”*
- b. *“The faculty sets the requirements for degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degree thus achieved.”*
- c. *“Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to appoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal.... 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.”*
- d. *“The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.”*

To the question of how faculty participation in the government of the college or university can be accomplished, the *joint statement* states that:

*“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. 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 committee in departments and schools and a faculty-elected senate of council for larger divisions or the institution as a whole.”*

The *joint statement* also addresses the means of communication:

*“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 channel of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed.”*

To summarize: The *joint statement on College and University Government*, jointly formulated, adopted, and endorsed by the AAUP, ACE and AGB, strongly advocates a strong shared governance; it clearly formulates the fundamental role and responsibilities of the faculty (and of the Board of Governors and the Administration), it spells out the importance of effective information sharing and the establishment of clear communication lines, and it endorses the Faculty Senate as the agency of the faculty. The reader of *The Charter* can easily find that it conforms well to this joint statement..

There is a vast literature on the issue of shared governance. A bibliography listed on the web site of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges can be found in [3].

There are several other important policy statements formulated by the AAUP regarding faculty participation in the decision making process in a college or university. They are attached as appendices to this document. The most relevant statements are:

- a. *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* [4].
- b. *Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators* [5].
- c. *The Role of Faculty in Budgetary and Salary Matters* [6].
- d. *Statement on Faculty Workload* [7].
- e. *On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom* [8].
- f. *Governance Standards in Institutional Mergers and Acquisition* [9].

All these statements clearly spell out the importance of shared governance and the role of the faculty in the academic enterprise and the welfare of the institution. These policies have been adopted, to various degrees, by most, if not all, academic institutions. A university cannot discharge its service to society without the full participation of its faculty.

## **V. The Report of the Middle States Association**

The Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools Evaluation Team visited the Drexel campus November 11-14, 2001. Following this visit and review of the University comprehensive and extensive Self-Study Report (participated in by 55 faculty, 4 deans, 5 associate deans, 4 assistant deans, 3 associate provosts, 2 associate vice presidents, one vice president, 8 board members, 32 members of the staff, and 2 students, submitted to MSA in May 2001), the Evaluation Team issued a Final Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees, and Students of Drexel University (*The MSA Report*) on December 13, 2001 [10]. The *MSA Report* included the following five key recommendations regarding shared governance at Drexel University:

- a. *“The faculty, especially the Faculty Senate, needs to be involved and consulted on all major curriculum initiatives and innovation.”* (p. 6)
- b. *“The faculty needs to be more involved in institutional planning, especially in regard to resource allocations.”* (p. 6)
- c. *“We also agree that a comprehensive planning process should adequately provide for participation by the faculty and academic administration and that additional opportunities for communicating plans, financial results, and budget allocations should be developed* (p. 14)

- d. *“The Senate needs also to encourage faculty participation in assemblies and other opportunities for dialogue that the administration provides.”* (p. 16)
- e. *“The University should adhere to The Charter of Faculty Governance as fully as possible.”* (p. 16)

Additional recommendations in the *MSA Report* address issues regarding communication and strategic planning:

- a. *“Although some initial steps have been taken to address these communication issues, they remain of great concern. Improving communication should be an overall priority as the University moves forward.”* (p. 2)
- b. *“Given the pace of change, greater communication is needed throughout the University – to the faculty, and from the faculty to the department heads, deans, and senior administration.”* (p. 14)
- c. *“Although some initial steps have been taken to improve communication between the faculty and the administration, such as the President meeting with the Chair of the Senate, improving communication needs to be a priority for all and a commitment that makes it a two-way process.”* (p. 16)
- d. *“Better inform the faculty of the process and value of changing the Carnegie Classification and involve them in the change”* (p. 19)
- e. *“The move toward Research Extensive status, as well as other imminent changes, require that the University engage in strategic planning. This planning process should provide the opportunity to review the current mission.”* (p. 3)

Several other important observations, concerns, and recommendations regarding the requirement for information sharing, communication with the faculty, and the need for a strategic planning process that can be found in the *MSA Report*.

The term *recommendation* has a specific definition in this context. According to the MSA guidelines to the evaluation teams [11] the term *Recommendation* means that *it is a requirement that must be addressed by Drexel prior to the next periodic review.*

Drexel’s *Substantive Change Report* to the MSA, dated May 29, 2002, under the heading *“Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education”* states that the Merger Transition Team (MTT) *“reaffirmed the merged university’s commitment to shared governance and recommended that the Drexel Charter of Faculty Governance be the document upon which faculty governance for the unified faculty should be based.”* The President, in his response to the MTT recommendation regarding faculty and student governance stated, *“I believe that the proposals you have made are thoughtful, principled and balanced and deserve our support.... I also agree, however, that the final decisions ought to be made by the faculty and students themselves, not by the Administration”.*

Faculty Senate has repeatedly addressed the issue of “communication” and “consultation” with the Administration and members of the Board of Trustees. Representatives of the Faculty Senate are members with voice and vote on most Committees of the Board of Trustees, but this does not satisfy the definition of “consultation” (see footnote on page 5). In fact, the AGB’s Statement on Institutional Governance [12] states (on page 7) that: *“In any event, boards should be mindful that the presence of one or more student, faculty member, or staff member on the board or its committees neither constitutes nor substitutes for full communication and consultation with these stakeholders.”* Even regarding an issue that is normally the responsibility of the Administration, namely, budgetary allocation, the AGB Statement (on page 7) states that *“The board should set budget guidelines concerning resource allocation on the basis of assumptions, usually developed by*

*the administration, that are widely communicated to interested stakeholders and subject to ample opportunity for challenge.” Clearly, there are exceptions on what, when, and how ‘consultation’ should be exercised and the example given in the AGB’s Statement (on page 9, for example) is appropriate, namely: ““Communication,” “consultation,” and “decision making” should be defined and differentiated in board and institutional policies. Governing boards should communicate their investment and endowment spending policies, for example, but they may choose not to invite consultation on these matters. Student financial-aid policies and broad financial-planning assumptions call for both communication and consultation with stakeholder groups.”*

## **VI. The Board of Trustees vis-à-vis Shared Governance**

Decisions in academia are made collegially, following extensive and elaborate review of numerous ideas, proposals, and demands that, at times, involve multiple stakeholders: faculty, administrators, students, parents, alumni, local communities, and others. Unlike in the business world, ideas and proposals simmer for a long time and the different constituents expect a shared decision making process. This often appears to be laborious and slow to board members used to a different style of corporate decision-making. This culture shock can cause a rift between the top management, which is accountable to the board of governors, and the faculty who have devote their professional careers to the institution they serve.

Board members often have limited time on campus and limited knowledge of academic issues, so there is a tendency to follow and adopt the recommendations put forward by the Administration. This makes it even more important that the Administration seek the advice of the Faculty before making recommendations to the Board. Such a course will ensure that a wide gap is not opened between the faculty, the Administration, and the Board of Trustees, since that could cause serious damage to the institution. When the faculty understand the rationale for the Administration’s decisions and/or its new initiatives, and have participated in developing them, they are more likely to participate whole-heartedly in the outcome.

A common complaint by the Administration and Board is that faculty are not always aware of financial and other pressures on the institution. As a result, they appear to be primarily concerned with the limited world around their instructional and scholarly activities rather than the general welfare of the institution as a whole. Thus, board members and administrators often treat faculty proposals as self-serving. This unconstructive situation could be easily remedied if the paradigm of Communication – Information – Trust (C.I.T.) were institutionalized at Drexel. If faculty are fully informed about the entire environment in which the university operates, they will be better able to provide useful and far-reaching advice. This can best be accomplished with a strong and respected Faculty Senate that is an active participant with the Board and the Administration in solving problems facing the institution and in setting the institution’s agenda.

Strong and effective shared governance provides the mechanism to transmit to the Board of Trustees and the Administration important factual information necessary to discharge their duties; it also serves as a formal vehicle to obtain, understand, and analyze faculty opinions and aspirations on the various aspects of the academic enterprise. No new initiatives can be successfully implemented without faculty ‘buy-in’ and participation.

The President of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), Mr. T. Ingram, noted in his Foreword to the newly published book titled “*Strategic Leadership in Academic Affairs – Clarifying the Board’s Responsibilities*” [13] that: “*Board members who serve on the academic affairs committee often find the experience more frustrating than satisfying, more mystifying than clarifying, more limiting than consequential. This unfortunately extends to their*

*colleague trustees who do not serve on the academic affairs committee....” Mr. Ingram also adds that: “ Respecting the academic culture, even with its imperfections, is no less important than recognizing that governing boards have their own shortcomings. How policies and practices are changed in the academic thicket is at least as important as what is changed.”*

According to Ingram “*This book [13] advocates collaborative leadership exercised as the nexus of academic affairs, institutional budgeting, and strategic decision making congruent with the institution’s mission.*” Further, Ingram recommends to board members that “*Two other important AGB publications are relevant to the issues addressed in this book [13] the “AGB Statement on Institutional Governance” (1988) and “Governing in the Public Trust: External Influence on Colleges and Universities” (2001). The first searches for the proper balance with regard to faculty collaboration in institutional governance, and the second addresses the board’s relations with the institution’s diverse stakeholders.*”

In fact, the AGB’s Statement on Institutional Governance [12] discusses the issue of communication and consultation on several levels. For example, it states (on page 8) that: “*In all instances in which the board believes resources will need to be reallocated in ways that will lead to the reduction or elimination some programs, the board should ask the administration to create a process for decision making that includes full consultation, clear and explicit criteria, and full communication with stakeholder groups. The board should recognize that institutional consensus is more likely when all parties have agreed on the process and criteria. If, for example, the board decides the institution is in such financial jeopardy that faculty and staff reductions and reallocations are necessary, it first should consult the stakeholders, then share the information and describe the analysis that led them to make such a determination.*”

## **VII. Educational Models**

The two most important capital generating activities of a university are education (instruction) and, to a lesser degree, funded research. There are two competing models of educational and research program development.

- a. The University Model: this model relies on its faculty to build programs and research from the ground up. The faculty are the group most familiar with current and up-to-date educational programs and only they possess the know-how for cutting edge research endeavors. Thus, they are the primary entity in the University who know and understand what types of future programs could emerge from the knowledge generated.
- b. The Administrative (or Business) Model: this model relies on market research. When the Administration attempts to develop educational programs and research directions, it relies on a business model and surveys the market.

The latter model uses existing factors in the marketplace and thus, it is certainly faster than the University Model. However, because that model uses existing factors, it produces educational and research programs that often become outdated by the time they are in the “production mode”. The university competes best in the marketplace when its educational programs and research activities are ahead of the market. This is best achieved by using the University Model.

The faculty are in the best position to identify and develop vital educational and valuable research programs. However, to be successful, the faculty must have access to appropriate infrastructure and support to develop future programs, courses, and research directions. This means that the faculty must have timely input into determining budget priorities, in appointment of senior administrative

officers, in short- and long- range strategic planning for the institution, in the approval of courses and programs, in issues relating to faculty and student welfare, and in instructional support.

A few examples, illustrating which model works best, are in place: in the 1980s and early 1990s, the National Science Foundation (NSF), and later other government agencies (e.g., Defense and Energy), solicited proposals for establishing National Engineering Research Centers (ERC) and similar research centers in academia. Drexel University responded to many of these solicitations; however, none was awarded. All other major universities in the tri-state region were awarded multi-million dollar, multi-year funding. Drexel fell behind its peers because it organized itself only after the solicitation was announced. Drexel was not ready to invest with prior preparation of the infrastructure necessary for establishing such national centers, in spite of repeated suggestions from faculty. On the other hand, Drexel had the vision and was ready to invest and to put the infrastructure in place for launching its campus-wide computer program and the Drexel Engineering Curriculum (known initially as the E-4 program) program. Both programs were planned ahead of the marketplace and with full faculty participation. The resulting accomplishments placed Drexel on the national and international maps.

The phrase, “The University is its Faculty,” has a strong foundation in the societal expectation that the faculty serves as the instructors of students, as role models for the student body (and alumni), and as the permanent institutional “memory.” The societal expectation of quality performance is primarily of the institution’s faculty; the institutional image is built through the accomplishments of its faculty, and the success of the graduating students is the success of the faculty. The role of the Administration and of the Board of Trustees is primarily to orchestrate faculty activities and to facilitate faculty productivity, both instructional and scholarly; thus, it should be done in concert with the faculty. This is still the best ‘Business Model’ for academia.

A clear statement on the nature of the academic model was articulated by M. Emmert, the Chancellor of the University of Connecticut [14]: *“Organizational change also must occur in the context of diffused authority and responsibility that accompanies shared governance. The modern university is about as far from a corporate or military command-and-control structure as organizations can get. And so it should be, if we are to maintain academic freedom and the central role of the faculty. But acknowledging this fact does not forswear thoughtful, coordinated, and timely action. It does mean that organizational change must accommodate the decentralized authority structure of universities.”*

On the issue of faculty involvement in strategic planning, Emmert further states that: *“University wide goals need to be established collaboratively, with input from the governing board, administration, faculty, and staff. Shared goals can focus attention and action. They allow important discussions about change to focus on the central question, “How does this help us achieve our goals?”*” These sentiments support the recommendations made in the Middle States Association and the AAUP Policy Statements.

On the issue of peer evaluation in the change process, Emmert states that: *“One of the academy's core values is reliance upon peer evaluation of performance. Regardless of the task, assessing manuscripts and research proposals, reviewing accreditation, making tenure decisions we place significant trust in the evaluative abilities of academic colleagues. Rightly so. This same evaluation process can provide useful information for academic planning, decision making, and management. And while few business leaders would trust their competitors to provide honest assessments of programmatic strengths, academic leaders commonly do so. What's more, change can be strengthened when we integrate internal and external peer reviews into assessment and planning.”*

The AGB Statement on Institutional Governance [12] addresses this particular issue as well. It states (on page 5): “*Colleges and universities have many of the characteristics of business enterprises. Consequently, boards should ensure that, as corporations, their institutions’ fiscal and managerial affairs are administered with appropriate attention to commonly accepted business standards. At the same time, nonprofit colleges and universities differ from businesses in many respects. They do not operate with a profit motive, and the “bottom lines” of colleges and universities are far more difficult to measure. They also differ from businesses in the sense that the processes of teaching, learning, and research often are at least as important as “the product,” as measured by the conferring of degrees or the publication of research results. And by virtue of their special mission and purpose in a pluralistic society, they have a tradition of participation in institutional governance that is less common in and less appropriate for businesses.*”

### **VIII. The Characteristics of an Effective Faculty Senate**

Drexel’s faculty has worked hard over the past dozen years to establish an effective Faculty Senate. The following were key guiding principles to ensure that the faculty would respect the Senate:

- Members are elected according to formulas designed to make it a truly *representative* body;
- As a representative body, it serves as a forum for developing consensus among faculty views from across disciplines and colleges—it is a forum within which faculty can voice and work through differences;
- Through its deliberations and its records, the Faculty Senate develops and passes along institutional memory.

An effective Faculty Senate serves the needs of the faculty, but also of the University community as a whole. An effective Faculty Senate provides:

- The *Board of Trustees* with a reliable and trustworthy way of knowing where the faculty stand on the vital questions before the Board and a mechanism for interacting formally with the faculty to resolve critical issues;
- The *Administration* with a reliable and trustworthy way of knowing where the faculty stand on vital questions before the Administration and, through its Steering Committee, with a mechanism for quickly getting essential information about faculty responses to policy changes or impending crises;
- The *Faculty* with a reliable and trustworthy way of developing faculty positions on the critical issues facing the University and a mechanism for presenting these views in a coherent and organized manner to the Administration and Board;
- The *Student Body* with a reliable and trustworthy way of knowing where the faculty stand on vital questions before the University and a way of interacting formally with the faculty on these issues;
- The *larger community*, including especially the parents of our students, with a reliable and trustworthy way of knowing where the faculty stand on the vital questions before the University and with an official faculty body if they want to communicate with the faculty as a whole;
- The *Faculty* with a forum for developing a common voice that can interact as a unit with other organized campus entities, such as departments and administrative offices;
- The *Faculty* with a coherent mechanism to share with administrators oversight for shaping a modern and competitive set of offerings to attract the talented students we need to thrive;
- The *Faculty* with a platform to model for our students the importance of cooperative citizenship.

Clearly, an effective Faculty Senate must ensure that its:

- Election formulas are understood and accepted by faculty;
- Areas of authority and influence are clearly defined and acknowledged by both faculty and Administration;
- Advice is sought out regularly by the Administration and the Board of Trustees;
- Voice is heard (although it doesn't have to dominate discussions, or to "win" all the time).

When the Faculty Senate is ineffective, faculty are reluctant to serve on it, preferring to invest their energies in their teaching, scholarship, off-campus consulting, and "service to the profession," all of which are more portable when changing jobs. Faculty become cynical about the Administration and, by extension, the institution, and apathy spreads rapidly. Faculty distance themselves from campus life and put their energy where they feel it will have positive effects. Thus, weakening the Faculty Senate by failing to include it in deliberations about the University and its future, ultimately weakens the University itself.

On the other hand, the existence of an effective and influential Faculty Senate allows an Administration to interact with a coherent body of the Faculty, where faculty are invested and willing to make the effort to learn about all aspects of the issues facing Drexel as well as consider fairly the compromises necessary whenever a large group of people are committed to the growth and betterment of a single institution. Such a Faculty Senate will enable faculty and administrators to develop the productive personal working relationships that are vital to a healthy institution by:

- Providing a forum in which faculty can express concerns about the institution;
- Providing a home and a structure within which critical academic matters, such as the curriculum and course development, can be assessed against institutional standards and values;
- Fostering the development of campus leadership;
- Fostering faculty pride in and loyalty to the institution.

A Faculty Senate can be effective and influential only if it has the public respect, support, and cooperation of the Administration and the Board of Trustees. Only then do faculty realize that their work is fruitful and that their ideas and initiatives are being considered. Then faculty will be more willing to spend their time and energy on behalf of the University and the 'public good'. On the other hand, when the Administration and the Board of Trustees do not consider the faculty as a partner in the academic enterprise, and if the faculty have no mechanisms to express their views in a formal and structured manner, then the Faculty Senate operates in a reactive mode, it resorts to confrontational policies, all leading to adversarial relationships within the community. Over the past dozen years the Faculty Senate repeatedly attempted to establish collaborative relationships with the Administration.

The mission of any institution of higher learning is to acquire and disseminate knowledge, skills and wisdom. It does this through a combination of scholarly research, teaching, and service. All of the scholarly research and teaching are done by the institution's faculty. The faculty bring a diverse set of knowledge, skills and wisdom of their own which, by proper application, create students who exceed the sum total of the knowledge of their instructors. The more diverse the faculty, the more likely it is that this educational goal can be achieved. Diversity, as John Stuart Mill demonstrated, is dependent upon freedom; in this case, academic freedom. Freedom requires a distribution of 'power' (i.e., of providing advice and recommendation) – it simply cannot exist if 'power' is concentrated among a small elite. Another name for distributed 'power' is 'shared governance'. Put simply, education requires diversity, diversity requires academic freedom, and academic freedom requires shared governance. By the most elemental logic, if Drexel University's mission is to educate, it must have a system of shared governance.

Tenured faculty can afford to think in terms of five, ten, fifteen years. They can take a short-term risk for a long-term benefit. Tenured faculty do not merely represent the institution for a short time – in many ways, they ARE the institution. They represent the institution’s memory and future development. They can invest in innovative educational programs because they will still be around in five to ten years to evaluate the results. Such faculty can also take risks on unpopular research or other scholarly activity (Administrative language: unpopular = bringing in less than \$250,000/year in external funding). Such research can often generate the greatest long-term impact.

Large-scale funding does not usually go for innovative research but rather for research where a positive outcome can be predicted with high probability. Unfortunately, that is exactly where most new ideas and discoveries are found. It is like the American economy – you hear a great deal about corporations and their profits but the engine of the economy is small business. Large research projects may get significant funding, but they are not where the next generation of innovative ideas will arise. Left to their own devices, administrators not only do not recognize this fact, but also would not change their behavior even if they did. Administrators too often focus on the immediate impact - how much money or how much publicity is created by the researcher. The actual result of the research is secondary. Again, tenured faculty can afford to plan for the long-term, to take the risk necessary for true innovation. A balance between short-term benefits championed by the Administration and long-term results promoted by faculty has the best chance of generating a sustainable scholarly output. Shared governance is the best method for creating such a balance.

For educational quality, for innovative research, and for the long-term health of any academic institution, the institution requires shared governance. To implement shared governance, the institution must have a written structure outlining the various responsibilities of different constituencies and describing how the ‘power’ (of providing advice and recommendation) is to be shared. One can imagine where the United States would be if the Founding Fathers decided that no written document was required and suggested that the President only need visit the local pub once in a while to have fulfilled the needs of shared governance. It should be fully understood that the term ‘power’ refers here to having clear and effective communication, information sharing and trust (i.e., C.I.T.).

The idea that the President of a university occasionally ‘consults’ with individual faculty members and that this constitutes shared governance is equally inappropriate. First, many faculty members are likely to feel somewhat intimidated and thus the President may not get a candid opinion. Second, if the President is free to choose with whom s/he speaks, this does not constitute a representative sample of the faculty and so the results would not be valid in any event. Third, under such circumstances, individual faculty members tend to promote their own personal agenda, not considering the full spectrum of the issue at hand. Finally, public discourse, debate, and exchange of views more often than not yield the optimal decision.

Having a weak Faculty Senate, or reducing its rights, privileges, and responsibilities as the representative and legislative body of the faculty, may damage the University in several important aspects:

- a. A university that does not recognize the role of faculty in its governance will be an odd member in the group of leading US institutions. Most major universities listed at the top 100 universities in the U.S. News and World Report, or the Carnegie classification of Research Intensive, or the National research Council ranking of organizations based on discipline, have a University Senate or its equivalent.

- b. The Senate provides assistance in running the institution that no other body can provide. In matters of curriculum and instruction, the university's Administration needs to rely on the faculty, because the Administration lacks the specific familiarity with the professional disciplines and all the related experience that the faculty possess.

On the other hand, it is not the intent of faculty to slow or to assume control on the decision making process. On the contrary, the AGB's Statement on Institutional Governance [12] addresses this issue (on page 8) most appropriately: "*Boards and chief executives should establish deadlines for the conclusion of various consultative and decision-making processes with the clear understanding that failure to act in accordance with these deadlines will mean that the next highest level in the governance process may choose to act. While respecting the sometimes lengthy processes of academic governance, a single individual or group should not be empowered to impede decisions through inaction.*"

Shared governance means *collaboration*. The simplest example where such collaboration exists is in recruiting, appointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty as well as in the selection process of department heads, deans, etc. The AGB uses this as an illustration of how such *collaboration* does work in academia: In its Statement on Institutional Governance it is stated (on page 9) that: "*There should be a conscious effort to minimize the ambiguous or overlapping areas in which more than one stakeholder group has authority. The respective roles of the administration, faculty, and governing board in faculty appointments, promotions, and tenure illustrate the principle of collaboration. For example, although the board may wish to exert its ultimate responsibility by insisting on approving individual tenure decisions, it might choose to delegate other kinds of actions to the administration, which might, in turn, delegate some authority for some decisions to an appropriate faculty body.*"

## **IX. The Role of Tenure in Shared Governance**

The word "University" comes from the Latin phrase "Universitas Studiorum"--University of all the studies. Indeed, it is the function of bringing together expertise in a very wide range of disciplines and professional fields, especially innovative and rapidly changing fields, that makes the University a distinctive and socially useful organization. In the *Chronicle of Higher Education* [15], Jagdish Bhagwati and Brendan O'Flaherty explore the implications of this point for faculty participation in hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions, and its connection to faculty governance. Their explanation also applies to faculty participation in curricular and developmental decisions in the university.

As Bhagwati and O'Flaherty observe, the evaluation of candidates for Faculty status and promotion and tenure requires expertise in the fields in which those candidates are working. This means that no one person--no Dean or Provost or University President--can possibly know all the fields and disciplines s/he would have to know in order to evaluate candidates for faculty status, promotion, and tenure in the departments under her/his supervision. The only possibility is for him/her to rely on advice from the faculty in the various disciplines who evaluate candidates in their respective fields through a process of hiring, tenure and promotion committee considerations. It is no accident that this process relies especially on tenured faculty. For an untenured faculty member, particularly in a rapidly moving field, a very promising and recently educated new faculty member would be a threat of unemployment. The tenured faculty member, by contrast, can expect to benefit by continued association with able younger colleagues, and thus has every reason to recommend the best of the candidates available. Since the tenured faculty member also has a specialized knowledge in the field that makes it possible for her/him to recognize the best of the candidates, the combination of faculty tenure and reliance on faculty committees for hiring and promotion decisions increases the productivity of the University as a socially useful organization. According to

this view, it is no accident that the very best universities are all characterized by precisely this combination of faculty tenure and faculty participation in tenure decision making.

What Bhagwati and O'Flaherty say can also be applied to curricular decisions and many related decisions about the development of the university. No one knows better than a scholar and civil engineer what new courses and curricula are likely to improve education and research in civil engineering. This is equally true of political science, graphic design, and accounting. Thus, a system of faculty governance in which important curricular proposals and proposals for the development of the various disciplines originate with the faculty in those disciplines will, like faculty screening of candidates for faculty status and promotion and tenure, increase the productivity of the university. Here again, faculty tenure plays a key role. For an untenured faculty member, or for a faculty member who does not feel secure in her/his tenure, a new direction of development in her/his field is a threat of unemployment. But the faculty member who is secure in her/his tenure can afford to support new developments and can benefit by association with them.

All of this points in the same direction: many decisions in a university are best made by the people who have both the specialized expertise in one or another of the many fields the university offers, and the security of continued association with an improved university, that only tenure can provide. The key point is that democracy, free speech, and broad participation on the part of a Faculty, secure in their tenure, are not only objectives in themselves, but are also the means of increasing the productivity of the University in just those activities that make it a contributor to society: the provision of the very highest standard of expertise in a wide range of specialized and innovative disciplines and fields of study. This explains why the very best universities are characterized by the combination of secure faculty tenure, faculty participation in governance, and a relationship of trust between faculty and administrators. To a considerable extent, that combination is what has made them the best.

#### **X. Commitment of Drexel's Faculty to Shared Governance**

Drexel's Faculty strongly believes in the principle and importance of shared governance and is willing to contribute accordingly. Over 100 faculty participated in the various activities of the Senate during AY 2001/02, which constitutes approximately 33% of all tenure track faculty [17] These activities have been pursued on a volunteer basis—only the Chair of the Senate and the Chair of the Senate Committee on Academic Affairs receive compensation for their efforts in terms of instructional release time, unlike many other universities where support is greater. Faculty participation is particularly impressive in view of the increases in faculty workload over the past six years of growth and renewal at the institution (in terms of student faculty ratio, student credit hours delivered, research productivity, and scholarship).

It is this unique commitment of Drexel's faculty that sustained the University during the difficult times of the first half of the 1990s, and it is the hard work of the faculty that carried the University during the rapid growth during the latter half of the 1990s. Throughout these two difficult periods Drexel faculty demonstrated a selfless attitude on behalf of the institution, continuous commitment, and excellence in teaching and scholarship. It is the Faculty of Drexel that propelled the University to become the strong institution it is now. The high productivity level and successes of the faculty were accomplished with limited infrastructure support and with little, if any, recognition.

Studies have shown that University faculty tend to be motivated by their potential for accomplishment in teaching and scholarship rather than by potential financial rewards. Faculty satisfaction arises from the successes of their students, undergraduate and graduate, and the outcomes of their research work, whether funded or unfunded. Faculty do not measure their

accomplishments solely by their compensation but by their professional reputations as teachers and researchers. Faculty are not merely employees of an academic institution. They embody what the academic institution is all about. A faculty member's professional reputation rests not only on his/her own accomplishments, but also on the reputation of the institution in which they serve. Thus, the institution's reputation is very much a faculty concern, and preserving or improving that reputation is an important area for faculty involvement.

## **XI. Selected Examples on the Importance of Drexel's Shared Governance System**

Shared governance has served Drexel well in two important, shining instances that put Drexel on the international map:

- a. The adoption of the Macintosh in the early 1980's [16] is a classic example where the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Bernard Sagik, under the guidance of the former President William G. Hagerty, worked hard with the faculty for several years in establishing the nationally known program.
- b. The development and establishment of the Drexel Engineering Curriculum (tDEC) is a more recent example. This program was developed from the grassroots, from a faculty experimental initiative that grew to a full collaboration with the Administration over many years.

## **XII. How is Drexel University Measured in Comparison to Other Academic Institutions?**

A survey, sponsored by the American Association of University Professors and by the American Conference of Academic Deans, was conducted during the period of June to August 2001 [11]. Data include responses from 350 public institution and 532 private institutions. The vast majority of these institutions supplied responses from both faculty and administrators. Some of the findings are directly relevant to the discussion presented herein. Two of the issues addressed in the Survey are provided here, verbatim, to further emphasize the importance of establishing a strong shared governance at Drexel.

Admittedly, the survey does not necessarily address all the aspects related to the academic enterprise and it is improper to 'lump' all academic institutions into a single mold. Nevertheless, a general review of the shared governance situation across the country might help to understand the deficiencies in this regard at Drexel.

### **a. Survey Results on the level of cooperation between faculty and Administration:**

Question No. 14 and the corresponding survey results are given below verbatim. The responses are from both faculty and administrators.

**Question No. 14:** *"Please characterize your impression of the faculty groups most involved in governance at your institution. Choose from the three options below to indicate your sense of the relations with the administration and the board and the role played by faculty in governance:"*

- "52.89%** a) Cooperative – faculty work with the administration and the board to resolve the tough choices facing the institution."
- "40.16%** b) Some conflict but collegial – faculty rarely see eye to eye on matters with the administration and board, but together they work towards policies all sides can live with."
- "6.50%** c) generally suspicious & adversarial – the faculty see their governance function as a veto point over unpopular administrative action."

*"Response by responded class and by institutional size and ownership indicate some variation in how this question was interpreted and answered."*

	<b>Administrators</b>	<b>Faculty Gov Unit</b>	<b>AAUP Chapter</b>	<b>Public &amp; Large Private</b>	<b>Private liberal Arts colleges</b>
a) <i>Cooperative</i>	62.06%	46.90%	28.45%	50.25%	57.87%
b) <i>Conflict but collegial</i>	46.90%	43.79%	57.76%	41.90%	38.58%
c) <i>Adversarial</i>	2.91%	9.31%	13.79%	7.86%	3.54%

**b. Survey Results Addressing the level of Consultation Between Faculty and Administration on Campus-Wide issues:**

Section B of the Survey, and the corresponding survey results, are given below verbatim.

**Section B:** “Below you will find 15 items describing decision regularly made on a campus. For each of the decisions listed, please indicate in the relevant box the percentage of faculty whose participation in the decision takes the form indicated. For each question, focus on the practice of the last 5 years. **Note** that the sum of the figures in each row should be 100% for question 1-5.”

“For the purpose of this questionnaire it is important that all respondents have the same understanding of the terms being used. Generally, department chairs should be counted as members of the administration rather than as faculty, especially for question 12. Even if these definitions do not agree with your own usage, please observe them faithfully. Although the order of the forms of participation listed here and on the questionnaire is in descending degree of faculty participation, it is not meant to imply that determination is considered more desirable than joint action of consultation.”

	<b>Faculty Status</b>	<b>Determination</b> Faculty authority and determination	<b>Joint Action</b> Between faculty and administration	<b>Consultation</b> Administration consults with the faculty	<b>Discussion</b> Administration explains policies taken to faculty	<b>None</b> No faculty participation
1	Appointments of full-time faculty	14.09	58.26	24.44	2.37	0.82
2	Tenure promotion for faculty	12.72	57.80	26.43	1.48	1.58
	<b>Academic Operation</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Joint Action</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>None</b>
3	Discussion about content of curriculum	62.79	30.54	5.34	0.88	0.41
4	Setting degree requirements	54.24	36.80	6.85	1.46	0.64
	<b>Academic Planning and Policy</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Joint Action</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>None</b>
5	Types of degrees offered	22.70	53.63	17.95	4.18	1.51
6	Relative sizes of the faculty of various disciplines	5.89	29.67	40.99	17.79	5.64
7	Construction programs for buildings and other facilities	1.23	7.23	41.20	38.22	12.09

	<b>Faculty Status</b>	<b>Determination</b> Faculty authority and determination	<b>Joint Action</b> Between faculty and administration	<b>Consultation</b> Administration consults with the faculty	<b>Discussion</b> Administration explains policies taken to faculty	<b>None</b> No faculty participation
8	Setting of the average teaching loads	6.39	33.26	31.58	22.53	6.30
	<b>Selection of Administrators and Department Chair</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Joint Action</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>None</b>
9	Appointing the academic dean	2.82	29.84	53.58	8.89	4.70
10	Appointing department chairs or heads	15.94	37.89	36.23	6.26	3.67
11	Setting faculty salary scale	1.71	17.79	30.41	34.12	14.87
12	Decisions about individual faculty salaries ( <i>refer to dept. chairs in glossary</i> )	2.52	15.64	24.51	30.14	27.25
13	Short range budgetary planning	2.01	15.88	38.68	30.81	12.64
	<b>Organization of faculty agency</b>	<b>Determination</b>	<b>Joint Action</b>	<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>None</b>
14	Decisions that establish the authority of faculty in campus governance	12.44	50.92	22.04	11.02	3.62
15	Selecting members for institution-wide committees, senate, and similar agencies	53.14	27.22	12.85	4.02	2.72

### c. Glossary of Terms Used

Below are listed the definitions of the various terms used in the Survey.

**“Determination:** Determination means that the faculty of an academic unit or its duly authorized representatives have final legislative or operational authority with respect to the policy or action, and any other technically required approvals or concurrences are only pro forma.”

**“Joint Action:** Joint action means that formal agreement by both the faculty and other components of the institution is required for confirmatory action or policy determination. Negative action can be accomplished by a veto by either faculty or administration & the board. The separate components need not act simultaneously but should act within a reasonable time interval. In no case should the interval be longer than an academic year.”

**“Consultation:** Consultation means that there is a formal procedure or established practice which provides a means for the faculty (as a whole or through authorized representatives) to present its judgment in the form of a recommendation, vote or other expression sufficiently explicit to record the position or positions taken by the faculty. This explicit expression of faculty judgment must

take place prior to the actual making of the decision in question. Initiative for expression of faculty judgment may come from the faculty, the administration, or the board.”

“**Discussion:** Discussion means that there is only an informal expression of opinion from the faculty nor from individual faculty members: or that there is formally expressed opinion only from administratively selected committees.”

“**None:** None means that there is no faculty participation. In cases where the specific item is lacking, e.g. there is no long-range budgetary planning or where the item is mandated say by the state legislature, e.g. admission requirements for some state schools, then the form of faculty participation is none.”

#### d. How Drexel Compares with the Survey?

Regarding the level of cooperation (Question No. 14): in the opinion of the Steering Committee Drexel’s faculty will *characterize its involvement in governance* as being “*generally suspicious & adversarial – the faculty see their governance function as a veto point over unpopular administrative action.*” That is, according to the survey results Drexel is within those 9.31% of the institutions who classify the relationship as being adversarial (see category (c) on page 19).

The opinion of the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate regarding the “*the practice of the last 5 years*” at Drexel on the fifteen categories of campus-wide issues is listed in the table below.

Category	The Status at Drexel
<b>Faculty Status</b>	
Appointments of full-time faculty	Consultation
Tenure promotion for faculty	Consultation
<b>Academic Operation</b>	
Discussion about content of curriculum	Consultation
Setting degree requirements	Consultation
<b>Academic Planning and Policy</b>	
Types of degrees offered	Consultation
Relative sizes of the faculty of various disciplines	No faculty participation
Construction programs for buildings and other facilities	No faculty participation
Setting of the average teaching loads	No faculty participation
<b>Selection of Administrators and Department Chair</b>	
Appointing the academic dean	Consultation/No participation
Appointing department chairs or heads	Consultation/No participation
Setting faculty salary scale	No faculty participation
Decisions about individual faculty salaries ( <i>refer to dept. chairs in glossary</i> )	No faculty participation
Short range budgetary planning	No faculty participation
<b>Organization of faculty agency</b>	
Decisions that establish the authority of faculty in campus governance	No faculty participation
Selecting members for institution-wide committees, senate, and similar agencies	Consultation

These categories do not cover the entire range of issues in which faculty should be involved, as discussed in the sections above. Issues such as strategic planning, appointment of senior academic and administrative officers, admission standards, etc., are not covered in this Survey. Nevertheless, while until now Drexel University faculty are consulted on many matters affecting the curriculum, there is little consultation on any other matters affecting the academic programs and welfare of the institution.

### **XIII. The Faculty Senate: Partner in Management of Change; Deliverer of Effective University Governance; Supporter of Academia**

The Chancellor of the University of Connecticut, M. Emmert, discusses in *Focus on Models of Change* [14], how universities can (perhaps should) accommodate to their current dynamic environments. Emmert's comments bring to mind many issues that relate directly to planning for success in Drexel's newly merged University structure: how to manage change; how to deliver effective governance within the merged faculty; and how a Faculty Senate can be the supporter (even champion) of academic values.

- *The Senate as Partner in the Management of Change:* Emmert discusses the issue of “balance and paradox” in managing change. He recognizes that the essential question is how to work within an existing academic culture while responding to a dramatically changing environment in which the University exists. He states that “*paradoxically, we must work within the academy's existing culture while helping to shape it to promote essential transformations.*”

Where better to engage in a discussion of our changing culture than within a representative Faculty Senate, one in which all Colleges and Schools of the unified University are represented? At the present time the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate and the MCP/Hahnemann University Council are engaged in discussions on issues of governance that will pull all the Colleges and Schools of the merged University into a unified governance structure.

Emmert points out that a basic challenge lies in addressing “*education's core values as the cornerstones on which academic quality is built...academic freedom, shared governance, a collective focus on academic rigor, open exchange of ideas, and policy making.*” These core values must be defended, while at the same time allowing for positive change that moves the university to ever higher levels of achievement and prestige. The challenge is to create an atmosphere where change is valued rather than perceived “*as aberrant and an attack on the academy's core values.*”

Where better to discuss, debate, and monitor change within our institution than in its Faculty Senate? Is there a better way to structure the discussion of the issues than calling upon the expertise of existing Faculty Senate committees and University Advisory Committees? Since it is commonly acknowledged that any change requires full faculty participation in the implementation phase, there is a better guarantee of success when faculty are involved from the very early stages of discussion and during planning and implementation.

This challenge is best met by joint involvement of the Faculty Senate and the Administration, working through established mechanisms for collaboration, calling upon the expertise of existing Faculty Senate committees and the University Advisory Committee Structure.

- *Faculty Senate as a Key Player in Delivering Effective Governance:* According to Emmert, effective governance is not a cookbook process, but does require some rules, many of which are already in place and others that could be added easily. The three most important rules are:

Rule No. 1: “*Focus outcomes on mutually agreed-upon goals.*” How better to achieve this than having one major partner in the discussion be a democratically elected body that has been recognized as the voice of the faculty? As the author states, “*shared goals can focus attention and action.*”

Rule No. 2: “*Manage for goal attainment, not bureaucratic control.*” Here is where a Faculty Senate, supported by a recognized and respected *Charter of Faculty Governance*, becomes a meaningful player in delivering shared governance. Articles III and IV in the current *Charter* define the roles, responsibilities, and purview of the Faculty Senate and create the basis for meaningful shared decision making process, e.g., monitoring meaningful curriculum and considering the impact of structural changes in programs and colleges. The role of the Faculty Senate as advisory “*in the spirit of collegial responsibility*” (see *Charter* Article III) is a critical one in moving the University to a more respected position in American academia.

Rule No. 3: “*Develop and disseminate performance and financial information.*” The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs (SCFA) has worked with the University Administration to develop and monitor the delivery of policies on workload, tenure and promotion procedure, faculty leave policies, and other faculty issues. Additionally, the Senate Committee on Budget, Planning, and Development Committee (SCBP&D) has developed mechanisms with the Administration to share budget information and suggest budget priorities. The Faculty Senate serves to coalesce most faculty behind the new initiatives and policies, even when initiated by the Administration.

Effective governance according to Emmert:

- Enables consensus to emerge among all constituents in the University;
  - Puts ideas on the table by being open, evaluative, and shared;
  - Is participatory;
  - Fosters competition but is not adversarial;
  - Allows for reasoned reflection toward consensus;
  - Promotes commitment to both the disciplines and the match of disciplinary knowledge with the institution;
  - Promotes effective decision making at many levels, simultaneously;
  - Anticipates and forecasts;
  - Allows progress to occur in manageable pieces;
- 
- *The Faculty Senate’s Function as Supporter of Academic Values:* As stated earlier, the importance of a University Faculty Senate is well established in all reputable academic institutions. At Drexel:
    - The Faculty Senate acts as a *gatekeeper of ideas*. Individuals turn to a Faculty Senate because they consider it the source of information about the health and welfare of the University. Drexel’s Middle States Association Self-Study clearly spelled out that the faculty sees the Senate as its voice, a healthy sign. Communication is the glue that holds successful organizations together.
    - The Faculty Senate is a *defender and integrator of Academic values*. The values of academe are widely shared across the country and within academic institutions: freedom of expression, the right to challenge actions, and the responsibility to have a meaningful voice in how an institution is governed.
    - The Faculty Senate is a *monitor and watchdog of change*. This is, of course, the challenge at this moment for Drexel. Strategic planning must include a meaningful role for faculty as we create a strong and successful merged institution.
    - The Faculty Senate provides the essential *governance checks and balances* to ensure that the University remains on an appropriate educational course.

#### **XIV. Future Directions**

The Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate urges the Administration and the Board of Trustees to open a discussion with the faculty with the goal of re-instituting a *true* shared governance structure that establishes a mechanism for the Faculty Senate to provide advice and recommendations on all issues related to the welfare of the institution, including budgetary matters, campus planning, strategic planning, appointment of senior officers, etc., consistent with the guidelines of organizations such as AAUP, AGB, and MSA.

The Faculty Senate has adopted a cooperative and collaborative approach in its dealings with the Administration and the Board of Trustees with the ultimate goal of improving the educational enterprise. The faculty is now looking to the Administration and the Board of Trustees for help in creating a more open, consultative, and collaborative atmosphere at Drexel.

## REFERENCES

1. “1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure”, in American Association of University Professors, Policy Documents and Reports, Ninth Edition, 2001, pp. 1-10.
2. “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities”, in American Association of University Professors, Policy Documents and Reports, Ninth Edition, 2001, pp. 217-223.
3. “Institutional Governance and Decision Making”, Bibliography in Association of Governing Boards in Colleges and Universities (AGB), <http://www.agb.org/content/browser/zrc8.cfm>.
4. The American Association of University Professors Policy Statement, *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, in The American Association of University Professors, Policy Documents and Reports, Ninth Edition, 2001, pp. 1-10.
5. The American Association of University Professors Policy Document on *Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators* in The American Association of University Professors, Policy Documents and Reports, Ninth Edition, 2001, pp. 228-229.
6. The American Association of University Professors Policy Document on *The Role of Faculty in Budgetary and Salary Matters* in The American Association of University Professors, Policy Documents and Reports, Ninth Edition, 2001, pp. 232-235.
7. The American Association of University Professors Policy *Statement on Faculty Workload* in The American Association of University Professors, Policy Documents and Reports, Ninth Edition, 2001, pp. 153-157.
8. The American Association of University Professors Policy Document *On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom* in The American Association of University Professors, Policy Documents and Reports, Ninth Edition, 2001, pp. 224-227.
9. The American Association of University Professors Policy Document on *Governance Standards in Institutional Mergers and Acquisition* in The American Association of University Professors, Policy Documents and Reports, Ninth Edition, 2001, pp. 236-237.
10. “The Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools Evaluation Team Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees, and Students of Drexel University”, December 13, 2001.
11. Commission on Higher Education, Handbook for Evaluation Teams, Sixth Edition.
12. “AGB Statement on Institutional Governance”, Association of Governing Board of Universities and Colleges, 2001.
13. “Strategic Leadership in Academic Affairs – Clarifying the Board’s Responsibilities”, Richard L. Murril, The Association of Governing Boards in Colleges and Universities, publisher, 2002.
14. “Focus on Models of Change”, Mark A. Emmert, in *Trusteeship*, Vol. 6, No. 4, 1998.

15. “Professors who Defend Tenure: Are they Hypocrites?”, J. Bhagwati and B.O’Flaherty” (Columbia University), The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 5, 2001, p. B24.
16. “‘Apple DU’ Initiative Shows Strengths of Shared Governance”, S. Smith, The Triangle June 21, 2002, p. 7.
18. “Preliminary Results from the 2001 Survey on Higher Education Governance”, G. Kaplan, Harvard University, [www.aaup.org](http://www.aaup.org), Feb. 2002.
17. Membership at Drexel Faculty Senate and its Committees.