

State University of New York
University Faculty Senate

Bibliography on Faculty/Administration Governance Issues

Governance Committee
April, 2007

University Faculty Senate
Governance Committee

2006-2007 Membership

Thomas Barthold - Herkimer County Community College
Sharon Cramer - College at Buffalo
Erik D'Aquino - University at Buffalo
Joseph Hildreth - College at Potsdam
Korni Kumar - College at Brockport
Larry Labniski - University at Buffalo
Leslie McCulloch - College at Brockport
Runi Mukherji - College at Old Westbury
Joseph Petrick - College of Technology at Alfred
Ronald Sarner (chair) - SUNY Institute of Technology
John VanderLippe - College at New Paltz

**This bibliography was compiled by Joseph Petrick
on behalf of the University Faculty Senate
Governance Committee**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
General Campus Governance Documents, Including Evaluation of Presidents and Other Administrators	6
Case Studies	13

INTRODUCTION

The impetus for the development of this bibliography was an expression of interest at the Fall 2006 Planning Session of SUNY University Faculty Senate for a list of references concerning faculty-administration related issues. This interest stemmed in large part from the visitation process conducted by a team from University Faculty Senate in the Fall Semester 2005 into the Spring Semester 2006. It was hoped that a bibliography of materials concerning how to deal with troubled presidencies could be a helpful resource for faculty in future disputes between faculty senates and academic administrations.

That there is a need for information concerning such disputes is without doubt, and results from problems in several general categories that can lead to conflict between faculty and presidents. These include:

- Presidential inability to fully communicate with faculty. Presidents sometimes act in secret, or refuse to listen to faculty.
- Disagreements over authority. While faculty and faculty senates advise presidents, there are sometimes disagreements about decision making processes, or implementation of decisions relating to curriculum, budget priorities, and personnel decisions.
- Legitimacy. Votes of no confidence are statements that faculty question the president's legitimate right to the position.
- Respect and civility. The breakdown of respectful and civil discourse on a campus signals the end of shared governance.

Although there was an enthusiastic expression of interest in gathering literature concerning disputes between faculty and administrators, there are a number of problems with collecting such literature. One problem is that although literature exists on how to select college presidents, how to evaluate college presidents, and how to work with them for the good of the college, there are no texts specifically on how to cope with difficulties brought about by college and university presidents. While the former are issues that are important to relations between faculty and administrators, it is too often the case that faculty are not afforded a strong position in the selection or review of presidents. Even when faculty do have input into the hiring of a president, there is no guarantee that relations between faculty and presidents will not deteriorate, for any number of reasons. As a consequence, faculties sometimes resort to votes of no confidence:

Dissatisfaction with the leadership of an institution can also be expressed in a faculty vote of no confidence in the president. No-confidence votes are typically preceded by displeasure with several management decisions and, in many cases, reflect the president's failure to consult appropriately with the faculty before announcing controversial or disturbing decisions. These votes, which have no legal authority, are designed to force the trustees to question the president's competence (McCarthy, Ladimer, and Sirefman 143).

The efficacy of no-confidence votes is open to question. They are however one of the few tools at the disposal of faculty no longer able to contend with intransigent administrators. Another tool is the class action lawsuit, used most notably in discrimination cases. McCarthy, Ladimer, and Sirefman (1984) however noted “the costs and complexity of mounting such cases, which often involve the subpoena and analysis of records and the development of statistical documentation, have deterred many potential litigants” (145).

Still another tactic was used in 1981 to contest a departmental reorganization at Long Beach State University. The president undertook unilateral action in department realignment, whereupon “Faculty countered the president’s action with the filing of some 200 grievances, claiming that the president failed to consult faculty prior to enacting the plan, as required by law, and that he abrogated an agreement concerning departmental approval of the changes” (McCarthy, Ladimer, and Sirefman, 1984, 141).

Perhaps the most extreme solution to difficulties between faculty and administration was documented by Lionel Lewis in his book, *When Power Corrupts: Academic Governing Boards in the Shadow of the Adelphi Case* (2000). Antagonism between faculty and the college administration at Adelphi University grew between 1985 and 1996, but as the Board overwhelmingly supported the college president, the faculty could not pressure the Adelphi Board of Trustees into a formal evaluation of the situation. Adelphi University Faculty Senate ultimately petitioned the New York State Board of Regents, who, after investigating the charges of the Faculty Senate, removed almost the entire Board of Trustees, as it was in their legal authority to do so. A new Board of Trustees then replaced the college president.

The strategy used by faculty at campuses of the State University of New York has been the no confidence vote in order to signal their inability to work with a particular college president, or administration. Another, more attractive, alternative is to use the visitation procedure documented in the University Faculty Senate *Governance Handbook*. The Governance Committee of SUNY University Faculty Senate has also developed the report, *Faculty Evaluation of Administrators*, which has a brief bibliography relating to the evaluation of administrators. It is to be hoped that not only evaluation take place, but that in the spirit of shared governance, administrators engage with faculty in the evaluation process.

As references were collected, this bibliography evolved from a relatively specific concern about difficulties arising between faculty and administration to more general issues concerning interactions between faculty and administrations. It is divided into two parts (1) general references on governance issues, including evaluation of administrators, and (2) a section of case studies on specific examples of difficulties between particular faculties and administrations. Neither is exhaustive, particularly since reports of difficulties between faculty and administrations tend to be reported as news items, either in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, or newspapers serving the region where disputes are occurring. Those references with annotations are available from libraries in the SUNY system. Items without annotation were not readily available, and have not been reviewed.

GENERAL CAMPUS GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS, INCLUDING EVALUATION OF PRESIDENTS AND OTHER ADMINISTRATORS

Rating (at the end of annotation, or citation when no annotation is present):

1 = Evaluation of presidents

2 = Evaluation of presidents and other administrators

3 = General governance documents

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. *Evaluating College and University Presidents*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1988. Rating: 1

Bensimon, Estela M. "The Social Processes Through Which Faculty Shape the Image of a New President." *Journal of Higher Education* 62 (1991): 637-60.

Bensimon conducted a study of four academic institutions in order to study the ways the image of newly installed presidents was constructed. Citing interactionist thought, she examined the ways in which presidents become known to faculty, the gestures that presidents make regarding faculty. It is concluded that presidential images are more easily discovered at smaller institutions, and thus may have a greater impact. Rating: 1

Berdahl, Robert O. "Shared Governance and External Constraints." In Marvin W. Peterson [Ed.], *Organization and Governance in Higher Education: An ASHE Reader*. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press, 1991. 389-98.

This article discusses some of the impacts of forces external to faculty and administration in relation to governance, including government, donors, and accrediting bodies. Impacts of such things as affirmative action are highlighted. Although Berdahl does not directly relate external forces to governance structure, the essay nonetheless serves as a reminder of the relevance of such forces. Rating: 3

Birnbaum, Robert. "The Latent Organizational Functions of the Academic Senate: Why Senates Don't Work but Won't Go Away." In Birnbaum, Robert, {Ed.}, *Faculty in Governance: The Role of Senates and Joint Committees in Academic Decision Making*. New York: Jossey-Bass, 1991, pp. 7-26.

Academic senates persist despite the criticism of being ineffective. Birnbaum uses Robert Merton's theory of organizational structure to posit that senates have

manifest and latent functions, the former leading to specified achievement, and the latter, unintended and unrecognized outcomes. Examples of these functions include the senate as symbol, status provider, a screening device for administrative personnel, a conservator of organizational structure, as well as other normally unspecified objectives. The author concludes by briefly examining academic senates in symbolic organizational systems.

Rating: 3

Bornstein, Rita. *Legitimacy in the Academic Presidency: From Entrance to Exit*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003. 233 pages.

President of Rollins College, Bornstein describes legitimacy and change at academic institutions. Aimed at college presidents interested in undertaking change at their institutions, there is a short (pages 111 to 114) discussion of the relation of presidents to faculty in the section titled "Faculty: Experts and Innocents" that is revealing of the thinking of presidents towards the supposed unreality that faculty inhabit.

Rating: 1

Burling, Phillip, and Matthews, Katherine A.. *Responding to Whistleblowers: Protection Acts and the Practical Consequences*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Attorneys, 1992. Rating: 3

Cleveland, Harlan. "The Cost and Benefits of Openness: Sunshine Laws and Higher Education." *Journal of College and University Law* 12 (1985): 127-73. Rating: 3

Collins, Valerie Hawkes. *The Faculty Role in Governance: A Historical Analysis of the Role of the American Association of University Professors and the Middle States Association on Academic Decision Making*. Annual Meeting of the Association of the Study of Higher Education. Memphis, TN, 1996. 77 pages; ED 402 840.

This study examined changes in private college governance from 1960 through 1990, and discusses how external forces affect decision making structures in the context of a discussion of Mintzberg's concepts of organizational structure and power. Rating: 3

Dimond, John D. "Faculty Involvement in Institutional Budgeting." In Robert. Birnbaum [Ed.], *Faculty in Governance: The Role of Senates and Joint Committees in Academic Decision Making*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991. 63-78.

A survey of research universities by the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance indicated that in general faculties do not have a major role in decisions about resource allocations. Three forms of committee structures were found, including committees appointed by senate, decision-making committees appointed by the administration, and advisory committees appointed by administration. Extent of consultation, levels of satisfaction, and sources of dissatisfaction were noted. It was concluded that the concept of "shared authority" should be reconsidered. Rating: 3

Eckel, Peter D. "The Role of Shared Governance in Institutional Hard Decisions: Enabler or Antagonist?" *Review of Higher Education* 24.1 (2000): 15-40.

There has been criticism of shared governance as an impediment to change. Eckel studied four research universities (University of Maryland, College Park, University of Rochester, Kent State, and Oregon State) in order to determine similarities in shared governance structures regarding making "hard decisions" relating to discontinued programs. A number of recommendations are made concerning changes to the AAUP Guidelines for Discontinuing Programs. Rating: 3

Farmer, Charles H. "The Faculty Role in Administrator Evaluation." *Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership*. In Charles F. Fisher [Ed.]. *New Directions for Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978. 41-50.

The rationale for the faculty evaluation of administrators, the choice of administrators to be evaluated, the methodology and criteria of evaluation, and the purposes of faculty evaluation are discussed. Rating: 2

Fisher, James L. *The Board and the President*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1991. 163 pages.

Written for trustees and college presidents, this book discusses the presidential search process, institutional reviews, and presidential evaluations. Although the AAUP Statement of Principles and the AAUP Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities is discussed (pp. 68-71), faculty relevance to boards and administrations are apparently seen by Fisher to be minimal. The book does however contain advice and information about presidential searches and reviews. Rating: 1

---. "Evaluating Presidents." *Educational Record* 69 (1988): 57-60. Rating: 1

---. "Taking a Closer Look at Presidential Reviews." *Educational Record* 77 (1996): 57-60. Rating: 1

Gilmour, J. "Participative Governance Bodies in Higher Education: A Report of a National Study." In Robert. Birnbaum [Ed.], *Faculty in Governance: The Role of Senates and Joint Committees in Academic Decision Making*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991. 27-39.

Gilmour reported on a national study of participative governance body organizations and addressed the questions of how senates are organized, how they relate to collective bargaining units, how college administrators perceive them, and what important issues they address, and how senates could be strengthened. Eight tables illustrating the quantitative results of the study accompany the text. Conclusions included that while ninety-one percent of the over four hundred respondents had participative governance bodies, members were not sufficiently rewarded for service. Rating: 3

Hanley, Dexter L. "Evaluating a President." *AGB Reports* 17 (1975): 42-7.

This essay is comprised of personal reflections by the former President of the University of Scranton about the necessity of presidential evaluation, the AAUP Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities, and the faculty viewpoint in relation to accountability in administration. Rating: 1

Heck, Ronald H., Johnsrud, Linda K., Rosser, Vicki J. "Administrative Effectiveness in Higher Education: Improving Assessment Procedures." *Research in Higher Education* 41 (2000): 663-84.

The authors develop an evaluation model for assessing and monitoring the effectiveness of deans and directors using generalizability theory as a basis for development of more accurate assessment procedures. The theory is demonstrated using faculty and staff assessments of the leadership effectiveness of deans. Rating: 2

Ingram, Richard T., and Weary, William. *Presidential & Board Assessment in Higher Education: Purposes, Policies & Strategies*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 2000. Rating: 1

Lovas, John C., Kanter, Martha J., and Jackman, Jay. "Shared Governance: The Next Generation." *Leadership 2000: The Annual Leadership Conference*. San Diego, CA, 1994, 23 pages. ERIC document 375 873.

Three papers concerning aspects of shared governance at De Anza College, in Cupertino, California,

- 1) A history of governance at the college by John Lovas;
- 2) "Operationalizing Shared Governance at Community Colleges," by Martha Jackman
- 3) "Trustee View of Shared Governance," by Jay Jackman. Rating: 3

McCarthy, Jane E.; Ladimer, Irving, and Sirefman, Josef P. *Managing Faculty Disputes: A Guide to Issues, Procedures, and Practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984. 270 pages.

Divided into three parts, this book discusses recurring disputes relating to promotion and tenure as well as dismissals, procedures for resolving recurring disputes, and special issues related to institutional practices. Case studies relating to complaint processes and faculty participation in resolving financial problems are presented. Rating: 3

McCarthy, Jane E., and Ladimer, Irving. *Resolving Faculty Disputes*. New York: American Arbitration Association, 1981. 70 pages.

The Center for Mediation in Higher Education of the American Arbitration Association produced this report discussing model procedures to serve as the basis for

discussion for faculty and administrators wanting to improve processes or design new systems for handling complaints. Includes discussion of due process in higher education, design consideration, and commentary on procedural design. Appendices include Model Procedures for Handling Faculty Disputes, Guidelines for the Conduct of Mediation, and Rules for Conducting the Formal Hearing, and other texts. Rating: 3

McKerrow, K., and Dennis, L.. "Evaluation of University Presidents: Broadening the Perspective." *Journal of Educational Thought* 23 (1989): 3-14.

This essay deals with the current status of university presidential evaluation and the narrow anti-evaluation perspective taken in the current literature. The authors analyze and expand upon the advantages to presidential evaluation developed by John Nason in his book, *Presidential Assessment*. As is the case with Nason's book, those doing the formal evaluation are not identified, and are presumed to be boards of trustees. Rating: 1

McLaughlin, Judith Block. "Leadership, Management, and Governance" in *Leadership Amid Controversy: Presidential Perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass (2004).

Aimed at college presidents, this text organizes assumptions and expectations about presidential performance into the categories of leadership, management, and governance, offering insights into stories of campus controversies in order to provide a framework for understanding the complexities of the presidential role. Rating: 1

Miller, Michael T. "The College President's Perspective on Faculty Involvement in Governance", 2001. ERIC Document 457 755. 12 pages.

This study was done to determine how college presidents perceive faculty involvement in governance. Twenty-three college presidents were questioned, and results suggest that presidents are not as enthusiastic about faculty governance as previously thought, although faculty involvement is appreciated in such areas as curriculum development. Shared governance was generally not considered to be an integral component of institutional decision making. Rating: 3

Murphy, Mary Kay. *The Advancement President and the Academy: Profiles in Institutional Leadership*. Phoenix, Ariz.: Oryx Press, 1997.

Written for college presidents who are interested in institutional advancement, this book includes essays by D. Bruce Johnstone and others. Of interest is the essay by Edward G. Coll, "The Advancement President and the Faculty," (pp. 136-44) in which Coll discusses various aspects of college presidents working with faculty and governance structures. The advice to new presidents is rather general in nature, as it does not deal with specific issues relating to either evaluation of presidents or difficulties that may arise with faculty. Rating: 3

Nason, John W., and Axelrod, Nancy. *Presidential Assessment: A Guide to the Periodic Review of the Performance of Chief Executives*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing

Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1984. 109 pages.

Although the audience for this text is not specified, it appears to be aimed at boards of trustees and presidents. Reasons for evaluating presidents are given, such as fulfilling the board's responsibility, strengthening the president's position, and educating trustees, faculty and others on the president's role. In addition to board assessment, presidents are encouraged to self-assess, and other forms of evaluation are addressed. The book contains useful information on how to conduct evaluations, including procedures, sample questionnaires, and rating scales. Rating: 1

Nordvall, Robert C. *Evaluation and Development of Administrators*. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 6. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979. 60 pages, with bibliography.

Nordvall discussed the reasons for administrative evaluation, types of evaluation programs, selecting and implementing an evaluation program, administrative development programs, as well as evaluation and development of college presidents. Although the audience for this pamphlet is not specified, it seems that it is targeted towards boards of trustees and administrators, although there is general information of evaluative structure, including brief descriptions of previous studies. Ad hoc evaluation committees in SUNY are discussed on pages 45-47. Rating: 2

Poston, Lawrence S., Marshall S. Clough, Robert K. Moore, and B. Robert Kreiser, "Faculty Evaluation of Administrators." *Academe* 92 (2006): 101-08.

This report by a subcommittee of the AAUP's Committee on College and University Governance discusses broad principles of administrator evaluation, levels of faculty participation, evaluative procedures and criteria, report generation, as well as basic principles regarding evaluation. Rating: 2

Schwartz, Merrill Pellows. *Assessing the Performance of Academic Presidents*. University of Maryland, College Park, 1998. 338 pages.

This study researched the processes used to evaluate presidential performance, the outcomes of those processes, and the relationships between how the assessments were conducted and how they were reported in a national study of 1,348 college and university presidents and 535 governing board chairs. The researcher makes a number of recommendations concerning presidential involvement in the assessment process in order to improve presidential performance. Rating: 1

---. A National Survey of Presidential Performance Assessment Policies and Practices. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1998. Rating: 1

Shaw, K. "Presidential Assessment: Good Intentions Gone Wrong." *AGB Reports* (1988): 20-23.

Rating: 1

Statement of Government of Colleges and Universities. American Association of University Professors.

<<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsresearch/policydocs/governancestatement.htm>>.

Rating: 3

Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. American Association of University Professors. <<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsresearch/policydocs/1940statement.htm>>.

Rating: 3

Strohm, Paul. "Toward an AAUP Policy on Evaluation of Administrators." *Academe* 66 (1980): 406-13.

This article deals with advantages of a formal process of evaluation, as well as practices prevalent at the time of writing. It also makes some procedural suggestions concerning performance review and reappointment review. The AAUP however had not developed guidelines for review, and the author can only propose broad guidelines.

Rating: 2

Tucker, Allan, and Robert B. Mautz. "Presidential Evaluation: An Academic Circus." *Educational Record* 60(Summer, 1979): 253-60.

The authors consider presidential evaluation a fad, and state that there is no evidence that resulting benefits outweigh detriments. They question whether evaluators are objective, but in spite of what they refer to as the futility of performing assessments, they suggest that boards conduct presidential evaluations on a regular basis. Rating: 1

Wattenbarger, J., N.D. Evans, and G.L. Mears. "Who's Evaluating the President." *Community and Junior College Journal* 49 (1979): 8-10.

The authors developed and tested a model for evaluation in which a president could be tested against expected performance. A questionnaire on presidential evaluation consisting of forty-four items was administered to subgroups of a college. The responses were analyzed, but neither the questionnaire nor the responses were made available. The authors then held structured interviews with members of the board of trustees of the college under study. Rating: 1

CASE STUDIES

Beaudoin, Diana Brigham. *Procedures and Informal Influences: Assessing a College President's Performance*. Harvard University, 1986. 222 pages.

This study examines the experiences of Hazelton College, a private liberal arts college which completed a formal assessment of its president. The case study is supplemented by 39 interviews with presidents, former presidents, trustees, and education consultants across the country.

Brown, Elizabeth A. R. "Faculty Evaluation of Administrators: The Experience of Brooklyn College." *AAUP Bulletin* 64 (1978): 298-304.

This report discusses the evaluation of administrators resulting from financial exigencies at Brooklyn College in the mid-1970s. A Committee for the Review of Administrators was charged with reviewing the performances and accomplishments of the college president and other administrators. Although the work of the Committee resulted in some accomplishments, the report concludes that faculty evaluation of administrators is unrealistic, without cooperation of college administrators. .

Davis, Bertram, Gourevitch, Victor and Howard, Daniel F. "Academic Freedom and Tenure: The State University of New York." *AAUP Bulletin* (1977): 237-260.

This is the report of the AAUP censure of the State University of New York in the mid-1970s. A number of SUNY campus administrations had used the excuse of financial exigency to retrench tenured faculty. The report concludes that in most cases retrenchment for financial reasons was not necessary.

Deegan, William L., McConnell, T. R., and Stull, Harriet. *Joint Participation in Decision Making: A Study of Faculty Government and Faculty-Administrative Consultation at Fresno State College*. Berkeley, CA: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1970. 113 pages.

This study describes faculty organization and governance as well as joint participation in decision making at Fresno State College, as part of a larger study of faculty governance by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California.

Gonzalez, Gaspar. "Fear and Loathing in 'La Escuela'." *Miami New Times* 2001: 16 pages. ERIC Document 462 089.

Originally published in the Miami New Times, this article offers a critique of the administration of Eduardo Padron at Miami-Dade Community College. Padron fired employees, cut and consolidated sports programs, and began moving administrators and staff from one campus to another. The AAUP sent representatives to the school to investigate the dissolution of the faculty senate by the college administration, ultimately sanctioning the school.

Hoag, David S. "Evaluation of the Formal Assessment Process of College Presidents at Liberal Arts Institutions: Three Case Studies." Saint Louis University, 2003. 155 pages.

Twenty-eight interviews were conducted concerning college presidents at three liberal arts colleges. The presidents had undergone comprehensive assessment by an external consultant. The study found that each president addressed areas that needed improvement, and that the assessment was a positive experience for the presidents and their institutions.

Kirp, David L. "Hurricane Hugo." *Lingua Franca* (April, 2001): 40-49.

Hugo Sonnenschein's presidency at the University of Chicago from 1993 to 1999 was marked by an "identity crisis," and included cost cutting and other changes that resulted in opposition from faculty and other constituent groups.

Lee, Barbara. "Campus Leaders and Campus Senates." *Faculty in Governance: The Role of Senates and Joint Committees in Academic Decision Making*. Ed. Robert. Birnbaum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991. 41-62.

Lee provides case studies of the relationship of academic senates to college administrations at three unnamed academic institutions. The examples include urban and rural institutions, as well as a unit in a system. Structural issues, cultural issues, and administrative postures are defined as characteristics senates. The impacts of governance on leadership, the impacts of leadership on senates, as well as how to make senates more effective are briefly discussed.

Lewis, Lionel S. *When Power Corrupts: Academic Governing Boards in the Shadow of the Adelphi Case*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2000. 195 pages.

This case study details the struggle of Adelphi University's administration and

board of trustees with its faculty between 1985 and 1996, which culminated in the removal of the trustees by the New York State Board of Regents. The new trustees, appointed by New York State, then dismissed the president. What occurred at Adelphi is used as a backdrop for discussing the imbalance of power in American institutions of higher learning.