INSIDE HIGHER ED

FOREWORD BY
STEPHEN TRACHTENBERG

GOVERNANCE RECONSIDERED

How Boards, Presidents, Administrators, and Faculty Can Help Their Colleges Thrive

SUSAN RESNECK PIERCE

JOSSEY-BASS
A Wiley Brand

The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series

Cover design by Michael Cook

Published by Jossey-Bass

A Wiley Brand

One Montgomery Street, Suite 1200, San Francisco, CA 94104-4594—www.josseybass.com

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data has been applied for and is on file with the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-1-1187-3849-8 (cloth)
ISBN 978-1-118-73862-7 (ebk.)
ISBN 978-1-118-73857-3 (ebk.)
First Edition

For my father, Elliott Resneck For my sisters, Linda Resneck DiStefano Krohn and Brenda Resneck Laughery For my daughter and son-in law, Sasha and Steven Seigel For my grandsons, Sean and Ryan Siegel

Foreword

Dr. Susan Resneck Pierce is the celebrated former president of the University of Puget Sound and the author of *On Being Presidential*, one of the preeminent guides for college and university leaders. With this second contribution, *Governance Reconsidered*, to the canon of the American academy, she is becoming one of the most consequential scholars of the discipline of higher education. Without leaving anything to the imagination, she inspires the imagination. She writes with clarity and specificity and provides examples and case studies which one can actually use to address a working agenda.

University presidents are burning out like so many moths in a room filled with lit candles. *Governance Reconsidered* provides an antidote to this melancholy circumstance. To read this book is to experience the scales falling from one's eyes about the management and governance of America's colleges and universities in one of the most daunting times since the Great Depression. Pierce has identified the most significant contemporary challenges to institutions of higher education and their leaders and has provided answers that are insightful and informed by reflection and practice. In her studies she covers shared governance, university financing, university personnel issues, the place of the university in America, and remarkable and fascinating tales of issues addressed by presidents, faculty, and trustees. This book is a tool that will help institutions address their future.

This book will be of interest to all who have any concern whatsoever with the future of our nation's colleges and universities. It will be particularly helpful to policy makers and practitioners and should be read by political leaders,

university presidents, and other administrators, including provosts, vice presidents, deans, and department chairs. Faculty who need to be knowledgeable about the institutions which host their work will also benefit from this valuable volume; likewise, students of both university administration and governance. Every trustee of state-supported and independent colleges and universities should receive a copy of this book along with his or her appointment letter. Journalists and others who think and write about the academy should have this on their desk to consult on a regular basis. Parents sending their youngsters off to college, as well as adult learners, should read this volume in order to better understand the institutions with which they are engaged. In other words, this is an important book, perhaps vital, for all.

Someone who reads *Governance Reconsidered* as well as *On Being Presidential* will begin to understand the fascinating special world of the American university. The literature will reveal how universities work and don't; will describe generic and unique challenges of university leadership; and will give reason for concern and encouragement. But Pierce's contribution is surely one of the most contemporary and comprehensive available and should be at the top of any such reading list. It is an outstanding contribution and, properly understood and used, will save the career of many a university leader in the demanding days to come.

At age seventy-six, I have not lived long enough to completely understand the meaning of the term “shared governance” as it is applied to colleges and universities and yet it persists, as I have myself said elsewhere, to enjoy an almost religious status in the academy, even while the tempo of faculty deliberations goes on to dominate university decision making. This is as true today as it was one, two, or three decades ago, even as we engage now in

an even more taxing environment where large amounts of money are committed and the strategic agenda is increasingly complicated.

The culture of faculty tends to be risk adverse. This is arguably the result of the skill set developed while earning a PhD where the credential was not historically awarded for pyrotechnics. It is hard to recall when the need for sound decisions made in a timely manner was more imperative on campus, and yet our universities have divided into what the late C. P. Snow called, “two cultures”—one of which focuses on decision making while the other makes decisions. And if the second group doesn't apply themselves, then the first may have cause to worry about future compensation and employment. This is not a good thing. Susan Resneck Pierce's book addresses and helps to mitigate the worst concerns that I contemplate. She explains why shared governance must be accompanied by shared responsibility. She illustrates that fiscal concerns involving big data needs full-time attention that is not an easy fit with full-time scholarship and teaching. She shows why when these two cultures come together the meeting is sometimes noisy. The deliberate faculty culture may not fully appreciate that shared governance includes a timely call to action; and that universities are about to be disrupted, as have most recently journalism, medical care, and other historic practices. The reconciliation of faculty and administrators to the common good within the process of vital decision making could not be more imperative. President Pierce's contribution is the right book at the right time.

Stephen Joel Trachtenberg

Stephen Joel Trachtenberg is President Emeritus and University Professor of Public Service at The George Washington University. He is the author of five books about

higher education, most recently along with Gerald B. Kauvar and E. Grady Bogue, of Presidencies Derailed: Why University Leaders Fail and How to Prevent It *(Johns Hopkins University Press)*.

Preface

In July 1984, two weeks after I began what turned out to be a six-year tenure as the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Tulsa, the provost, Thomas F. Staley, gave me important advice. Telling me that I was off to a good start, he cautioned that I might be even more effective if I were a bit more patient. Specifically, he advised me to look both ways before crossing the street.

As dean, I was in the enviable position of being an administrator with no financial worries. Tulsa's enrollment was about 4,000 students. The endowment was around $450 million. Tom had dedicated $250,000 annually for an arts and sciences discretionary fund to be used to enhance our academic programs. The only technology that we really worried about populated our science and language laboratories, and those labs were well equipped. No one seriously questioned the value of higher education. Those days are long gone, even at Tulsa.

At the beginning of that fall term, I constituted the department chairs as an advisory council. They had not previously met as a group and so were skeptical about whether these twice-monthly meetings would have value. In response, I told the department chairs that I wanted them to advise me on matters of importance to the college. I expressed the hope that together we might be able to make decisions that would benefit teaching and learning and that also would make a difference for our colleagues and our students.

At our first meeting, I asked the department chairs about the unusual policy that all arts and sciences graduates, including those majoring in fields like biology and

mathematics, received Bachelor of Arts degrees. The department chairs unanimously agreed that we should also offer the Bachelor of Science degree. We quickly agreed on which degrees belonged in the arts category and which in the sciences.

I suggested that the department chairs each discuss the matter with their departmental colleagues and report back at our next meeting in two weeks. If, as we now all anticipated, there was broad agreement, we could simply make the change. The provost and president had already agreed it was a good idea. We would not need to take the matter to the board.

One department chair, ignoring my proposed timetable, mused that making this change, which he favored, would take a long time. When I asked him how long, he responded, “At least three years.” I, not having yet mastered the art of patience, exclaimed, “Why three years?” He then asked how long I thought it would take. I said that I was thinking about something like three days but that I could live with three weeks. We did make the change in two weeks.

There was in fact no real urgency to changing a policy that had apparently existed for many decades, and the impetus for seeking action within two weeks was not impatience. Rather, I hoped to demonstrate to my new colleagues that with appropriate consultation and communication, we could make and implement obvious decisions easily and quickly. These colleagues and many others on the faculty became supportive of that approach, and over the next several years, through their collaborative and creative efforts, we earned a Phi Beta Kappa chapter, began to internationalize our offerings, created partnerships with such cultural organizations as Tulsa Opera, increased

enrollment, improved student quality, and earned grants from national foundations.

The Inspiration for This Book

My interest in the topic of governance has been inspired both by recent changes in the higher education landscape and by my work since 1973 as a faculty member, a department chair, a dean, an academic vice president, a president, a member of a number of nonprofit boards, and, for the past eight years, a consultant. The many conversations I have had in my consulting role with faculty members, administrators, students, trustees, alumni, leaders of higher education associations and foundations, and elected officials have informed my thinking about governance in new and more nuanced ways.

In the past several years, new economic and political pressures, along with the advent of new technologies, have led to conflicts on many campuses over who is responsible for the nature and pace of change generally and for decisions about academic matters in particular. On these campuses, contentiousness has often replaced collaboration.

Concerns about ever-growing expenses and ever-increasing tuition, for example, have led some governors and other elected officials to seek in unprecedented ways to influence the leadership, the curriculum, the tuition, and even the conventional classroom-based approach to teaching at a number of state-supported universities. These same concerns have led boards of both public and private colleges and universities to push presidents to make changes quickly to eliminate programs and even positions that are not cost-effective and to identify and implement new revenue streams. Many presidents have done just that, turning to the academic programs, which until recently on

many campuses had been protected from budget cuts and which previously had been considered the province of the faculty. Having already made all the cuts that they believed that they could make in nonacademic areas, many presidents and their senior administrative colleagues have phased out academic programs and hired adjuncts rather than tenure-track faculty to meet instructional needs. Many presidents have also led their institution to add new majors (often pre-professional) and new graduate programs, to create online courses often taught by adjuncts, to enroll greater numbers of international students, or to establish campuses abroad.

When presidents and their senior colleagues take such actions without honoring the often time-consuming, highly deliberative processes of shared governance, they almost always trigger conflict with the faculty, who inevitably value those processes and their deliberative nature. In such instances, faculty members typically argue that shared governance as it has historically been practiced ensures that all academic decisions are mission-driven and that all academic programs are of high quality. Higher education journals and the national press are now filled with stories about faculty members at both public and private colleges and universities who are critical of their presidents and sometimes their boards for making unilateral, top-down decisions that faculty members maintain have compromised academic values and academic quality.

This book will specifically explore how and why the notion of shared governance as it has been practiced to varying degrees on most US campuses since the mid-1960s is being challenged and even shattered on many campuses. The book will describe how conflicts about governance often escalate in ways that are destructive to the institutions about which trustees, presidents, and faculty generally care so deeply. Finally, the book will reconsider

governance, offering recommendations to trustees, presidents, and faculty members about their roles and responsibilities going forward so that they can enable their institutions to thrive and in some cases to survive.

The Intended Audience

This book is intended for trustees, presidents, senior administrators, faculty members, elected officials, leaders of higher education associations and foundations, and people who care about the quality of higher education in this country. I hope to help those in each group to understand the roles and responsibilities of each of the players and the complexities inherent in those responsibilities. I also hope to inspire them to work together effectively rather than to be locked in adversarial relationships that harm our colleges and universities and inevitably their students as well.

The Structure of This Book

Chapter 1 begins with a history of shared governance in the United States and the challenges it has faced historically and currently faces. In writing this chapter, I was particularly struck by how the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was at its founding a century ago focused primarily on the question of academic freedom and that only in its 1966 statement did the AAUP make explicit the linkage of shared governance and academic freedom. This chapter also discusses the impact on the presidency of contentiousness on many campuses about governance.

Chapter 2 focuses on the causes of the various financial pressures facing colleges and universities today and explores the impact of constrained resources not only on

the quality of the academic programs but increasingly on how governance is practiced and, on a number of campuses, has been shattered.

Chapter 3 describes the growing reliance on contingent faculty, the vast majority of whom are part-time and who do not participate in governance. This chapter further explores the similarly negative implications for shared governance of MOOCs (massive open online courses), online learning, and for-profit institutions.

Chapter 4 considers the impact on governance of growing questions about the value and cost of higher education. Specifically, the chapter explores ways in which higher education is in fact vulnerable to some of the criticism it is receiving from elected officials, commentators on higher education, and trustees. The chapter also makes the case for the value of a college education and describes the negative effect of elected officials and trustees substituting their judgment for that of college and university presidents in terms of policy and budget and for that of the faculty in terms of curriculum and other academic matters.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 offer cautionary tales about presidential, faculty, and trustee actions respectively. Each chapter also offers recommendations for how each of these groups need to reconsider governance and work together collaboratively so that their institutions will thrive and in some cases simply survive.

The book ends on a more hopeful note by presenting, in Chapter 8, four exemplary tales about presidents who have been responsible for bringing about transformational change on their campuses and who have done so in partnership with the faculty and the board. Each of these mini-case studies highlights the benefits of presidents who successfully engage their campuses and their trustees in

thinking about and contributing ideas for how their institutions can most productively move forward.

Some Explanations for My Readers

I draw heavily throughout the book on examples of both dysfunctional and effective governance.

When these examples have made their way into the national press and also social media and have received extensive coverage, I name the institutions and cite that coverage as I think appropriate. I am aware that such accounts, whether in the mainstream press, blogs, or Facebook posts, may be incomplete, biased, or both. (Although I make every attempt to present these stories fairly, as a student of William Faulkner's fiction, I am mindful of the unreliability of narratives and so recognize that those who are closer to the events that I am recounting than I am may have different understandings and perspectives about those events.)

When I know of examples that, to the institution's good fortune, have not made their way into the public realm, I seek to disguise the institution and the players. In such cases, I sometimes change the gender of the president, trustees, or key faculty members. I sometimes describe the institution as being located in a different setting. I sometimes modestly alter the institution's mission. I sometimes alter slightly the details of events. And in a few cases I conflate similar events that have occurred on two campuses into one case study. At the same time, I want to be clear that the stories I tell are always grounded in real events.

I have learned about these examples in a number of ways. Sometimes, I simply have firsthand knowledge. Sometimes, the stories have come to me from those on the campus

itself. In all instances when there is contentiousness, I have sought to understand and represent all sides of the issue.

I also want to point out some choices about terminology. Although members of governing boards at public institutions are often referred to as “regents,” for the sake of simplicity and to emphasize that governing boards are entrusted with the health and integrity of their institution, I will use the term *trustees* throughout the book. Similarly, although the chief executive officer on some campuses is referred to as the chancellor, I have chosen throughout to use the more common title of *president*.

Finally, because Jossey-Bass prefers not to use footnotes or endnotes, I am including an extended bibliography that lists the numerous newspaper and journal articles that have provided me with pertinent information.

Acknowledgments

After my interview in February 1992 as a finalist for the presidency of the University of Puget Sound, I arrived home just in time to receive a phone call from the board and search committee chair, the quite wonderful late Lowry Wyatt, who offered me the position. I accepted without asking about the salary. We agreed to meet two days later to talk about details. I hung up the phone, and before I called my family and friends to share the good news, I danced around my house.

That moment was the last time I failed to negotiate vigorously, although going forward my negotiations were for the college, not for me personally. It was also the last time that I danced alone, because I quickly learned that creating partnerships with my colleagues, trustees, students, alumni, the community, national foundations, and others would better serve Puget Sound than any solo act I might pull off.

Although the early sections of this book include cautionary tales about boards, presidents, and members of the faculty who have contributed to or even created dysfunction on their campus, I want to emphasize that I nevertheless have a deep and abiding faith in this country's colleges and universities.

The great majority of faculty members with whom I have worked have been dedicated to their students. These faculty members have sought to teach students to be critical thinkers, to write and speak clearly, to value logical arguments supported by evidence, and to be passionate about ideas and knowledge. Over and over again, I have seen faculty members who have been transforming agents

—in the most positive of ways—in the lives of their students. Although I certainly have encountered my share of criticism, recalcitrance, and political posturing from some faculty members, I have also and always (please note that I said “always”) been able to count on the collective wisdom of my faculty colleagues when it came to institutional matters.

Similarly, I have also come to know some unbelievably effective presidents who have brought about constructive change on their campuses in collaboration with the faculty and with the support of their boards. They have much to teach us about effective leadership, and so I will try to point out throughout the book the lessons to be learned from them. In particular, I want to thank Francesco Cesareo, Assumption College; Tom Evans, Carroll College; Mark Gordon, Defiance College; Rob Huntington, Heidelberg University; Rock Jones, Ohio Wesleyan University; Steve Kaplan, University of New Haven; Brit Kirwan, the University of Maryland System; Ted Long, Elizabethtown College; Bob McMahan, Kettering University; Vince Maniaci, American International College: Jo Ellen Parker, Sweet Briar College; Georgia Nugent, Kenyon College; Pam Reid, the University of St. Joseph; Steve Trachtenberg, George Washington University; and Rich Wagner, Dunwoody College of Technology. In addition, I want to acknowledge two provosts who have also taught me a great deal: Bob Entzminger, Hendrix College, and Patricia Killen, Gonzaga University.

I have also worked with some exemplary trustees. Although there are too many to name, I especially want to thank Bill Weyerhaeuser, my board chair for ten of my eleven years at Puget Sound; Terry Lengfelder, the board's vice chair; and trustee Hal Eastman, each of whom encouraged me to think in strategic ways and to act boldly. I further want to acknowledge some of the current and former board chairs

and vice chairs with whom I have been fortunate to work: Fred Bayon, Assumption College; Richard Willis and Ray Murff of Baylor University; Ray Messer, Mark Semmons, and Terry Cosgrove of Carroll College (Montana); Phil Mallott of Defiance College; Maurice Wagener and Ted Ferrara, Dunwoody College of Technology; Kathleen McKinney and Rich Cullen of Furman University; Sondra Libman of Heidelberg University; Charlie Kettering of Kettering University; Kathe Rhinesmith and Michael Long of Ohio Wesleyan University; and Virginia Upchurch Collier and Elisabeth Wyatt, Sweet Briar College.

I am again grateful to my editor, David Brightman, executive editor for Higher and Adult Education at Jossey-Bass. (OK, I admit it: I love to say the phrase “my editor.”) I first worked with David on my recent book, *On Being Presidential: A Guide for Colleges and Universities*, and suddenly understood the enormous value a truly talented editor brings to a manuscript. In the case of this book, David wisely encouraged me to expand my interest in writing a book about trusteeship to the larger question of governance. It was he who suggested the book's title, with its nod to the much-admired Ernie Boyer's pathbreaking work *Scholarship Reconsidered*. David is a consummate editor and a good friend.

I also deeply appreciate the support of Aneesa Davenport, associate marketing manager for Higher and Adult Education at Jossey-Bass, and Cathy Cambron for her superb copyediting.

And I continue to be indebted to Scott Jacshik, editor at and cofounder of *Inside Higher Ed*, first for encouraging me to write for *IHE*, then for introducing me to David Brightman and Jossey-Bass, next for sponsoring *On Being Presidential*, and now for sponsoring *Governance Reconsidered*.

Writing is very solitary and demanding work. In that light, I want to thank my friends Karen Goldstein and Joel Trosch and my daughter, Alexandra (Sasha) Siegel, for being avid and critical readers of various iterations of this manuscript. They each gave me, in different ways, the kind of encouragement I needed to write the book and the critical perspective that led me to make it better.

I want to thank my grandsons, Sean and Ryan Siegel (ten and eight at this writing), for providing me almost daily with a much-needed respite from writing. They also have become my biggest promoters. For instance, while waiting for pizza to be served one evening at a local restaurant, they found *On Being Presidential* on Amazon.com. They proudly showed the website to the waitress and waiter and to everyone sitting near us. Each of them is a voracious reader, and they are better writers at their respective ages than I ever was. How lucky am I?

I also want to acknowledge my 93-year-old father, who remains deeply interested in my work; my sisters, Linda Resneck DiStefano Krohn and Brenda Resneck Laughery, who simply give me support no matter what; and my son-in-law, Steven Siegel, who makes me happy because he so loves my daughter and my grandchildren. I also want to thank Albert (Bert) Sonnenfeld, who has been an important part of my life since he was the best teacher I ever had when I was a graduate student, and John Riggs, who has been a friend since we were teenagers in Janesville, Wisconsin, some decades ago. And although my husband, Kenneth Pierce, died almost seven years ago, his insights into how institutions work and his unfailing encouragement still inspire me.

Finally, I want to acknowledge a number of my former students throughout my career as a faculty member and administrator. That I am still in touch with each of them

makes me happy. By virtue of who they have become and the ways they each have made a difference in the lives of others, they make me proud and reaffirm my faith in higher education.

About the Author

As soon as Susan Resneck Pierce stepped down after eleven years (1992–2003) as the president of the University of Puget Sound, she began “flunking retirement.” Today, as president of SRP CONSULTING, LLC, she advises colleges and universities on such matters as effective board and presidential performance, governance, board development, and strategic planning. She serves as a coach to presidents and an advisor to board chairs. She often facilitates focused retreats for boards, senior administrators, and faculty. Dr. Pierce also serves “Of Counsel” to Witt-Kieffer and, as a member of its Education Leadership Council, advises the firm about trends in higher education.

Dr. Pierce writes and speaks extensively about higher education. Her book *On Being Presidential: A Guide for College and University Leaders* (Jossey-Bass, 2011), like this book, is sponsored by *Inside Higher Ed*, to which she is a frequent contributor. She is also the author of *The Moral of the Story* (Columbia University's Teachers College Press, 1982), coeditor of a book on Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man*, and author of many essays about American literature. In recent years, she has given presentations at meetings sponsored by the American Council on Education, the American Council of Academic Deans, the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC), the National Association of Colleges and Universities, and the National Association for Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.

Under Dr. Pierce's leadership, the University of Puget Sound entered the ranks of the national liberal arts colleges. As the result of a successful comprehensive campaign and a careful use of institutional resources, the endowment grew from $68 million to $213 million; the

college completed $85 million of new construction and major renovations; SAT scores increased from 1067 to 1253; and applications for 650 freshmen places grew to number 4,400 annually. To honor President Emerita Pierce's work at Puget Sound, donors endowed both a chair in humanities and honors and a lecture series in public affairs and the arts in her name. In addition, thanks also to a major donor, the atrium of Puget Sound's new humanities building also carries her name.

From 1990 to 1992 Dr. Pierce served as vice president for academic affairs at Lewis & Clark College and from 1984 to 1990 as dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Tulsa. As assistant director of the Division of Education Programs at the National Endowment for the Humanities, she directed the three federal programs that supported undergraduate education in the humanities. She also has served as chair of the English Department at Ithaca College, as visiting associate professor at Princeton University, as president of the Boca Raton Community Hospital Foundation and vice president for the Hospital, and for several years as a senior consultant for Academic Search.

Dr. Pierce is the recipient of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) District VIII Distinguished Leadership Award for 2003. She has served on the boards of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and the American Conference of Academic Deans, on the Executive Committee of the Annapolis Group, on the advisory committee for the AAC&U project on engineering and the liberal arts, on the Council of Presidents of the Association of Governing Boards, and on the Washington Women in Leadership Advisory Committee. She has been active in many civic, cultural, and professional organizations, cofounded the University of Puget Sound Access to College program in

collaboration with the Tacoma Public Schools, and served from 1998 to 2002 on the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Task Force on College Drinking.

Susan Pierce received her bachelor's degree from Wellesley College in 1965, her MA degree in English from the University of Chicago in 1966, and her PhD in English from the University of Wisconsin in 1972.

Chapter 1
Shared Governance: Its History and Its Challenges

Tensions over governance have been part of the fabric of American college and university life since the latter part of the 1800s. Concerns about academic freedom were initially at the heart of these tensions, but over time, especially since the mid-1960s, conflicts about governance have been prompted by disagreements between some members of the faculty and the administration and sometimes the governing board about who should have responsibility for and authority over—or who at least should be consulted about—which decisions.

In 1966, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), in collaboration with the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB), defined the notion of shared governance more fully than had been done in the past. As I will discuss more fully later in this chapter, the AAUP argued that even as the governing board had ultimate authority for the institution, the board should delegate the college or university's operations to the president, who in turn would delegate to the faculty primary responsibility for academic matters. This notion was accepted by a great many colleges and universities in concept, despite variations in how it was carried out in practice.

I believe that something even more serious than the historical tensions about governance is now occurring. Specifically, I am convinced that the notion of shared governance as it has been generally understood and at

least loosely practiced since 1966 is now being shattered on many campuses and is in jeopardy on other campuses.

Significant economic and political pressures have, on the one hand, led many boards to call for immediate campus responses to problems. It is no longer acceptable to many trustees that, as the old saw goes, it is easier to move a graveyard than to change the curriculum. Some of them judge the traditions of shared governance to be unnecessarily process-laden and time-consuming. Some believe that the very notion of shared governance is no longer viable.

Many presidents share that same sense of urgency and so are making decisions, including those that affect the academic programs, more quickly than was traditionally the case. Sometimes, presidents do so without full or even any consultation with the faculty. In response, those faculty members who believe that they no longer have a say in academic matters, matters of institutional significance, or both are apt publicly to protest presidential and even board decisions. In what appear to be increasing numbers, members of the faculty are going so far as to vote that they have no confidence in their president.

Such adversarial relationships are occurring at a time when our colleges and universities need not conflict but the shared wisdom and perspectives of all constituents. Failures of collaboration among the faculty, the president, and the board, whatever the cause, are inevitably destructive (as they are in all organizations). At the least, failures of collaboration can lead to an unhealthy paralysis in which decisions are delayed or not made at all. At the worst, such failures can throw an institution into crisis.

In addition, conflicts over governance sometimes lead some of the players—faculty, presidents, and trustees—to say and do things that are not in the best interests of themselves or

of their institutions. For example, on a campus filled with tension between the president and the faculty, a longtime trustee known for his candor told concerned faculty members—all of whom had tenure—in a public meeting that if they were unhappy with the president's decisions, they should resign and go find another job. The faculty in attendance concluded that the trustees did not understand or value their work. Some worried that the comment meant that the trustees wanted to get rid of tenure. There was a good deal of conversation in the hallways of the college about the value of tenure in protecting free speech.

Several faculty members responded unprofessionally. They told the story to their students, thereby eliciting their support. Some of the students then held a rally to call for the president's resignation and to denounce the board. They invited the local press, who covered the rally in a series about what it called a crisis on campus. Rumors spread that some faculty members were encouraging enrolled students to transfer.

Although the trustees understood that only a few members of the faculty members had involved the students, they were critical of the faculty as a whole, arguing that responsible faculty members should have stood up to and opposed those who had involved the students.

The board remained unified in its support of the president. The faculty became increasingly alienated. Admissions and retention did suffer.

The Pressures on Shared Governance

In my judgment, there are a number of particular catalysts for the movement away from shared governance, including the following:

- As noted earlier, the extremely daunting economic pressures facing most institutions have led some presidents and also some chief academic officers to make unilateral decisions about academic programs, decisions that traditionally had relied on at least the advice if not the consent of the faculty.
- The growing concern, on the part of faculty members at institutions of all sizes and types, that a “corporate” approach to decision making has replaced a more collaborative approach and has led many faculty members vigorously to defend faculty prerogatives because they believe these prerogatives protect them from capricious decisions on the part of administrators and, in some cases, trustees.
- The nature of the professoriate has changed dramatically, in that currently only 25 percent of the faculty at US colleges and universities are tenured or on the tenure-track, with the result that 75 percent of college and university faculty today are contingent faculty, hired on a contract basis, with no role in governance. More than 80 percent of them are part-time. As a result, the vast majority of faculty typically play no role whatsoever in governance.
- The rapid pace of change in the society at large is putting pressure on colleges and universities to institute rapid change as well.
- The growing skepticism among elected officials about the value of higher education has led some governors and some boards of public universities to influence or seek to influence matters that previously had been the province of the administration and sometimes the faculty.

- Some trustees, presidents, and elected officials have embraced the theory advanced by Clayton M. Christensen and Henry J. Eyring in their 2011 Jossey-Bass book, *The Innovative University: Changing the DNA of Higher Education from the Inside Out*, that the traditional model of higher education is no longer sustainable. In particular, they have accepted Christensen and Eyring's view that such disruptive technologies as online education, including MOOCs (massive open online courses), will be more cost-effective and efficient than conventional classrooms. They also subscribe to Christensen and Eyring's view that aspiring colleges and universities need to innovate rather than to imitate—that is, that they need to abandon the habit of emulating the most prestigious institutions like Harvard in order to achieve a higher place in the college rankings and to climb the “Carnegie ladder,” the categories developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Faculty members, in contrast, are often skeptical about whether online learning, especially when it is not supplemented by direct interaction with a professor, is pedagogically effective and of a high quality. Faculty members are particularly skeptical about the MOOCs, which are created by for-profit organizations.
- Fewer chief academic officers than in the past are seeking presidencies and so, for that reason as well as others, boards are increasingly turning to so-called “nontraditional candidates” for the presidency—that is, persons from outside the academy.
- The power, reach, and ease of social media, as is true in other sectors and as later chapters will illustrate, have transformed conflicts that previously would have been confined to a campus and perhaps its local community