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Abstract

The concept of shared governance in academe is facing major challenges from internal and external forces that attempt to replace it with a corporate managerial model. Thus the question facing academe today is: What should the response by faculty to these perceived anti-intellectual elites that try to corporatize the concept of shared governance by implementing the business’s managerial model? In this paper: first, I discuss the corporatization process of shared governance in the academic institutions as it has been introduced by its proponents; second, I show how this corporatization process, regardless of how it was intended, might pose a dangerous threat to the way academic institutions have been managed effectively and successfully; third, I define what constitutes the concept of shared governance. Despite the attractiveness of the shared governance concept, especially among faculty, it is still an ambiguous and difficult concept to define. Literally, it means participatory decision making processes; and fourth, I conclude by proposing a new shared governance model as a response to the corporate challenge. This proposed model, which I call the “satisfactory shared governance model,” consists of eight common characteristics: (1) Consensual; (2) Participatory; (3) Communicative; (4) Accountable; (5) Transparent; (6) Responsive; (7) Efficient; and, (8). Equitable. For this model to succeed, it has to be based on academic freedom, shared vision, and mutual trust. The main purpose of this paper is threefold: First, to refute the argument that the concept of shared governance should be replaced by a corporate managerial model; second, to argue that the shared governance concept is a successful principle and it should be protected, especially by the faculty in academe. However, it should be clear that perfect shared governance is an ideal which is difficult and impossible to achieve in its totality and faculty should not let perfection be the enemy of the good for academe. Therefore, I would argue that this goal could be achieved by implementing a shared governance process that will satisfy the needs of the main constituencies in every academic institution; and, third, it is suggested that in order to ensure that a satisfactory shared governance is implemented in all academic institution throughout the United States, I would propose that a reputable organization, such as the AAUP should issue an Annual Report of Shared Governance Index. This annual index will undoubtedly place pressures on the academic institutions and forces them to be more collegial and open when it comes to governance.

Introduction

Governance here is defined as a process by which decisions are made and implemented. Based on this definition, one can define shared governance as the process of distributing the power of making decisions and implementing them among the main academic institution constituencies. Or, to put it in other words, it is the participation of the main academic institution’s constituencies in the process by which decisions are made and implemented. By the main constituencies I mean administration, faculty, students, and staff. It is obvious that in the last few years, the academic community, led by the faculty, has engaged in intense debate centered on the gradual shift from the concept of shared-governance to the notion of a corporate governance model. The question here is: What should the response be by faculty to these anti-intellectual elites that try to implement business’s managerial model to run academic institutions? To contribute to the answer of this question, I will (a) define the corporate model as it has been described by its proponents; (b) refute the applicability of this model to academe by discussing its main weaknesses; (c) discuss what I will call the conceptual
problem of the shared governance model; and (d) propose a model which I call the “satisfactory shared governance model.”

The Corporate Model
What does the corporate model mean? And why do its proponents argue that it is appropriate and needed to manage academic institutions? To answer the first question, let me begin by providing explanations of the corporate model as provided by its proponents: (1) Corporate governance comprises the long-term management and oversight of the company in accordance with the principles of responsibility and transparency (Annual Report, Payer Group, 2008). (2) The practices, principles and values that guide a company and its business every day, at all levels of the organization. (invester.colgatepalmolive.com/glossary.cfm). (3) The framework of how directors and managers perform their respective duties to add and create shareholder value (Dayarayan: http://www.dayarayan.info/english-Glossary%20.php). (4) Process of directing and controlling agencies (Finance.gov, 1999). (7) An internal system encompassing policies, processes and people, which serve the needs of shareholders and other stakeholders, by directing and controlling management activities with good business savvy, objectivity, accountability and integrity” (O’Donovan, 2003).

It is obvious from these definitions that there is no single agreed-upon definition for this concept, and it is safe to say that it depends upon who is you ask. Therefore, from these definitions, and others, one could conclude that there are common characteristics of the corporate model which can be summarized as follows: (a) process of directing and controlling; (b) organization of efficiency and growth; (c) accountability; (d) division of labor and managerial expertise; (e) hierarchical chain of command; (f) top-down managerial style; and (g) enhancing investor confidence.

First: Why the Corporate Model?
As proposed by supporters of the corporate model, the main reasons for managing academic institutions could be summarized as follows: (1) the supporters of the corporate model argue that the existence of a new intellectual environment that led to the rise of the notion of corporate governance and the decline of the shared or consensual governance. (2) They argue that the corporate model is a “well-run bureaucracy, namely, efficiency, flexibility, rapid adaptability, and technical competence” (Mitchell, 2007). (3) They argue that “changing conditions in higher education and increasing demands from the public for accountability require substantially new approaches to institutional governance” (Gerber, 2001). (4) They argue that “the collegial style of academic governance that emerged during the last century is no longer suited to the needs of the contemporary university” (Mitchell, 2007). (5) They argue that “higher education needs to be, to some extent at least, managed like a business. In every phase of its operation, the university is in fact a commercial enterprise - charging tuition, paying salaries, constructing and maintaining buildings, providing food services, … etc” (Fish, 2007). And, (6) they argue that the corporate model produces a well run institution and in turn produces better results.
Second: Disadvantages of the Corporate Model

1. **Top-down managerial style:** The Corporate Model tends to create a system that is top-down and elitist. The advocates of a top-down managerial style want to transform faculty from professionals into "employees" and students into "consumers." And the new slogan for academic institutions would be “we teach for less.” That is to say, a kind of what I might call the “Walmartization phenomenon,” where satisfaction is guaranteed to the customers or their money back; its strategy is based on cheap labor, cheap goods, and massive sales; and its slogan “we sell for less.”

2. **Lack of Participation:** The corporate model recognizes either the benefit of deliberation and compromise involved in shared governance or the importance of the faculty's role in decisions about academic programs, quality, and institutional direction.

3. **Lack of focus:** This model lacks focus and precision. Literally, there are tens of definitions for this model, and most of these definitions, as Hauss puts it, “revolve around the broad cooperation, of highly centralized business and labor organizations with the government in setting economic policy on the basis of a shared set of values and priorities” (Hauss, 2000, p. 159). In short, as it is emphasizes by the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, that “there is no single model of good corporate governance” (OECD, 2004, p. 13).

4. **Market oriented:** This model does not believe in liberal education and considers it as a waste of time and resources, especially important disciplines as that deal with special issues such as women and gender studies.

5. **Higher education as industry:** The corporate model sees higher education, in general, as just another "industry," whose main purpose is to satisfy the customers (the students) and sell its goods, which are degrees and certificates.

6. **Brain drain:** Implementing this model will force well-educated professionals, academicians, and researchers to leave any institution that attempts to dictate policies and procedures to them.

7. **Threat to academe:** This model will pose a dangerous challenge to the viability of higher education. To quote Buck: “A vital college or university is supported by three equally critical pillars, academic freedom, an equitable system of tenure, and a governance structure in which faculty participate as full partners and officers of the institution. In my view, there are two major threats to the continued viability of higher education in the United States: the corporatization of the academy, especially at the level of the governing board, and the overuse and abuse of contingent faculty. Both of these trends have a profoundly negative impact on shared governance, academic freedom, and the quality of the education we provide our students” (Buck, 2002).

8. **Nature of academic institutions:** The corporate model tends to ignore the nature of academic institutions. Or, as Shattock has argued that, “… this shift towards corporate governance appears to ignore the need to examine and understand the nature of academic work and the implications of this for its organization and management” (Shattock, 2002, p. 243).
9. Finally, it is a problematic in itself: The corporate governance is problematic in itself, which means that it should be rejected by the leaders of academe because; as the Business Change Forum describes it, “it is one of the top 10 problems of the 20th century management.” And it continues to argue that “We need to rethink our approach to corporate governance. We cannot address corporate governance only from the governance side” (Business Change Forum, 2010).

The Conceptual Problem of the Shared Governance Model

Despite the attractiveness of the concept of shared governance, it is still an ambiguous and difficult term to define precisely. There is no agreed-upon definition of a shared governance model. The following is a sample of definitions that have been offered by scholars who have studied this concept since its inception by the AAUP in 1920. (1) It is a “social system of self-government wherein decision-making responsibility is shared among those affected by the decisions” (Lau, 1996). (2) The collegial model proposes a community of scholars, with consensual decision making processes involving all constituencies affected by the decisions” (Schuetz, 1999). (3) Shared governance can be thought of as a “sharing of responsibility by faculty, administration, staff, appointed personnel and students, for making decisions about institutional missions, policies and budget priorities” (University of Arizona, 2003). (4) Shared Governance means that “all constituents of the University community are provided with the opportunity to shape the decisions that will affect them and will be intended to benefit the community as a whole in support of the University’s mission” (Park University). (5) Shared governance “reflects the view that colleges and universities ought to be run by their most immediate stakeholders, primarily by faculty, professional staff, and students” (Trakman, 2008). (6) Shared governance is a “system of governance whereby the decision-making capacity of the institution is shared by those affected by the decisions; these include the boards, administrators, faculty, staff and students” (Schuetz, 1999). And finally, when the AAUP published its first "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" in 1920, it did not define the concept per se. It only emphasized “the importance of faculty involvement in personnel decisions, selection of administrators, preparation of the budget, and determination of educational policies.” And in the refined statement which was introduced in 1966, it emphasized again that “The document does not provide for a ‘blueprint’ for the governance of higher education. Nor was the purpose of the statement to provide principles for relations with industry and government. Rather, it aimed to establish a shared vision for the internal governance of institutions.”

The Collegial Response: The Satisfactory Shared Governance Model

In order for academe to respond effectively to the corporate challenge, I would propose a new shared governance model. This proposed model could be called the “satisfactory shared governance model” It is defined as the process by which the constituencies in an academic institution are able to participate in the decision making process. It consists of eight characteristics: (1) consensual; (2) participatory; (3) accountable; (4) transparent; (5) responsive; (6) communicative; (7) efficient; and, (8) equitable. These eight major characteristics are essential for the shared governance model to be satisfactory but, they are not sufficient to measure the degree of its success and effectiveness. The main emphasis of this model is on participation in the academic institution decision-making process. It is a system in which the
main elements of the academic institution, such as faculty, are sanctioned by the administration and given authority to represent their members. In other words, it is a system in which faculty, students, staff, and the administration work within an explicit framework to guide the academic institution toward its particular mission.

The “satisfactory shared governance model” is one in which groups representing the major constituencies in the institution are incorporated by administration, in the sense that all sides have a close relationship. The groups are given privileged official positions, access to administration, the permission to bargain with the administration on key policies and procedures, in return for which the members of the groups respect and support the policies agreed upon. The goal here is the establishment of a system by which constituencies in the institution participate fully in implementation of all policies and activities that have an impact on their interests.

The Main Characteristics

I. Consensual
The first characteristic of the “satisfactory shared governance model” is searching for consensus. Every academic institution consists of several constituencies and many viewpoints. Satisfactory shared governance requires mediation of these different interests to reach a broad consensus on what is in the best interest of the institution as a whole and how this can best be achieved.

II. Participatory
The second characteristic of the satisfactory shared governance model is participation, which must be a key cornerstone of shared governance in order to be satisfactory. Participation should be both direct and representative and also formal and informal. The main question in this case is how system-wide shared governance work more effectively? This could be done by allowing every major group in the institution to articulate the interest of its members as long as it does so in a manner that facilitates compromise. In this case, while some groups must ultimately win more than others, the emphasis is on precluding the alienation of any important segment of the institution. This model assumes that interests do not merely attempt to influence policy but are themselves part of the decision-making and implementation system. In return for their participation in policy making, the groups --- through their control over their membership – make the institution more manageable and effective.

III. Accountable
The third characteristic of the satisfactory shared governance is accountability, which means that the academic institution must be answerable to the institution’s constituencies. Bear in mind that determining who is answerable to whom varies depending on whether impact of decisions or actions taken are internal or external to the institution. In general, however, the institution is answerable to those who will be affected by its decisions or actions.

IV. Transparent
The fourth characteristic of the satisfactory shared governance is transparency. This means that information is freely available and directly accessible to those who will be affected by
such decisions and their enforcement. Or, as Oliver puts it, “letting the truths and the facts be available for others if they so choose” (Oliver, 2004, p.3).

V. Responsive
The fifth characteristic of the satisfactory shared governance is responsiveness. This means that the academic institution is required to serve all of its constituencies within a reasonable time frame.

VI. Communicative
The sixth characteristic of the satisfactory shared governance is to have effective communication system – meaning the existence of a communication system which is inclined to communicate and share information readily and effectively. This means requires that constituencies engaged in extensive and constructive communication. One need to bear in mind that academic institutions are intellectual environments and should be venue for discussions and debates about the meaning of ideas, concepts, and even trivial matters. In an environment of shared governance, communication should be clear, timely, respectful, ethical, constructive, and available throughout the decision-making process. The more an institution improves communication among its constituents, the more successful it will be and the greater the collaboration between these constituencies will be in addressing all academic and non-academic issues.

VII. Efficient
The seventh characteristic of the satisfactory shared governance is efficiency. This simply means the utilization of the institution’s resources in a way as to maximize the output of goods and services, and at the same time minimize the costs. In other words, it could be expressed as the ratio of the output to the input of any process or system.

VIII. Equitable:
The eighth and final characteristic of the satisfactory shared governance is for the academic institution to be fair and impartial. One can conclude that an academic institution’s well being depends on ensuring that all of its members feel that they have a stake in it and do not feel excluded.

The Pre-Requisite Values
There are at least three pre-requisite values that are essential for the success of the satisfactory shared governance model. These are: (1) Academic Freedom: It is hard to imagine effective governance if the main constituencies in an academic institution do not enjoy the right to speak, write, and express themselves freely without fear of reprisal on issues and policies related to their own institution. It is equally true that without academic freedom authentic and effective shared governance would be almost impossible; (2) Shared Vision: This simply means that it is essential to make the vision of the institution central to the way it conducts its business, takes its decisions, and discusses the important issues and challenges that will affect its future. It is a fact that neither top-down nor bottom-up governance approaches work well unless there is a clear vision that have been shared by all constituencies of the academic institution; and, (3) Collective Trust: I believe that it is a crucial prerequisite for shared governance. This means that all individuals and units in the academic institution must trust each other. In other words,
establishing a collective trust in the academic institutions should be one of the essential components for achieving effective and efficient activities. It also essential for academic institutions to bear in mind that collective trust is not something that should be assumed, rather, it is something that has to be built-up from scratch and it usually takes a long time.

I believe that these three pre-requisite values represent a common basis that academic institutions should consider as essential for the development of a satisfactory shared governance model. They are intended to evaluate and improve the degree of how to govern academic institutions and to provide guidance and suggestions for all constituencies that have a role in the process of developing effective satisfactory shared governance. Finally, these three pre-requisites are non-binding and do not suggest “one best way” of shared governance. Rather, they seek to identify certain important values for achieving satisfactory shared governance and to serve as a reference point. In the following section I propose some measures to assess the ways in which satisfactory shared governance model could be quantified. The following flow chart, figure (1), illustrates what the satisfactory shared governance model looks.
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**Satisfactory Shared Governance Index**

By an index I mean numerical scales used to provide quick lookup of data and to compare indicators with cut-off scores and reference points. The concept of satisfactory shared governance index used here to measure three important aspects: **(a)** the suitability of an academic institution to the concept of shared governance - in other words, to examine whether or not an academic institution is suitable for implementing the concept of shared governance. **(b)** the degree of satisfaction with concept of shared governance among the main constituencies in an academic institution; and **(c)** to illustrate where an academic institution will be ranked on the scale of overall satisfaction compared to other academic institutions.
First, The Suitability Test:
In order of an academic institution to be suitable for the implementation of shared governance, it has to pass the suitability test, which simply indicates that an academic institution’s environment is suitable for implementing the concept of shared governance. The test consists of three pre-requisite values that are essential, but not sufficient, for the success and effectiveness of the satisfactory shared governance model. These values are: academic freedom; shared vision; and, collective trust. I would argue that the absence of any one of these values mean that the academic institution is not suitable for implementing shared governance successfully.

The way these three values will be measured is to place every one on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 strongly disagreeing being the lowest intensity (the least satisfaction) and 10 strongly agreeing being the highest intensity (the most satisfaction). In order for every value to be satisfactory it has to have a median score of 5 points or higher on this scale. This cut-off score of 5 points or higher is what I will call the necessity benchmark point to pass the “suitability test.”

The main rationale behind this criterion-referenced cutoff score is that one must be able to distinguish between acceptable levels (50% or more) of satisfaction for every pre-requisite value this model requires. This means that the cutoff scores create two classifications of academic institutions: (a) academic institutions that have median scores of 5.0 or more (50% or more) for every pre-requisite value will be suitable for implementing the shared governance model; and, (b) academic institutions that have median scores of less than 5.0 (less than 50%) will not be suitable for implementing the shared governance model, and these institutions will be designated as “failed institutions” in governing themselves effectively and successfully.

Second, The Degree of Satisfaction:
Academic institutions will be classified into three main categories: (a) Satisfactory -- This category describes an academic institution perceived as having met, at least, six characteristics that constitute the satisfactory shared governance model; (b) Marginal Satisfactory -- This category describes an academic institution that has met satisfactory only four or five of the eight characteristics that constitute the satisfactory shared governance model; and, (c) Un-Satisfactory -- This category describes an academic institution that has met satisfactory only three or less of the eight characteristics that constitute the satisfactory shared governance model.

Third: The Ranking Score:
Ranking for every academic institution on the index will be based on the total scores of the eleven indicators (the three pre-requisite values and the eight characteristics) of the satisfactory shared governance model. The rating for each indicator is placed on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 strongly disagreeing being the lowest intensity (meaning the least satisfaction) and 10 strongly agreeing being the highest intensity (meaning the most satisfaction). The eleven indicators are averaged equally into a total score of 110, which is the sum of the eleven indicators. Therefore, the overall averaged score of every academic institution will be placed on the scale, which ranges from 1 to 110 to show how it ranks among other institutions. This ranking of the satisfactory shared governance index should be conducted annually. And it should be compiled and published by a national agency preferably the AAUP based upon an annual survey of the academic institution's faculty.
Testing the Satisfactory Shared Governance Model

The following illustrates how the concept of satisfactory shared governance should be used and implemented. The main purpose of this case study is (a) to examine whether or not an academic institution, which I will call “IU,” passes the suitability test; (b) to examine the degree of satisfaction with the concept of shared governance among the full-time faculty at IU; and, (c) to illustrate how the IU will be ranked among other academic institutions. The IU is a regional academic institution, which consists of about 7,000 student; 320 faculty (64% (205) of them are full-time faculty; and about 200 administrators.

Method

The instrument used for this index was a questionnaire (see Appendix 1). It is made up of a total of twelve questions. Three of these questions are designated to assess the three pre-requisite values, which constitute what I call the suitability test. Another eight of these questions are designated to assess the degree of satisfaction among main constituencies in the academic institution. One of these questions is designated to assess the overall degree of satisfaction with the implementation of the concept of shared governance in the academic institution. The questionnaire was distributed to a randomly selected sample of 120 faculty (out of the 205 full-time faculty) from ten different departments. The questionnaire was conducted anonymously and faculty responses were kept strictly confidential. Only 42 (about 20.5% of all full-time faculty) responded to this questionnaire.

Results

The most important results of this case study can be summarized as follows: (a) as it shows in table (1) that IU passed the suitability test, which means that its academic environment is suitable for implementing the shared governance model. Using the median to measure the cut-off point, table (1) shows: (a) that freedom has a median score of 6.50, which means that 53.5% (using the cumulative percent) of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the main constituencies enjoy the right to speak, write, and express themselves freely without fear of reprisal on any issue and policy related to the institution; (b) that vision has a median score of 7.00, which means that 61.9% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the vision of their academic institution is central to the way it conducts its business, makes its decisions, and discusses the important issues and challenges that affect its future; and, (c) that trust has a median score of 5.00, which means that 61.9% of the respondents believe that all individuals and units in your academic institution trust each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table (1): The Suitability Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Concerning the categories of satisfaction, table (2) shows that (using the median as indicator also) the IU should be ranked as “satisfactory category.” It has a median score of
6.00 points on three characteristics (consensus, policies, and resources); it has a median score of 6.50 points on one characteristic (communication); and, it has a median score of 7.00 points on three characteristics (participation, accountability, and transparency).

Table (2): The Degree of Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Constituency</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Finally, concerning the ranking score of the IU, table (3) shows that it would be ranked 70.0 on the scale which range between 1 and 110.

Table (3): The Ranking Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Constituency</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td>64.14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

Let me conclude by emphasizing the following points: (a) It is important to recognize the fact that there is no such thing as the best way or “one size fits all” approach of governance neither in business, nor in government, not in nonprofit agencies; (b) It is a fact that there are major and real differences between educational institutions, business corporations, and non-profit agencies and these differences should not be ignored nor taken lightly. Therefore, the view that academic
institutions need to adopt the corporate model if they are to be governed responsibly is inaccurate. (c) It is obvious that the corporate model is nothing but a reactionary response to the numerous challenges facing academe such as privatization; de-regulation; lack of resources; anti-intellectual environment; and perceiving academic institutions as training grounds for preparing skillful labor force by the private sector. Therefore, I believe that to ensure establishing a shared governance model in every academic institution, academicians should work toward implementing shared governance that satisfies the needs of main constituencies. I strongly hope that a reputable organization, such as the AAUP, adopts the idea of conducting and publishing an Annual Report of Shared Governance Index, which I believe will exert significant pressures on all academic institutions and force them to be more collegial, accountable, and open when it comes to the idea of governance. Finally, let me end this paper by emphasizing that, in principle, the concept of “shared governance” is a very noble and desirable idea, and that it is a great goal worth struggling for, regardless of how strong the opposition might be.
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Appendix (1)
Survey of the Satisfaction of Shared Governance at colleges and universities

Dear Colleague
I am writing an article about the concept of shared governance in the academic environment. The title of my article will be “The Corporatization of Shared Governance: A Corporate Challenge and the Academe Response.” The data from this survey will be a component of my article. I would argue that our University takes great pride in providing its constituencies with high standards of excellence, quality, transparency, and service in its academic environment. Your opinion is extremely valuable and important in evaluating this assumption. The information you will provide in this questionnaire will be used solely to analyze the effectiveness of the concept of shared governance at our university. Please remember that this survey is anonymous and your responses will be kept strictly confidential. For this reason, please do not write your name. Many thanks for taking a few minutes to answer the following questions.

**First:** The concept of shared governance is defined here as the process by which the principal constituencies (administration, faculty, students, and staff) are able to participate in making and implementing (or not implementing) decisions and policies of their academic institution. In other words, satisfactory shared governance should consist of the following characteristics, Consensus-oriented; Participatory; Transparent; Communicative; Accountable; Responsive; Efficient; Equitable.

**Second:** Please rate the following statements in terms of whether you strongly disagree (1) or strongly agree (10)

1. Decisions at your academic institution are made using the **consensus** approach.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Strongly Agree

2. Participation is considered a cornerstone in implementing the concept of shared governance at your academic institution.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Strongly Agree

3. At your academic institution **policies and procedures** are implemented and enforced **impartially**.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Strongly Agree

4. Communication at your academic institution is extensive, clear, and timely throughout the decision-making process.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Strongly Agree

5. Your academic institution serves **all of its constituencies** within a reasonable time frame.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Neutral
   - Strongly Agree
6. Decisions and policies at your academic institution are made to produce results that meet the needs of the University while **making the best use of resources**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Accountability** is considered essential in the shared governance at your academic institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. At your academic institution information is freely available and directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement. In other words, it your school is a **transparent** institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. At your academic institution, the main constituencies enjoy **the right to** speak, write, and express themselves freely without fear of reprisal on any issue and policy related to the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **The vision** of your academic institution is central to the way it conducts its business, makes its decisions, and discusses the important issues and challenges that affect its future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. All individuals and units in your academic institution **trust** each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Overall, how satisfied are you with the implementation of the concept of shared governance at your academic institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggestions/Comments:**

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________