

**Chapter 1 : College and University Governance | AAUP**

*Faculty participation in college or university decision making is accepted as intrinsically good and as having positive effects on institutional functioning, but it is reflected in varying degrees in actual practice.*

Association for the Study of Higher Education. Faculty Participation in Decision Making. Faculty participation in institutional decision making is accepted as intrinsically good and as having positive effects on institutional functioning, but it is reflected in varying degrees in actual practice. Neither faculty nor administrators have been very satisfied with actual patterns of participation or the effectiveness of that participation. Faculty seek to protect and to reinvigorate historical mechanisms like academic senates and the well-established areas of curriculum and faculty tenure and promotion. They also seek mechanisms and approaches for establishing a significant role in areas where little participation historically has occurred. Sympathetic to faculty frustrations about participation, administrators seek ways to more fully integrate consultation with faculty into decision-making processes. Faculty and administrators are frustrated by the paucity of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfactions of faculty participation and seek ways to increase the rewards of that participation. Perceiving that many significant decisions are being made above the campus level, faculty now increasingly are concerned about mechanisms for participation at the system level in multicampus systems and at the state level. Participation in institutional decision making is associated with increased employee satisfaction and performance in a wide variety of organizations. Faculty expertise on the subjects on which decisions are to be made is perhaps the most fundamental factor supporting faculty participation in institutional decision making. But faculty also tend to accord legitimacy to and fully cooperate in the implementation of only those policies that faculty have helped formulate because they believe faculty have a right to participate. Although participatory leadership models require a number of preconditions, these preconditions are met in higher education environments more frequently than in other organizational settings. Faculty senates and faculty senate committees continue to be useful mechanisms for faculty participation at many research universities, at other universities, and at elite liberal arts colleges with regard to core academic areas like curriculum and faculty tenure and promotion, but they are not necessarily as influential at other types of higher education institutions. Senates are more representative of a cross-section of faculty in the s than they were in the s, the result of increased use of elected representatives and more democratic selecting procedures for committees. Faculty are less comfortable, however, with the involvement of nonfaculty constituencies in the revised senate structures established in the late s and early s and continue to seek means to minimize the influence of those constituencies. Faculty historically have the broadest role and greatest influence on matters of curriculum and faculty personnel especially tenure and promotion. The literature suggests, however, that these patterns may be difficult to maintain unless faculty are willing to address issues of general education, staffing flexibility, and some aspects of faculty conduct from a broader perspective. The resolution of these issues is central to faculty credibility and institutional viability. Within the past 15 years, faculty participation has also become relatively well accepted in institutional planning and in the selection and evaluation of administrators at many institutions. Faculty participation is a significant element in the process by which presidents are selected and a normative factor against which presidential candidates are evaluated. Faculty ambivalence about integrating financial with academic factors, which has tended to restrict faculty participation and influence in some stages of planning, has also begun to recede. Healthy debates about the best mechanisms for integrating faculty participation into strategic planning suggest good prospects for balance between administrative leadership and broad participation as such approaches are actually implemented. Although faculty involvement in budgeting and in adverse circumstances in retrenchment has historically been limited by both administrative resistance and faculty ambivalence, groundwork is being laid on many campuses for greater and more effective faculty participation. Faculty have begun to take steps, in conjunction with administrators, to gain a better understanding of the technical bases and political dynamics of the budgetary process, thus reducing an earlier handicap. Boards of trustees and university administrators are also becoming more sophisticated about the importance of process considerations in handling retrenchment

and the greater acceptability of retrenchment measures if faculty are consulted about procedures and implementation. Administrators increasingly see themselves as managers of an institutional decision process and focus their energies on four crucial elements: The articulation of a set of shared values and goals is central to strengthening the collegial foundations of decision making in higher education. In and , a number of national blue ribbon commissions helped focus campus attention on the need to clarify the purposes of the undergraduate curriculum, with special emphasis on general education. Further, some scholars have suggested that Theory Z and other Japanese management approaches can help focus attention on a collegially oriented administrative style, while others have raised issues about some of the negative implications of Theory Z on the campus. The higher education literature of the last 10 years reflects a growing consensus about the characteristics of and an adequate framework for administrative consultation with faculty. A set of understandings has evolved about where very broad consultation is useful and where the extent of consultation is appropriately more limited. Agreement has also been reached that every effort should be made to maintain process and procedure, even in crises. Various approaches and means for administrators to make information relevant to campus-generated decisions more available to faculty consultative groups have been identified in the higher education literature. A national resource center for faculty participation in institutional decision making has been identified as a possible mechanism for providing a base of knowledge about best institutional practices. Faculty and administrators can call upon a sizable literature on generic organization theory to gain useful insights to improve group deliberations. That literature illuminates various aspects of group decision making, including task-oriented leadership and group maintenance leadership, patterns of sharing group leadership, obstacles to rational evaluation of alternative decisions, and suggestions for improving group decision making. The higher education literature contains a number of suggestions as to how institutions might increase the intrinsic satisfactions of and extrinsic rewards for institutional participation. Suggestions for increasing intrinsic satisfactions include providing faculty participants a better understanding of the dynamics of the consultative process and setting terms of committee service to correspond with the beginning and ending of major projects. Coordinated efforts of administrators and faculty are necessary to increase the extrinsic rewards for constructive institutional participation, thus reversing the pattern of very little weight given by most institutional personnel committees to institutional or public service, a pattern most accentuated in research universities. Formal faculty participation at the system and state levels can take the form of direct membership on the board itself, a formal systemwide senate or statewide committee, or participation in ad hoc and standing technical committees. The mechanisms of a systemwide senate in multicampus systems or a statewide coordinating board, have been of the strongest interest both in theory and in practice. This digest was derived from ED Association for the Study of Higher Education, Faculty Roles on State Boards. Report of the General Secretary. Further, this site is using a privately owned and located server. This is NOT a government sponsored or government sanctioned site.

**Chapter 2 : Faculty Participation in Decision Making. ERIC Digest.**

*This paper models faculty participation in university decision-making and the effects on enrollment, academic quality and non-academic quality. The model predicts that faculty participation positively.*

Association for the Study of Higher Education. Faculty Participation in Decision Making. Faculty participation in institutional decision making is accepted as intrinsically good and as having positive effects on institutional functioning, but it is reflected in varying degrees in actual practice. Neither faculty nor administrators have been very satisfied with actual patterns of participation or the effectiveness of that participation. Faculty seek to protect and to reinvigorate historical mechanisms like academic senates and the well-established areas of curriculum and faculty tenure and promotion. They also seek mechanisms and approaches for establishing a significant role in areas where little participation historically has occurred. Sympathetic to faculty frustrations about participation, administrators seek ways to more fully integrate consultation with faculty into decision-making processes. Faculty and administrators are frustrated by the paucity of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfactions of faculty participation and seek ways to increase the rewards of that participation. Perceiving that many significant decisions are being made above the campus level, faculty now increasingly are concerned about mechanisms for participation at the system level in multicampus systems and at the state level. Participation in institutional decision making is associated with increased employee satisfaction and performance in a wide variety of organizations. Faculty expertise on the subjects on which decisions are to be made is perhaps the most fundamental factor supporting faculty participation in institutional decision making. But faculty also tend to accord legitimacy to and fully cooperate in the implementation of only those policies that faculty have helped formulate because they believe faculty have a right to participate. Although participatory leadership models require a number of preconditions, these preconditions are met in higher education environments more frequently than in other organizational settings. Faculty senates and faculty senate committees continue to be useful mechanisms for faculty participation at many research universities, at other universities, and at elite liberal arts colleges with regard to core academic areas like curriculum and faculty tenure and promotion, but they are not necessarily as influential at other types of higher education institutions. Senates are more representative of a cross-section of faculty in the s than they were in the s, the result of increased use of elected representatives and more democratic selecting procedures for committees. Faculty are less comfortable, however, with the involvement of nonfaculty constituencies in the revised senate structures established in the late s and early s and continue to seek means to minimize the influence of those constituencies. Faculty historically have the broadest role and greatest influence on matters of curriculum and faculty personnel especially tenure and promotion. The literature suggests, however, that these patterns may be difficult to maintain unless faculty are willing to address issues of general education, staffing flexibility, and some aspects of faculty conduct from a broader perspective. The resolution of these issues is central to faculty credibility and institutional viability. Within the past 15 years, faculty participation has also become relatively well accepted in institutional planning and in the selection and evaluation of administrators at many institutions. Faculty participation is a significant element in the process by which presidents are selected and a normative factor against which presidential candidates are evaluated. Faculty ambivalence about integrating financial with academic factors, which has tended to restrict faculty participation and influence in some stages of planning, has also begun to recede. Healthy debates about the best mechanisms for integrating faculty participation into strategic planning suggest good prospects for balance between administrative leadership and broad participation as such approaches are actually implemented. Although faculty involvement in budgeting and in adverse circumstances in retrenchment has historically been limited by both administrative resistance and faculty ambivalence, groundwork is being laid on many campuses for greater and more effective faculty participation. Faculty have begun to take steps, in conjunction with administrators, to gain a better understanding of the technical bases and political dynamics of the budgetary process, thus reducing an earlier handicap. Boards of trustees and university administrators are also becoming more sophisticated about the importance of process considerations in handling retrenchment

and the greater acceptability of retrenchment measures if faculty are consulted about procedures and implementation. Administrators increasingly see themselves as managers of an institutional decision process and focus their energies on four crucial elements: The articulation of a set of shared values and goals is central to strengthening the collegial foundations of decision making in higher education. In and , a number of national blue ribbon commissions helped focus campus attention on the need to clarify the purposes of the undergraduate curriculum, with special emphasis on general education. Further, some scholars have suggested that Theory Z and other Japanese management approaches can help focus attention on a collegially oriented administrative style, while others have raised issues about some of the negative implications of Theory Z on the campus. The higher education literature of the last 10 years reflects a growing consensus about the characteristics of and an adequate framework for administrative consultation with faculty. A set of understandings has evolved about where very broad consultation is useful and where the extent of consultation is appropriately more limited. Agreement has also been reached that every effort should be made to maintain process and procedure, even in crises. Various approaches and means for administrators to make information relevant to campus-generated decisions more available to faculty consultative groups have been identified in the higher education literature. A national resource center for faculty participation in institutional decision making has been identified as a possible mechanism for providing a base of knowledge about best institutional practices. Faculty and administrators can call upon a sizable literature on generic organization theory to gain useful insights to improve group deliberations. That literature illuminates various aspects of group decision making, including task-oriented leadership and group maintenance leadership, patterns of sharing group leadership, obstacles to rational evaluation of alternative decisions, and suggestions for improving group decision making. The higher education literature contains a number of suggestions as to how institutions might increase the intrinsic satisfactions of and extrinsic rewards for institutional participation. Suggestions for increasing intrinsic satisfactions include providing faculty participants a better understanding of the dynamics of the consultative process and setting terms of committee service to correspond with the beginning and ending of major projects. Coordinated efforts of administrators and faculty are necessary to increase the extrinsic rewards for constructive institutional participation, thus reversing the pattern of very little weight given by most institutional personnel committees to institutional or public service, a pattern most accentuated in research universities. Formal faculty participation at the system and state levels can take the form of direct membership on the board itself, a formal systemwide senate or statewide committee, or participation in ad hoc and standing technical committees. The mechanisms of a systemwide senate in multicampus systems or a statewide coordinating board, have been of the strongest interest both in theory and in practice. This digest was derived from ED Association for the Study of Higher Education, Faculty Roles on State Boards. Report of the General Secretary. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or the Department of Education. This digest is a summary of "Faculty Participation in Decision Making: Administrators, Practitioners Available From:

**Chapter 3 : Governance in higher education - Wikipedia**

*In a review of the participation literature, Lowin () suggests that future research investigate factors which mediate the level of participation in organizational decision-making.*

College athletics in this country is in continuing crisis. Even after several years of proposals and discussions of reform, the gains achieved are quite modest. Earlier inquiries revealed significant educational neglect in major college basketball and football programs, with shockingly low graduation rates at some institutions. Among the dismal revelations were findings that fewer than one in ten basketball players graduated at a large research university in the Midwest, and that no black basketball players graduated in a ten-year period at a southern regional state university. Graduation rates of less than 30 percent were common. Admissions standards often seemed guided solely by athletic concerns. A more recent study revealed that thirty-five of ninety-seven major basketball programs had graduation rates of 0 to 20 percent. These results occurred despite the existence of extensive tutoring efforts. Despite the attention given to intercollegiate sports reform in the media and elsewhere, ample evidence exists that the problems in college sports are persistent, substantial, and fundamental. It continues to be true in most major programs that basketball and football players are among the worst students on campus. It is not unusual to find that the median SAT scores for basketball and football players are hundreds of points below those for the general student body. Moreover, while improper payments to athletes appear to have abated from the frenzied level of a few years ago, the practice has not disappeared, as recent investigations have revealed. It is not surprising that the crisis in intercollegiate sports continues. The fact of the matter is that the economic environment that produced academic and financial improprieties in the past has not substantially changed. The teams that win the most continue to earn the most in college sports. Adherence to rigorous admissions and academic standards is an impediment to winning, and a college that seeks to provide its athletes with a serious academic endeavor runs the risk that its competitors will not. The commercial rewards of athletic success continue to be juxtaposed to rigorous academic pursuits. The time has come to recognize that intercollegiate athletics poses a major governance problem for American colleges and universities. Athletics is no longer merely an interesting extracurricular activity that occupies the campus on Saturday afternoon. In major programs, athletics often functions as an auxiliary enterprise that generates its own substantial revenues. On many campuses this has led to a suggestion that the intercollegiate athletic program should not be subject to the same governance structure as are more traditional educational endeavors. Moreover, policy making in athletics is greatly affected by decisions that are made far from campus. These include decisions made by the National Collegiate Athletic Association NCAA , by competing institutions, and by the broadcasting companies that are providing the revenues that have financed the recent expansion of college sports. Recent experience has shown that the athletic department should not be allowed to function as a separate entity. Despite the substantial amounts of money earned in athletics at some colleges and universities, almost none of it is used to support academic programs. Indeed, academic programs are often threatened, but seldom benefited, by changes in the fortunes of the athletic program. The impulse toward separateness of the athletic department needs to be curbed. The goal of structural reform in the governance of college sports should be more fully to integrate athletics into the educational mission of the institution. The policy statement that follows addresses the general allocation of authority in the governance of athletics. This statement is undertaken with a realistic view of the prospects for college sports reform. It is doubtful that faculty efforts alone will be sufficient to refocus the priorities of major athletic programs. On the other hand, faculties are in a unique position to advocate adherence to meaningful academic standards. Faculties, able to speak with independence and candor, can add important balance to the discussion of reform. In addition, the faculty has a vital role to play in assessing the educational and budgetary implications of decisions concerning the scope of the athletic program. This statement addresses how responsibility for policy making on athletics should be allocated between the faculty and other components of the university. General Principles The basic framework for defining faculty responsibility in the governance of athletics is found in an earlier statement of Association policy. The Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities underscores the need for joint

participation in governance by the various constituencies within the university: 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. The Statement on Government recognizes that the faculty has primary responsibility with respect to fundamental areas of educational policy, and that the faculty, along with other components of the institution, should participate in the exchange of information that accompanies long-range planning. An important premise of that statement is that budgetary matters are an appropriate faculty concern: The faculty should participate both in the preparation of the total institutional budget and within the framework of the total budget in decisions relevant to the further apportioning of its specific fiscal divisions. Both statements provide that the authority for final decision making is to be allocated among the governing board, the president, and the faculty consistent with the responsibility that each component appropriately claims within the overall governance structure. Even where primary responsibility rests with one component, the other affected parties may have a legitimate participatory role. The Importance of Full Disclosure of Information About the Athletic Program In the past, the governance of athletics has been made more difficult because administrators and others have treated information about the athletic program as highly secret. Often, information critical of admissions policies, the educational experience of athletes, and financial arrangements with coaches and booster clubs is revealed only as a result of scrutiny by outside agencies, such as the press or the NCAA. Such secretiveness is unacceptable in an intellectual environment that is committed to fostering open and candid discussion. It is also antithetical to effective governance. For the future, the presumption must be that all aspects of the operation of the athletic department, including the education of athletes and the finances of booster clubs, are open to scrutiny by the university community. A special effort should be made to ensure the confidentiality of information where that is needed to protect the privacy of individual athletes and employees. In general, however, policies with respect to athletics should be subject to the same openness of debate that attends other financial and educational issues within the academic community. Especially in the present era of intensive, highly commercialized college sports, there are often pressures within the athletic program that draw athletes away from the type of preparation, review, and class attendance that are fundamental to a meaningful education. The faculty has the primary obligation to ensure that pressures are tempered and that athletes have adequate opportunity to pursue educational goals. Almost all of these, however, may have important educational implications and thus are legitimately of concern to the faculty. Among the matters warranting attention are questions such as the level of competition at which the university will participate and more specific questions concerning the length of playing seasons and policies with respect to team travel. A decision to move to a higher level of competition, for example, will often mean that athletes face increased pressures on their academic schedules. In the same vein, long playing seasons may present a significant barrier to regular class attendance. Because of their mixed educational and administrative character, such issues of athletic policy will call for joint participation by faculty, administration, and, where appropriate, other components of the university. In addition to its particular concerns about the impact of athletics on educational programs, the faculty has a shared interest in planning for the long-range development of the university. The faculty should also play an appropriate role in decisions about the allocation of resources within the university. Policy making with respect to athletics affects both of these governance functions and thus the faculty is properly involved. Faculty involvement is particularly important with respect to the budgetary deliberations undertaken in connection with the athletic program, even with the understanding that ultimate budgetary authority may reside in another body. The allocation of money to and within the athletic program can be a direct determinant of the level of competition that is pursued and hence greatly influences the degree of nonacademic pressure that participants experience. In addition, athletics increasingly involves major decisions on allocation of resources that should properly be viewed in the context of more general institutional needs and goals. A mechanism should exist for meaningful faculty participation in the budgetary decisions that determine the overall size and scope of the athletic program. On the other hand, the legislative deliberations of the outside body will frequently affect areas over which the faculty has primary internal responsibility. The

Mechanisms for Faculty Participation 1. A candid appraisal of major intercollegiate athletic programs will reveal that the internal incentives for educational achievement are modest at best. External pressures in athletic programs on coaches often lead to demands that encourage, rather than temper, the heavy emphasis on athletic preparation. There is ample evidence of the abuses that can result. Another area of persistent abuse has been special programs for tutoring and counseling athletes. The faculty must reassert its primary responsibility in monitoring the educational experiences of athletes. Such balance can be achieved only by removing all decision making that relates to academic matters from the commercial incentives that otherwise affect the daily functioning of the athletic department. Several specific areas warrant faculty attention. These include admissions standards for athletes, where the goal should be to ensure that the educational talents of athletes meet the requirements of the general student body. In addition, programs for tutoring and instruction in study skills should be the same as those offered to non-athletes. The mechanisms for faculty monitoring are already in place in many institutions. These take the form of committees and offices that set general academic policy and provide oversight. As with every other faculty function, the goal of the governing entities in this area is to ensure that relevant information is adequate and that participation is sought from all affected parties. To the extent that there is a need for a distinctive faculty voice on such educational issues, the faculty senate or assembly is the appropriate body to provide it. In some situations the faculty will find it necessary to use carefully structured ad hoc inquiries to fulfill its monitoring function.

**Institutional Policy Making on Athletics**  
An internal forum should be available in which the various components of the university, including the faculty, jointly deliberate over the formulation of athletic policy. A university-level athletic committee with representation from those with applicable governance authority would be appropriate. Because of the high degree of faculty responsibility for many of the issues presented, the faculty representation on such a body should be substantial. An issue of particular importance is the method for selecting the faculty participants. The selection should be undertaken with a view to ensuring the independence of the faculty voice, and thus direct election by the general faculty or its elected governing body is preferable. Such direct election will also serve to define lines of responsibility within the faculty. Thus, the function of the body is to be more than advisory. A broad range of matters would be expected to come before such a body. The degree of finality to be accorded to such joint deliberations will be determined by the allocation of responsibility among the various governing components. Because of the mixed nature of many athletics issues, however, the joint deliberative body will often be the most appropriate device for resolving matters that overlap the primary responsibilities of the participating entities. In these instances its deliberations should carry a presumption of finality.

**Policy Making by Outside Bodies**  
Because of the significant internal effects of rule making by external associations, a university should take steps to ensure that its voice is heard in whatever deliberations accompany the external decision making. As with internal governance, the degree of faculty responsibility will vary depending on the nature of the policy in question. The faculty perspective is also important for issues that have major budgetary implications and those that define the level of importance assigned to athletics within the institution. The same university-level committee that decides internal athletic policy may prove to be the appropriate vehicle for faculty participation. On matters of significant educational importance, full deliberation by the elected faculty senate or assembly may be necessary. In external organizations that invite the participation of a faculty representative, the person so designated should enjoy the support of the faculty. The goal of mutual acceptance is satisfied by a selection technique that provides for the designation of the faculty representative by the chief administrative officer with the advice and consent of the faculty as expressed through its faculty senate or other representative body.

**Chapter 4 : "Taiwanese faculty and administrators' perceptions and preferences towa" by Shih-Ching Tsai**

*Faculty participation in college or university decision making is accepted as intrinsically good and as having positive effects on institutional functioning, but it is reflected in varying degrees in actual practice. The rationale for faculty participation is related to increased employee.*

The library of Lincoln University, New Zealand The concept of governance in postsecondary education predominantly refers to the internal structure, organization and management of autonomous institutions. The internal governance organization typically consists of a governing board board of regents , board of directors , the university president executive head, CEO with a team of administrative chancellors and staff, faculty senates, academic deans, department chairs, and usually some form of organization for student representation. In the United States, state institution governing boards often emphasize the concept of citizen governance in recognizing that board members serve a civic role for the institution. Management structures themselves have become increasingly complex due to the increasing complexity of intraorganizational, interorganizational and governmental relationships. Whether college and university education, adult education, technical or vocational education, educational administration presents complex challenges at all levels of private and public education. As universities have become increasingly interdependent with external forces, institutions are accountable to external organizational relationships such as local and federal governments, equally in managing business and corporate relationships. The nature of the managing relationships characterize whether governance is corporate and business oriented or defined more by a collegial shared form of governance. In this way, governance is sometimes defined at difference to the internal management of institutions. Throughout the world, many national , state and local governments have begun to establish coordinating and governing boards as both buffer and bridge to coordinate governance and institutional management. With the complexity of internal structures, the external relationships between institutions and local, state, and national governments are evidently equally differentiated given the different forms of government in the international system making the concepts of governance for postsecondary education pluralistic in its broadest sense and usage. External governing relationships depends much on institutions, government policy, and any other formal or informal organizational obligations. Generally, institutions are recognized as autonomous actors with varying degrees of interdependence with, and legislated commitments to the external stakeholders, local and national government. Administrative building at University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore Due to the influences of public sector reforms, several authors Kezar and Eckel ; Lapworth ; Middlehurst point out that next to the concept of shared and participative governance a new form of governance has emerged, i. According to Lapworth, the rise of the notion of corporate governance and the decline of the shared or consensual governance can be seen to be a result of the decline in academic participation, a growing tendency towards managerialism and the new environment where the universities are operating. Refinements to the statement were introduced in subsequent years, culminating in the Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities. Rather, it aimed to establish a shared vision for the internal governance of institutions. Student involvement is not addressed in detail. The statement concerns general education policy and internal operations with an overview of the formal structures for organization and management. In process and structure, the meaning with the end result is an organizational philosophy for shared governance in higher education. While institutions internationally do not directly have the same genealogy with the idea of shared, collegial governance, universities worldwide are loosely organized by similar structures and based on comparable models. McMaster notes the different cultures in universities and the traditional relationships between faculty and administration, characterizing historical transitions and suggesting that universities today are undergoing transitions in culture. With debates over the recent trends, university organizations, governing associations, and numerous postsecondary institutions themselves have set forth policy statements on governance. The policy maintains that faculty involvement in governance is critical. Providing research support, the organization states faculty should advise administration in developing curriculum and methods of instruction. Faculty is responsible for establishing degree requirements, takes primary responsibility in tenure

appointments and the award of promotion and sabbatical. The policy concludes with the assertion: State and federal government and external agencies should refrain from intervening in the internal governance of institutions of higher education when they are functioning in accordance with state and federal law. Government should recognize that conserving the autonomy of these institutions is essential to protecting academic freedom, the advance of knowledge, and the pursuit of truth. Unlike the NEA, the AAUP elaborates more on the role of governing structures, including the role of the president to ensure "sound academic practices", as the NEA suggests faculty rights to appeal flawed and improper procedures. In summation, where the AAUP discusses the organizational structure for governance and management in more detail while touching on student involvement, the NEA statement differs by detailing primarily faculty rights and responsibilities in shared governance. Where the AAUP statement discusses policy on students and their academic rights, with the community college statement the NEA does not address student involvement. Accordingly, six principles affirm standards of academic freedom, faculty participation in standards and curriculum, and faculty decisions on academic personnel as the AAUP first established principles of governance. In conclusion, the AFT emphasizes affirmation of the goals, objectives and purpose for shared governance in higher education. Statements from associations of governance[ edit ] Association of Governing Boards: External Influences on Colleges and Universities. The board should establish effective ways to govern while respecting the culture of decision making in the academy. The board should approve a budget and establish guidelines for resource allocation using a process that reflects strategic priorities. Boards should ensure open communication with campus constituencies. The governing board should manifest a commitment to accountability and transparency and should exemplify the behavior it expects of other participants in the governance process. Governing boards have the ultimate responsibility to appoint and assess the performance of the president. System governing boards should clarify the authority and responsibilities of the system head, campus heads, and any institutional quasi-governing or advisory boards. Boards of both public and independent colleges and universities should play an important role in relating their institutions to the communities they serve. AGB statement on governing in the public trust[ edit ] With their statement on governing bodies, the AGB then provides statement on governing in the public trust, iterating many of the same points concerning recent external pressures. The statement defines the historic role and rationale behind the principles of citizen governance upon which state institutional boards operate. Again, addressing the nature of external influences in university governance, the AGB defines specific principles in maintaining accountability and autonomy in the public trust, including the primacy of the board over individual members; the importance of institutional missions; respecting the board as both buffer and bridge; exhibiting exemplary public behaviour; and In conclusion, the statement asks for the reaffirmation of a commitment to citizen governance to maintain the balanced and independent governance of institutions. Acknowledging the diversity of governing structures and believing a balance is necessary between internal and external forces, the organization maintains: The recommendations address practices by which internal governing structures operate and how they can improve institutional governance for the Commonwealth of Australia. Additional perspectives[ edit ] University governance in Africa[ edit ] The Pan-African Institute of University Governance is a project set up by the Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie and by the Association of Commonwealth universities, in support of the Ministry of the higher education of Cameroon. Based physically at the Yaounde - Cameroon, it is about a unique structure of support which aims at improving all the practices which contribute to the smooth running of higher education in Africa. Its vocation is to accompany the modernization of the governance of higher education thanks to the implementation of expertise, the modules of training, seminars and workshops and especially specific tools of management, analysis and evaluation. It spreads his actions on the whole domain of governance academic, administrative, financial, social, numerical and of the research and has a function of observatory of higher education in Africa. At this effect, the Institute founds its methods of work on its role of observatory of higher education, on its expertise in evaluation of mechanisms of functioning and decision-making in establishments, and thus on its capacity of analysis of the modes and tools of management of higher education. The activities of the Institute in "€" are articulate around three types of actions: The Institute works in partnership with stakeholders and international institutions to

accompany initiatives and realize actions which can contribute to the improvement of the functioning of higher education and more widely education in Africa. This is a will to work for the emergence of Africa of tomorrow. View and missions of the Pan-African Institute of University Governance[ edit ] The philosophy of this Institute expands dialogue and shared experience between African university leaders on issues related to university governance. African Universities can only develop if they succeed in inventing their own policies and procedures, all by taking into consideration international standards. To assist universities in the accomplishment of their missions in an efficient and modern way, the Pan-African Institute of University Governance shall make use of the relationship it has with partners such as the Agence universitaire de la Francophonie AUF and the Association of Commonwealth Universities ACU. It consists of two joined visions. Rounding on common objectives and shared missions, Anglophones, Francophones, Lusophones and Arabic-speakers will better enrich discussions on how to develop higher educational system. Therefore, our approach is that of the exchange of experience and good practices likely to be widespread within the framework of our institutions that most frequently lack real communication. The first one is current. It consists of rationalizing, valorizing and modernizing both the university foundations and their various systems of functioning. It supposes to put on better the whole university structure: The second approach of governance fundamentally questions the efficiency of the systems of functioning of universities, too much centered on the hierarchical authority of the State, and on that of the university and academic administration, whether it is to define the financing, programs, the qualifications and even the courses of training. The governance of higher education will succeed only if it allows creating a common space of meeting between the actors: With the South African transition to democracy in , the national government and institutions of postsecondary learning envisioned the cooperative governance of higher education. Nonetheless, where the concept of conditional autonomy remained vague with its vision in , the authors suggest that given the direction the government and NCHE have taken, there need be a rethinking of the relationship between institutions and the newly established democratic government. Efficiency in finances with stronger managerial controls and deregulation of the labor market, i. Downsizing and Decentralization , breaking up large institutions into smaller peripherary units with a small centralized managerial core and a split between public and private funding. Excellence , the In Search For Excellence Model, which focuses on a more human resource approach to institutional change with a mix of top-down and bottom-up organization Public Service , with the merging of both public and private managerial practices. The European countries of Norway and Sweden are provided as additional examples of the new managerialism in tertiary education. New organizational forms for governance and leadership with the diversification of higher education have emphasized maintaining institutional autonomy , harmonizing institutional standards, and expanding higher education with goals related to the neoliberal market model of education. Significant among these changes is the establishment of governing and coordinating boards with decision-making structures for collaboration in external and internal governance of higher education as done in many states within the United States. Believing that there will be either a convergence or divergence between a strong administrative managerialism and faculty involvement in governance throughout Europe, the UK and U. In conclusion, Sporn believes the new governing structures provide stronger leadership and management, but that institutions "should pay close attention to the role of faculty and shared governance. Supreme Court case *Dartmouth College v. Woodward* before the Yale Report of where the former was catalyst from the later, each of which upheld the separation of church and state private universities in the United States generally maintain remarkable autonomy from local, state, and federal government. Questions might be raised over the role of shared governance in private education. Quinn notes the way in which Catholic colleges and universities adopted principles of shared governance throughout the s. The findings of the report detail the method with summary of the present state of shared governance. The findings include the state of the locus of authority and reforms as well as the analysis of the challenges facing Liberal Arts Colleges with the pressures of the current economic climate. The survey did not include participation from any population of students.

*Personal interviews with a random sample of faculty members of a large midwestern university dealt with the role of faculty in decision making on academic, financial, and student affairs, personnel matters, capital improvements, and public and alumni relations. While the faculty members.*

### Chapter 6 : The Role of the Faculty in the Governance of College Athletics | AAUP

*Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.*

### Chapter 7 : Project MUSE - Faculty Participation and Shared Leadership

*Faculty participation in campuswide institutional decision making has long been a subject of campus concern and scholarly attention, the latter primarily from the mids to the mids.*

### Chapter 8 : "Faculty participation in decision-making and their job satisfaction in" by Mash-Ariun Bat-Erden

*project entitled: Community Participation and Decision-Making in the New Forest Economy. In In general terms, the research project is taking a broad look at public participation and consultation.*

### Chapter 9 : Jennifer Wenzel: Faculty Directory

*Some experimentation conducted by Leavitt (2) suggests that faculty participation in decision making is necessary if faculty members are to continue to be.*