FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN SMALL PRIVATE BLACK COLLEGES OF TEXAS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North Texas State University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Vernon vanBolden, M.S., M.M.
Denton, Texas
May, 1983

The problem with which this study is concerned is determining the degree of faculty participation in the decision-making process within six small private black colleges in Texas. The decision areas investigated are faculty personnel (which includes appointments, promotions, tenure, and merit pay increases), curriculum, and administration.

Respondents to this study include 189 administrators and faculty members from six small private black colleges in Texas. A continuum designed by a task force of the American Association of Higher Education (1967), which is composed of administrative dominance, administrative primacy, shared authority, faculty primacy, and faculty dominance, was used in the survey. Data from responses are presented by number, percentage, and mean.

Based on data findings, conclusions that appear to be warranted are (1) the faculty believes it has more influence in the curriculum decision process than in any other selected decision area although it is perceived to be only shared authority with administrators retaining the right of veto;
(2) although the role of the faculty is somewhat influential in the curriculum decision process, the faculty perceives its influence in the selected decision-making areas as, generally, non-existent, and the administrators also perceive the faculty's role as, generally, non-existent; (3) perceptions of both faculty and administrators agree that administrators dominate all steps in the decision-making process that include initiation, consultation, recommendations (receipt, handling, review, and modification), final choice, and veto power; and (4) since in every area of decision-making, the administrators perceive their influence as even greater than it is perceived by the faculty, either the power of administrators is, in fact, greater than the faculty believes, or the faculty is allowed to believe that it has more influence on decision-making than it, in fact, has.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Perhaps one of the most crucial issues in the reform of campus governance in the 1980s is the proper distribution of power and authority among administrators, faculty, students, and others who want and feel they should have access to decision making. To date, only a few educational organizations have examined the phenomenon of redistributing that authority. Generally, it seems the redistribution of internal decision-making authority is expected to take the form of shared participation among institutional constituencies. The faculty and administrators, particularly, have sought to have decision-making authority shared either proportionately or separately, or at least to have such authority more equitably and representationally divided between them.

In most of the published prescriptions for redistributing decision-making authority between these two institutional constituencies, the obvious areas (e.g., fund raising by administrators and grade giving by faculty members) are clearly defined and assigned, but in matters of crucial and mutual interest to both constituencies (e.g., tenure, promotions, curriculum) the participation share is not at all clear for either group (1, p. 67; 3). Since the decision-
making authority between constituencies is so unclear and may not be distributed uniformly across issues or institutions, a better assessment of the existing distributions and their variations is necessary before any moderately defensible recommendations on their redistribution can be offered, especially if they are to serve as a bastion against attacks on institutional autonomy from external sources.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed in this study is the participation of the faculty in the decision-making process within six small private black colleges in Texas.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study are to measure and describe the degree of faculty participation in decisions regarding faculty appointments, promotions, tenure, merit, and curriculum in the six small private black colleges in Texas.

Research Questions

Based on the problem and purposes of this study, the following research questions were formulated.

1. What is the role of the faculty in decisions concerning personnel, curriculum, and administrative matters as perceived by the faculty themselves?

2. What is the role of the faculty in decisions concerning personnel, curriculum, and administrative matters as perceived by administrators?
3. What are the specific areas in which there is considerable shared authority or in which there is no shared authority?

4. Do the perceptions of the faculty members and administrators differ by institution?

5. Concerning the actual decision-making process
   a. Who initiates the process?
   b. Who is consulted after the process begins?
   c. Who can make formal recommendations?
   d. To whom are the recommendations made?
   e. How are the recommendations handled?
   f. Does anyone review the recommendations, if so, then for what purpose?
   g. What effect does a review function have on the recommendations already made?
   h. Can the recommendations be modified as a result of the review procedure?
   i. Who makes the final choice on the issue?
   j. When are arbitrary decisions made that disregard all the preceding actions?
   k. When a promotional choice has been made, who can negate all that has gone before by vetoing the selection?
Background and Significance of the Study

Administering an educational institution is known as academic governance, which according to Corson is

The process or art with which scholars, students, teachers, administrators, and trustees associated together in a college or university establish and carry out the rules and regulations that minimize conflict, facilitate their constituency collaboration, and preserve individual freedom (4, p. 60).

Unlike many other organizations, however, academic institutions do not have a direct hierarchy of authority wherein command flows smoothly from upper to lower levels.

In academia, there is little line hierarchy of authority of command from president to dean to chairman through full professors, associates, assistant and finally instructors. Each faculty member has his domain of teaching and research authority over which there is little or no control by other faculty members, the administration, trustees, alumni, and so on (7, p. 70).

Dressel, Johnson, and Marcus (5, p. 68) suggest that this distribution of authority varies from institution to institution as a result of distinctive governance patterns. Such authority is exercised through endemic institutional structures and individual functions that constitute the decision-making process. It is hypothesized that the variety with which the constituencies interrelate creates distinct distributions of authority at different institutions.

In 1966, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), which has been long concerned with the distribution of institutional authority, issued a "Statement of Government of Colleges and Universities" (2) because "the
colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage calling for appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the components of the academic institution" (2, p. 375). The intent of this call for mutual understanding about academic governance was to foster joint thought and action. This statement was endorsed as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of faculties and administrator.

Still, there remain some questions about the clarity of constituent roles in academic governance and the distribution of institutional authority. The AAUP statement makes a number of imprecise comments about the faculty, who have "special obligations" and "duties," and about both constituencies, who should have some "participation" in what is described as "appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action" (2, p. 376). Apparently, the structures and procedures for faculty and administrative participation in governance remain to be "designed, approved, and established" by the joint efforts of each institution's constituencies (2, p. 376).

This joint effort could obviously vary considerably according to issues and institutions. The AAUP statement does not define structures or describe procedures generally applicable, but it does draw two essential conclusions regarding joint effort.
Important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand (2, p. 376).

Therefore, authority could be shared equally or proportionately on some issues and be jurisdictionally separate on some others. In brief, the AAUP supports shared authority between the faculty and administration; it is not specific about how that sharing should be accomplished.

The review of the literature concerning faculty participation in the decision-making process provides little or no information in regard to small black colleges. In 1973, there were forty-one small black colleges in the United States that were educating approximately 148,000 students; it was predicted that this figure would increase by 8 percent in the next ten years (3, p. 80).

The role of the small black colleges in our country, as defined by leadership, is specifically that of preparing the future leaders of black people. Three basic reasons why a study of faculty participation in decision-making in small black colleges takes on special significance at this time are that (a) the influence of academic senates has waned in the wake of the growing popularity of collective bargaining, (b) economic and personal-professional factors have been prime movers among faculties of small black colleges toward
advocating for a so-called "bigger piece of the pie," and (c) collective bargaining (as revealed in a review of the literature) has failed to establish itself as a particularly effective medium to improve governance role in small black colleges (2, pp. 375-379).

Intra-institutional changes during the period 1972-1982 followed a progressive course toward fuller faculty participation and responsibility in decision-making on matters that are essential components of academic life. Although the evidence does not support the notion that full or optimal responsibility has been achieved, it is apparent that over the time period of this study there has been a play of forces moving the professoriate, however slowly, in this direction -- hence, there is need for this research.

Efforts on the part of administrations governing boards to dominate governance on certain issues (such as appointments and promotions) have caused the professoriate to seek redress through court action. Faculty participation in decision-making in small colleges has been initiated as a crusade (perhaps by only a few individuals) that is devoted to the expression of an "either-them-or-us" power struggle. The long and bitter power struggle has produced either a rearrangement of trivial faculty rights or a lasting hostility among colleagues because actual needs have not been met. However the initiation, faculty participation remains as the
major alternative to collective bargaining. Although the rationale for this research project may be overdrawn, far from exhaustive, and open to infinite variations, it illustrates some probable conditions that have led to the emphasis on mass faculty participation in the decision-making process.

Definition of Terms

The following terms have restricted meanings and are defined for the purposes of this study.

1. **Faculty** is defined as the full-time instructional staff. The term faculty includes any duly authorized representative (one or more individuals, or a committee) chosen by the appropriate faculty unit. A representative is considered duly authorized only if he is (a) chosen directly by the faculty, (b) appointed by a body whose membership has been selected by the faculty, or (c) appointed by the administration from a slate selected by the faculty.

2. An **administrator** is any individual for whom 65 percent of his duties include managing and enforcing school policy, regulations, and procedures.

3. **Administrative dominance** occurs when an administrator acts alone and has complete authority to make decisions.

4. **Faculty dominance** occurs when the faculty is solely responsible for making the decision, and the final decision is accepted by the administration.
5. **Administrator primacy** occurs when an administrator is responsible for making the decision but is expected to consult or confer with appropriate faculty.

6. **Faculty primacy** occurs when the faculty is primarily responsible for making the decision but must confer or consult with the administration.

7. **Shared authority** occurs when both faculty and administration mutually agree on the final decision.

8. **Consultation** is a formal procedure or established practice that provides a means for the faculty (as a whole or through authorized representatives) to present its judgment in the form of recommendations, votes, or other expressions sufficiently explicit to record the positions taken by the faculty. This explicit expression of faculty judgment must take place in time to affect the decision to be made. Initiative for the expression of faculty judgment may come from the faculty, the administration, or the board.

**Limitations of the Study**

The primary limitations of the study concern the constituents, the sample, the participants, timing, and the ability to generalize. The practical restrictions that are involved with an in-depth study limited this study to Texas and to six small private black colleges, which result in the following limitations.
1. The important influence of students and trustees in academic governance is acknowledged. The exclusion of these constituent groups should not be interpreted as a derogation of their significance. It is hoped that a clarification of faculty-administration relationships will be beneficial to future studies on the involvement of other constituent groups in governance practices.

2. All institutions chosen are members of the Texas Association of Developing Colleges. These are all black, all private, and all similar in student population. It is recognized that an element of bias is introduced through such selection procedures.

3. Although individuals who are actively involved in the governance practices were asked to respond to the questionnaires, their selection was made by the dean (vice president of academic affairs) at each college. Here again, the possibility of some slight bias is appreciated.

4. The hazards of attempting to generalize to a population of forty-one from a sample of six is recognized. Mainly, the study can reveal the situation only at the institutions studied.

5. The variable of size is a limitation. Institutions in this study fell within the small to intermediate range of 500 to 1,100 full-time students at all levels.

6. Finally, the selected issues are a justifiable limitation. Conclusions can be drawn only on the five issues
investigated in the study. These particular issues were chosen purposely on the basis on high salience to both the faculty and the administration. Other issues might produce different results.

The Research Instrument

The classification scheme of the American Association for Higher Education is used to categorize governance conditions at the institutions in this study: "The model can be used to evaluate the allocation of authority with respect to specific issues or to describe the general state of the faculty-administration relations on a campus" (1, p. 14). In order to measure that distribution task, a five-zone continuum was designed that is composed of administrative dominance, administrative primacy, shared authority, faculty primacy, and faculty dominance.

Specifically, the continuum permits only two major distinctions in authority—divided separately (separate jurisdiction) or shared proportionately (joint participation). Divided exclusively between either the faculty or the administration, governance patterns fit either extreme of the continuum. Authority is exclusively divided when the separate constituents, in this case faculty and administrators, wholly control certain areas described as their jurisdictions, managed without any mutual collaboration or negotiation with the other constituent (6, p. 2). When
authority is shared jointly by the two constituents, it falls somewhere between the ends of the AAHE continuum into one of the three interior zones, depending upon the proportion allotted each constituency. The center zone encompasses almost equally shared authority.

Therefore, prior to assigning an issue or institution to any zone of the AAHE distribution of authority continuum, the constituency participation of each of six procedural stages were evaluated since, theoretically, any of the six stages could be the decisive one. It is assumed that reconstruction of the participation of each constituency reveals at which stage the decisive authority is exercised and by whom.

Based upon this assumption, a series of inquiries was designed for each stage to elicit factual responses from any individual on his or her participation in the decision-making process on the five issues (appointment, promotion, tenure, merit increase, and curriculum change) under investigation. The quantity and quality of participation in the decision stages determines the process of governance at the institutions. The questionnaire method is then used to collect the data.

Procedures for Collection of Data

The researcher chose (because of the smallness in size of the participating institutions) to use all faculty and
and administrators as the population of the study. It is recognized that the two constituencies are difficult to define unequivocally because at times their responsibilities could overlap. Individuals were classified into one of the two groups substantially on the basis of their primary (65%) responsibilities in either teaching or administration. In all cases, department chairmen were included as part of the administration. A total of 247 questionnaires were distributed to faculty and administrators. As a matter of course, the president, vice president or dean of academic affairs, and the vice president or dean of liberal arts or applied arts were automatically included, as well as department or division chairmen.

The vice president in charge of academic affairs in each institution arranged for the distribution of the questionnaires. No manipulation was evident since all suggested substitutes were readily incorporated in the sample. With the relatively small group of persons who are ultimately and intimately involved in academic decision-making at the institutions studied, a high proportion (if not all) of the probable participants were serviced, thereby obtaining an accurate description of the governance process.

Not too surprisingly, a few respondents disagreed with the majority of descriptions of issues or governance relationships, but with the help of the supplementary documentary analysis and subsequence cross-checking, an accurate and
reliable delineation was produced. In most issues instances, participation and control are clearly determined. In some few others, the situations are not easily allocated to a particular zone.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Respondents were asked to describe sequentially their participation in the six stages of each issue as well as judge the involvement of other personnel. Responses of faculty members and administrators were recorded using the model to assist in the determination of the distribution of authority. Control by the administration suggests the administrative dominance end of the continuum; faculty control indicates the faculty dominance extreme. Somewhat equal control falls in the center zone of shared authority. Varying modifications fall between three areas into the intermediate zones of administrative primacy in one direction and faculty primacy in the other. The responses of the faculty and administrators from the six institutions were recorded using the five separate points on the continuum. The responses are summarized by issue and by institution. Similarities and differences are identified by percentage of responses and related to each research question.

Organization of the Study

This study is presented in five chapters. In Chapter I, the problem, purposes, and general design of the study are
introduced and explanations are offered regarding the importance and need for the study, Chapter II consists of a synthesis of related literature and research for private and public colleges. In Chapter III, methodology, sampling the instrumentation of the study, and the collection and treatment of the data are included. Chapter IV contains the analyses of data and interpretation of the data findings. A summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research are presented in Chapter V.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

There has been a debate in the relevant literature, which started before the beginning of this century, as to whether or not the faculty of a college should be represented on the governing board of the institution. This debate is most often initiated by the professors who, having grown in importance and prestige, are impatient over their lack of participation in the governance of the institution. These professors see themselves as disenfranchised and exploited. They are critical of a governing structure they perceive as being under the control of educational executives who have little understanding of or appreciation for academic matters, particularly academic freedom.

Although the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) shies away from endorsing faculty representation on governing boards as the solution to this problem (2) many individual faculty members are less timid. Occasionally, the faculty is joined by administrators who endorse such representation, possibly out of a belief that the president and the administration need academic allies in dealing with a lay board. Some critics are eager to see broader board
representation by other groups (including faculty) that are, typically, not on such boards. A few of the more zealous advocate complete control of the governing board by faculty or by students and faculty. Others are content to recommend the addition of one or more faculty members on an existing board (2).

Advocacy of faculty trusteeship, however, remains a minority opinion in all sectors of higher education, particularly among lay trustees. Participation in the governance of an institution of higher education is not limited to the board of control. Most of the activities of governance in which faculty can and do participate are not the same as those of governing boards. This chapter includes a general overview and a review of the bases for participation. It deals with the participants, their roles, and the results of participation.

General Overview of Faculty Participation in Academic Governance

In 1967, one year after publication of the AAUP statement on issues and institutions (4), the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) [which at that time was affiliated with the National Education Association (NEA)] issued a report by its Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations entitled Faculty Participation in Academic Governance (2). Like the AAUP statement, this AAHE report stresses that "the concept of shared authority
should underlie an effective system of academic governance" (2, p. 23). The task for institutions of higher education is not to question "the faculty's ability to participate in decision-making, but to develop procedures that will promote the most constructive exercise of this influence" (2, p. 23). The report also recommends that the faculty should be allowed to choose the appropriate means of formulating and presenting their views on all issues that require a sharing of authority between the faculty and the administration. Collective bargaining, which will be discussed in a later section of this chapter, is included as an appropriate means of sharing authority between faculty and administrators (2, p. 23).

Similarly, this task force recognizes that the functions performed by the constituencies (the administrators and the faculty) determine the amount of authority they could exercise. A fundamental point of this AAHE report (which is similar to that of the AAUP statement) is the stated belief that "authority should not be shared equally between the faculty and the administration on all issues" (2, p. 24). The AAHE report also stresses that on certain issues the faculty voice is dominant while on others the administration should exercise the dominant decision-making authority.

On a wide range of educational and economic questions decision-making should be a joint process. "Shared authority" is thus recognized as a model concept
which established the right of faculty participation while recognizing that in some substantive areas one party or the other may assume the major burden of decision-making (2, p. 24).

The AAHE report (2), much like the earlier AAUP statement, supports the idea of shared authority generally and describes two basic options for institutional decision-making even with the inclusion of collective bargaining. The two options are the distribution of authority proportionately on some issues and separately on others, i.e., joint participation (shared authority) or separate jurisdiction (dominant authority).

Keeton (36, p. 147), in his report of a survey on academic governance at nineteen campuses, makes five recommendations about the criteria for a governance system that is likely to be effective. First, the authority structure should reflect a genuine commitment to enfranchise constituencies previously unrepresented or underrepresented. Second, the process and prerogatives in governing should be designed to foster the cooperation of each constituency. Third, the system should provide effective means for constituencies to be heard and heeded at the levels and loci where final decisions are made. Fourth, the system should provide mechanisms of accommodation short of coercion and violence. And fifth, the process should be more flexible than in the past. Despite all of this, Keeton concludes simply that "sharing authority can take two basic forms:
deciding some things jointly and dividing the labor on others" (36, p. 147). In accordance with the two earlier statements, then, authority would be proportionately shared or jurisdictionally separate.

Although these three statements contain certain imprecise or inconsistent terminology, they share some common recommendations about the distribution of authority. On the whole, they all support the idea of institutional constituencies sharing decision-making authority. Faculty involvement is not the question; the question is how, how much, when, and about what issues the involvement should occur. Constituencies must participate cooperatively, effectively, early, often, and at meaningful decision-making levels. And finally, since constituent concern and issue interest vary, all three statements recommend that authority be shared flexibly through one of two basic forms—joint participation or separate jurisdiction.

As with hospitals, welfare agencies, and lower-level schools, higher education organizations are people-processing institutions. Riley and Baldridge elaborate that "clients with specific needs are fed into the institution from the environment, the institution acts upon them, and the clients are returned to larger society" (55, p. 11). This is an extremely important characteristic because the clients demand and often obtain significant input into institutional decision-making processes. Even powerless
clients, such as school children, usually have protectors, such as parents, who demand a voice in the operation of the organization. In higher education, of course, the clients are quite capable of speaking for themselves—and they often do.

Riley and Raldridge say that "colleges and universities are somewhere in the middle of a continuum from independent to captured" (55, p. 11). In many respects they are insulated from their environment. Recently, however, powerful external forces have been applied to academic institutions. Interest groups that hold conflicting values made their wishes, demands, and threats well known to administrators and faculties in the 1970s and 1980s (55, p. 11).

Academic organizations have several unique organizational characteristics. They have "ambiguous goals" that are often strongly contested; they serve people who demand a voice in the decision-making process; they have a problematic technology," for in order to serve clients their technology must be holistic and adaptable to individual needs; they are professional organizations in which employees demand a large measure of control over the institutional decision process (55, p. 11).

The character of such a complex organizational system is not satisfactorily conveyed by the standard meaning of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy carries the connotation of
stability or even rigidity; academic organizations tend to be more fluid. Bureaucracy implies distinct lines of authority and strict hierarchial commands; academic organizations have blurred lines of authority and professional employees who demand autonomy in their work. Bureaucracy suggests a cohesive organization with clear goals; academic organizations are characteristically fragmented with ambiguous and contested goals. Bureaucracy does adequately describe certain aspects of colleges and universities, such as business administration, plant management, capital outlay, and auxiliary services. But the processes at the heart of an academic organization—academic policy making, professional teaching, and research—do not resemble the process one finds in a bureaucracy (55, p. 12).

Many writers, report Riley and Baldridge, reject the bureaucratic model of the university. They seek to replace it with the model of the "collegium" or "community of scholars" (55, p. 12). This approach argues that academic decision-making should not be like the hierarchical process in a bureaucracy. Instead there should be full participation of the academic community, especially the faculty. Under this concept, the community of scholars would administer its own affairs, and bureaucratic officials would have little influence (7).
Models for Decision-Making

Pressures from faculty, students, staff, and, for that matter, trustees have converged in recent years to focus attention on the need for a workable model of shared authority and decision-making in institutions of higher learning. Thus, the Assembly on University Goals and Governance (1, p. 24) declares that good governance depends on a reasonable allocation of responsibility if the authority structure is to be credible for all major constituent groups.

Many of the crosscurrents in today's universities revolve around the relationship of responsibility to authority. Who has the authority and responsibility for university decision-making? There are various perspectives on this question with most responses being based on the collegial, the hierarchical, the political, the industrial union, or the shared authority models (20).

Blau (13, pp. 184-189) points out that the collegial model emphasizes the importance of faculty as the "key operatives of the university," with a focus on teaching and research, and with the faculty also being responsible for the supervision of a number of supporting services in the institution. In the hierarchical (or administrative or bureaucratic) model, basic decision-making authority and responsibility rest with the central administration, which is charged with the task of implementing trustee-established
goals (13, p. 83). Baldridge (5) says that in the political (or bargaining or consensus-based) model, administrators govern within a consensus that is established by broad discussion and debate. The shared authority model rests on an agreement among various interests in the university to allocate certain functions among themselves and to collaborate in the decision-making process of others (19, p. 83).

Different groups and individuals support each of the models. Although the hierarchical argument rests on logic, wherein decisions must be made with "all deliberate speed," frequently the university has no clear and agreed-upon goals; its processes, when they exist, are poorly understood and a number of its constituents have limited attachment to its purposes (18, p. 90). Corson believes that the institution, made up of constituencies that are often in conflict, requires a positive force to press for agreement on educational objectives, to assess progress regularly, and to suggest new goals and next steps (21, p. 258).

Faculty tend to react negatively to the hierarchical model and support the collegial model. Keeton points out that faculty are likely to feel, by virtue of their experience, commitment, and continuity, that they are most qualified to make campus decisions; furthermore, they argue, "faculty alone have the kinds and degree of qualifications essential to the task of college or university" (36, p. 11). Parsons says flatly, "the fundamental fact [is] that years
A number of observers point out that faculty members are not always objective on matters that affect their own welfare, and many are turning to support the political model rather than the collegial. There are major problems with the political model, however, since it is often cumbersome and slow. It requires a good sense of timing and a reasonably sophisticated leader, if the business of the institution is to get done (18, p. 91). Baratz says,

At some institutions the weaknesses of the hierarchical, collegial, and political models have led to a push by faculty for unionization. The collective bargaining mechanism sets the framework for decision making. In many ways though, unionization is not the solution to the university's authority problems. It tends to further the tendency of separate groups to argue in their own interests. Moreover, it negates the collegial underpinning of the university. Thus, a number of faculty and administrators regard the collective bargaining model an anathema (6, p. 11).

The Role of the Faculty in Academic Governance

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and its sister organizations, the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of the Universities and Colleges, have always been active in determining the role of faculty in the governance of institutions. The AAUP has long had a standing committee, Committee T, that addresses itself to college government. Perhaps the most frequently consulted document concerning
college governance is the AAUP's 1966 Statement on Government of College and Universities (4, pp. 180-185), in which the faculty's role is clearly stated. The prime responsibilities of the faculty are in areas of curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. The faculty sets the requirements for degrees, and appointment, promotion, tenure and dismissal are primarily a faculty responsibility. Finally, faculty should actively participate in the determination of policy and procedures that determine salary and salary increases.

This same AAUP document also presents a structure for faculty participation, saying, "Agencies of faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present" (4, p. 185). This is to point out that both structures and procedures should permit joint participative action by all components of the university.

Joughin (34, pp. 33-66) suggests that faculty participation in institutional governance can play a major part in recruiting new and retaining esteemed faculty. Likert points out that "shifts toward system four [participatory] are accompanied by long range improvements in productivity, labor relations, cost and earnings" (41, p. 31). Perhaps Richardson, Blocker, and Bender sum it up best when discussing their participatory model of governance.
Objectives are developed jointly, with the result that there is substantial commitment to their achievement by all members within the organization, and corresponding satisfaction of higher-level needs is not exclusively the province of administrators but is shared with faculty and students (54, p. 11).

Mason supports the 1966 statement in his discussion of implied shared authority.

The faculty and the administration particularly participate jointly in influence and decision-making—the model makes the faculty predominant in issues where its special knowledge or status so required (43, p. 7).

The AAUP has long believed in faculty participation in college governance. The first recommendation of Committee T's final report (4) on their 1953 study points out this fact very clearly.

The committee wishes again to suggest, as it did following the study in 1939, that accrediting agencies be urged to recognize, among the criteria for judgment of educational institutions, the importance of procedures which provide adequately for faculty participation wherever such participation will be useful. The kinds of consultation employed within a college or university are exceedingly significant as evidence of the quality of the intellectual environment with which the specific institution provides members of its faculty (3, p. 64).

The AAUP appears to be seeking support from accrediting agencies, and other groups have supported them in their quest. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (16, pp. 41-56) gave a high priority to the recommendation that "faculties should be granted, where they do not already have it, the general level of authority as recommended by the American Association of University Professors" (16, p. 41).
Faculty members generally have strong views about what should be their role in decision-making. To assess these views in a quantifiable fashion, Begin (8) asked faculty members what the faculty's role should be in six broad areas of institutional decision-making: academic affairs, personnel matters, financial affairs, capital improvements, student affairs, and public and alumni relations. Five choices were presented that represent varying degrees of influence from, at one extreme, almost complete faculty discretion (the faculty should always or almost always determine such matters) to no faculty involvement (the faculty has no role) at the other (23).

The academic affairs area of decision-making is defined as involving such matters as degree requirements, curricula, student admission requirements, and academic standards. Predictably, respondents prescribed a role of overwhelming influence for the faculty in such matters; 865 said that decisions in this area, as a minimum, should "usually be determined by the faculty" (8, p. 11). All of the remaining respondents think the proper role of the faculty in academic matters is to make recommendations to the administration, but many made this lesser choice on practical grounds. They felt that it is unrealistic to expect professors to take time from their teaching and research for involvement in decision-making even in the area of academic affairs (8, p. 13).
When asked what they think the faculty's role should be in faculty personnel matters including appointments, promotions, dismissals, and the awarding of tenure, faculty members stated a belief that their colleagues tend to permit friendships and personal biases to influence their decisions unduly. This concern was voiced frequently, especially among those who believe that the faculty's proper role is advisory. But in promotions, the granting of tenure, and especially in dismissals, concern was frequently expressed over the tendency of the faculty to become "soft in the head." In the decisions, administrative involvement is perceived as a balancing factor and as a protection against improper influences. Still, nearly 70 per cent of the faculty members interviewed believe that faculty wishes should, as a minimum, "usually" be controlling in decisions about personnel matters (10).

AAHE (2) reports that students of higher learning have noted the impracticality of separating decisions in academic affairs (and in other areas in which the desirability of faculty influence is generally acknowledged) from decisions about finance, for which faculty prerogatives are less well accepted. It is impossible to divide faculty and administrative prerogatives along educational and budgetary lines as if they are unrelated; "educational planning is meaningless without budgetary implementation" (2, p. 31).
Clearly, faculty members are reticent to assign themselves a determining role; only 11 per cent of one sample felt faculty influence should be decisive in financial affairs, compared to 86 per cent who felt this way about academic affairs (2). The connection between educational decisions and financial decisions is, at best, quite evanescent in the minds of many faculty members, who repeatedly show a strong tendency to view educational and financial affairs as two different worlds. As a result, Clark reports (17, pp. 44-45) prerogatives are assigned respectively to the faculty and the administration on the rather simplistic assumption that everything educational belongs to the former and everything financial to the latter.

The faculty's proper role in capital improvement matters (buildings, other physical facilities, and grounds) does not differ greatly from its role in financial affairs. Many believe the faculty is uniquely qualified to make decisions about capital improvements. The faculty is best able to judge what new facilities are needed and the order in which they should be provided; after all, the faculty lives and works in them (20, p. 45).

In comparison with research, teaching, and other professional interests, student affairs rank very low in the academician's system of priorities. Pressed for time and realizing their lack of competence in a specialized way,
most faculty members willingly concede to professionally trained student personnel workers the primary responsibility for each decision (20, p. 45).

**Arguments in Favor of Faculty Participation**

The principal argument of those who advocate faculty participation in decision-making is that every unit of government in a democracy, including the government of an academic institution, requires the representation and the consent of the governed for its authority; this, according to Dykes (23), is the concept of the representative board. In this theory, the faculty has what amounts to an inalienable right to a voice in the formulation of the policies of the institution of which they are members. Dykes feels that having no representative or representatives on the decision-making board disenfranchises the faculty, relegating them to the status of second-class citizens, which, Dykes contends, results in a lack of initiative and self-confidence, and contributes to lowering the general social status and esteem of college professors. The academic president, according to this view, is not able to act satisfactorily as the faculty's representative for at least two reasons. First, the president is not elected by, and therefore is not responsible to, the faculty; second, since he is not really one of the faculty,
he is not able to reflect or convey the opinions and interests of the professors (23).

This concept is also advanced by Bucklew, who says,

It is essential, for many reasons, that there be open communication between the faculty and the administration of the institution; otherwise they are too remote from each other's thinking. The best way to provide this communication is to have faculty participation in the decision-making process. Communication can take place without such representation, but it is apt to be furtive, brief and either inconsequential or distorted. Chance remarks between trustees and faculty at receptions and social gatherings take on disproportionate significance. How much better to have a regular and formal avenue of communication in the full participation of faculty in the decision-making process (15, p. 22).

Another argument in support of faculty participation, American custom and law to the contrary, is that the faculty is the university and should therefore be represented in, if not dominate through faculty participation, college governance. Dykes reasons that "the essence of an academic institution . . . is the teaching and research done by the faculty. Without the faculty, an institution would cease to exist" (23, p. 28). Other countries, notably England, recognize the importance of faculty by granting them greater autonomy in the conduct of their affairs. The least that should be done in this country to remedy the situation is to grant faculty representation in governance (23, p. 28).
Arguments against Faculty Participation

Likert's (41) argument against faculty participation depends on the fact that in institutions that have governing boards, the basic charter or statute contains a proscription against faculty membership on the governing boards. One such institution is Columbia University, whose original charter was amended in 1810 to include a provision that "no . . . professor, tutor, or other assistant officer, shall ever be a trustee" (41, p. 29). Elliot and Chambers discuss a publication of the Association of Governing Boards which reports that "the provision that faculty members cannot be elected trustees remains in force at Columbia" (25, p. 15). Similar provisions against faculty participation on governing boards exist at Lehigh University, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Oberlin College, the University of Oregon, and the University of Wyoming (25, pp. 17-23).

State legislatures have, from time to time, enacted legislation prohibiting faculty from membership on governing boards, and such membership has been denied by virtue of legal opinion even where no specific legislation existed. An example of the former is a New York law of 1876 that declares that no professor or tutor on any incorporated academy should be a trustee of such academy (38). An example of the latter is a recent ruling by Frank Kelly, attorney general of the State of Michigan,
that it would constitute a conflict of interest for faculty members to serve on the governing boards of any Michigan state supported college or university (31, p. 1).

In addition to statutes, laws, and legal opinions, which in some institutions prohibit faculty representation on the governing boards, "it may be said that custom has excluded faculty members from membership in the governing bodies of the colleges almost universally and almost as effectively as statutes would do it" (39, p. 175). Custom, however, is buttressed by argument and by the voice of respected authorities at frequent intervals.

Over a decade before its student crisis of 1968, the Board of Trustees of Columbia University felt itself under some pressure to evaluate its role and composition, and it appointed a special committee of trustees to consider faculty involvement in academic governance. Rejecting the concept of faculty representation, the committee reports,

This Committee does not believe a more satisfactory composition of boards of trustees will be achieved merely by adding faculty to these boards because they are faculty...... That the administration of university affairs is quite a different matter from the pursuit of learning is indeed a statement to which this committee assents, believing also that high aptitudes for both are seldom found in the same person................The Committee rejects any idea of proportional representation on the Board as among professions, social classes, or special interests of any kind. The idea that "executives," "labor," "the professions" or other such group should have "spokesmen"
implies an inability to achieve the disinterestedness that is essential to the governing of a university (50, p. 430).

This concept was accepted by the entire board of Columbia when it adopted the committee's report.

Another governing board to consider and reject faculty representation is the University of Pennsylvania's. Its board appointed an outside consultant, Donald Belcher (10), an executive of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, to study and evaluate its policies and practices. Belcher saw the matter in organizational and managerial terms; the board saw the matter as the board having the authority to delegate authority to the president and hold him accountable. Belcher reports,

That a faculty representative should be present (at board meetings) to argue with the President, or even as a "watch dog" to report the President's performance back to the faculty is clearly contrary to all principles of good organization . . . . I recommend that no member of the faculties of this University be added to its Board of Trustees, whether by faculty or by Board action (10, p. 43).

Evidently the faculty at Pennsylvania saw the matter the same way. A member of the faculty of that institution is sanguine in his report to the AAUP.

The proposal has been advanced at various times that a member of the University faculty be accorded a seat on the Board of Trustees: but an ad hoc committee of the University Senate appointed recently to consider the whole subject of relations between trustees and faculty recommended unanimously against this proposal as having more disadvantages than advantages. This recommendation was accepted without dissent by the University Senate . . . . In general the faculty seems to be satisfied to have the President represent its interests in dealing with the Trustees (46, p. 114).
The Board of Trustees of Northwestern University also has considered and denied voting membership to both students and faculty. In this instance, however, both the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Student Forum had been supplicants for this privilege. The special committee of the board which considered these requests was reported as having explained only that student and faculty memberships "would not be appropriate" (1, p. 1).

Kingman Brewster, Jr. (14), the president and presiding officer of the governing body of Yale University, also considered and rejected the concept of faculty trusteeship. "Representation of faculty, students, or anyone else directly affected by their [the governing board's] decision(s) would immediately corrupt the essence of trusteeship and turn it into a legislative forum of 'blocs'" (14, p. 20). This understanding of the board (as being constituted of disinterested lay trustees who represent the public) is shared by Eberle.

The lay board concept and process is desirable because the reason for the operation of a higher education institution is to fulfill a public function. Therefore, those who interpret and state the public's (and publics') interests in the educational enterprises must have as few vested interests as possible. This lay concept should be strengthened rather than weakened if higher education's responsibility to society is to be fulfilled. Much needs to be done to strengthen it. Proposals to place students and faculty on lay boards do not provide the requisite strength (24, p. 32).
Although the argument regarding conflict of interest is the principal and most frequently cited objection to the inclusion of faculty representation on the governing board, various other objections have been advanced in recent years. Corson, for example, is concerned about "the time such participation takes away from the faculty member's primary job research and instruction (21, p. 81). Dibden is concerned that a faculty trustee would be apt to "violate . . . the proper privacy of the two authority groups to which the member belong[s]" (22, p. 347).

In the literature on faculty trusteeship and participation in the decision-making process, there is one evaluation of the actual workings of faculty representation on the governing board of a specific institution. Marcham (12, pp. 615-617), who for five years was faculty representative of the Board of Trustees of Cornell University, wrote an article just prior to the time when the faculty representative on the Cornell Board of Trustees was given voting rights (faculty representatives had been non-voting adjuncts to the board for almost forty years). Marcham attempts to evaluate those four decades of experience and his part in it. He reports that the faculty representatives regularly attended all meetings and informal social gatherings of the board where they were treated with respect and goodwill by the other trustees. The faculty
representatives attempted conscientiously to contribute to the decision-making process within the context of the board.

Nevertheless, Marcham concludes, faculty representation on the Board of Trustees of Cornell University was something of an empty symbol, a not-very-meaningful gesture of cooperation. He suggests that faculty representation on the board neither fulfilled the expectations of its initial advocate (President Jacob Gould Schurman, who welcomed allies in presenting academic issues to a lay governing board), nor the faculty's hope that it would thereby gain an effective voice in policy formulation and determination (12).

Part of the problem, as Marcham sees it, is that the Board of Trustees itself had become relatively powerless. Faculty representation, he laments, "can do little more than join the faculty, itself a relatively powerless group, to a board which has little influence on the development of the university" (12, p. 621). The real power, he alleges, is held by the administration, particularly the president and his assistants. The agenda, which was distributed five or six days before meetings, consisted of individual items on which the president would request specific action. Not only was there little or no attempt to formulate general policy questions out of
these specific items of business, but the president's proposals were almost invariably approved by the board.

Not only were the faculty representatives and other trustees relatively unfamiliar with the specific agenda items, but the president had the authority of his office behind him and could turn any issue into an overt or covert vote of confidence. "Only once," in Marcham's experience as a trustee, "did the faculty representatives succeed in persuading the trustees to support their views against those of the president" (12, p. 619). Marcham accuses the president of acting without consulting either the faculty or other members of his administration.

Another facet of the problem involved the faculty and the faculty representatives. Once elected, the representatives acted as individuals without consulting or reporting to their constituency.

**Motivations for Faculty Participation**

Among the theorists in motivation research, Maslow (43, pp. 90-91) has formulated a positive theory of human motivation. He believes that satisfaction of self-esteem needs, and the desire for reputation or prestige, status, recognition, importance or appreciation, leads to feelings of self-confidence, worth, and adequacy. Herzberg (33, pp. 53-57) points out that satisfiers are achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility,
advancement, and growth. Richardson and Bender (31) recognize the importance of motivation in the shared authority model of governance; they say,

The strength of the shared authority models rest with the values they promote, their flexibility in dealing with the need for change and their ability to motivate members to function at higher levels of commitment (53, p. 22).

The first motivational influence toward participation, a sense of personal duty, is idealistic and somewhat altruistically oriented, while the second, protection of faculty interest, suggests a self-seeking, egotistic outlook. The first apparently stems from the academician's image of himself as an independent professional serving the high ideals of faculty autonomy and freedom in teaching and scholarship through his participation. The second comes from a desire to secure personal or departmental vested interests ("nothing motivates the academician like his interests in his own bailiwick"). The third-ranked influence, desire for a voice in decisions affecting faculty, is rooted in the basic ethos of American culture (23, p. 60).

A feeling of responsibility to the university ranks fourth as a motivational force. The importance accorded this item is somewhat surprising, in view of the surfeit of publications that proclaim the current orientation of the professor to scholarship and his disciplinary peers,
and his declining interest in and loyalty to his institution (48, p. 11). Although a sense of institutional responsibility is not a primary motivating force, it clearly carries some weight. Moreover, it cannot be assumed that only the "locally" oriented faculty members are motivated (38, p. 59).

There are some professors who regard participation as an obligation and are willing to devote time to it. But it is suggested that these are the older, more established members of the faculty who have a relatively long identification with the university. Younger faculty members appear to be much less affected. Kerr (38, p. 59) contends that faculty members' concern with the general welfare of the university is eroded and they become tenants rather than owners as a result of the new ecology of the multiversity.

Some faculty members think that their colleagues participate because they like the influence it brings, and some feel this is the primary influence in actuating some faculty. "Ten to twenty per cent of the faculty members who participate are motivated purely by a desire for power" (38, p. 60).

Dykes (23) observes that the low influence attributed to promotions and salary increments as motivating forces results from the fact that participation in decision-making and involvement in institutional affairs are relatively inefficacious means of securing advancement. It
is pointed out that if participation really were important in promotion and salary increases, there would be much more of it, although "some people, who don't measure up in teaching and scholarship, try to make themselves by being good, solid citizens of the university" (38, p. 60). The factor of personal enjoyment and sense of accomplishment is, on balance, of only minor importance as a motive. "A true scholar detests such distractions" (38, p. 60).

Other minor motives for participation are (a) it is expected of the faculty, (b) it brings recognition from the administration, and (c) it gives status with the faculty. One professor, summarizing the prevailing view about the influence of expectations, says, "It doesn't make a damn what is expected, the faculty couldn't care less" (56, p. 128). Moreover, declining to participate may be a reverse way for the individual faculty member to assert his power (56, p. 128).

Recognition from the administration is similarly dismissed as a significant motive, except for the relatively few faculty members who have administrative ambitions. "The would-be administrators participate to attract attention to themselves" (23, p. 61). An implication is that such faculty members are seeking an outlet for ambitions that are blocked by their incompetence in scholarship.
There is a myth that the administrator cannot write because of the demands placed on him; therefore, he doesn't. Many people who can't meet scholarship requirements thus go into administration. Participation becomes an escape valve; if one can't write or do research, he can escape into administration by making himself available through participation in the affairs of the institutions (23, p. 61).

Finally, the wish to secure status with the faculty is viewed as having negligible influence as a motive. Dykes (23) believes that academicians do not achieve status with their peers through participation in decision-making involvement in institutional affairs, but rather through disciplinary standings and by their reputations as scholars or researchers. For this reason, there is a tendency to denigrate the efforts of those who become involved.

The Need for Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision-Making

Four basic arguments can be advanced to justify the need to have faculty participation in college governance. First, there is the tenet that a government is established by the consent of those governed. Second, the Jeffersonian ideal claims that the competence of the ordinary citizen is a valid claim for participation in government. Third, research (11, p. 69) in the behavioral sciences demonstrates the great importance of involving the personnel of an organization more fully in the decision-making process. Fourth, participation in governance by groups can improve the quality of the decision made.
There are several ways to approach the idea that governments are established by the consent of those governed. Perhaps the most common is that of trying to satisfy the pressures of the respective interest groups. Richardson, Blocker, and Bender begin by pointing out that authority is and should be by consent; they "draw some brief conclusions concerning the implications that authority depends upon the assent of those governed" (54, p. 20).

Perhaps the most pressing questions in American universities today are those concerned with the interaction of authority, responsibility, governance, and leadership. Changes in society and on campuses are causing a reexamination of patterns of university government.

After examining existing patterns of university governance in light of campus pressures, analyzes the development of a form of decision-making that has been labeled "creative management" (18, pp. 89-90). This method of governance centers on an informed and thoughtful administration and an administrative leadership that is willing to decide and act when necessary. In order to function, this involves widespread consultation, inclusion of the university's various constituencies in decision-making on complex matters, and primacy in decision-making for each constituency in its special area of competence (18).
Areas of Faculty Participation

Cleary (18) points out that faculty traditionally participate in five areas that include (a) departmental staff meetings, (b) ad hoc faculty committees, (c) standing faculty committees, (d) the faculty senate, and (e) the local chapter of the AAUP.

Dykes (23, p. 65) found that, except for departmental staff meetings, none of the five areas is rated either very high or very low in usefulness. All five areas are thought to have some value but none, including departmental staff meetings, is uniformly useful as an instrument of participation.

Departmental staff meetings are most useful in providing opportunity for participation primarily because it is there that most decisions of real consequence to the individual professor are settled. One observer says "Just as water will always find its own proper level, so will a professor find the point or points at which his participation is important to him . . . . The department is apt to be at the very center of attention of most members of the faculty" (27, p. 11). Other faculty, in essence, agree. Departmental meetings, they repeat, are where "important decisions are made" and where the faculty finds out "what's really going on," and decisions made at the departmental level are "readily transferable into action" (27, p. 11).
Clearly, the effective and meaningful participation that many faculty members experience at the departmental level is a major source of satisfaction. The personal, face-to-face relationships among colleagues and among faculty members and administrators at this level contribute to a sense of personal involvement in decision-making that is lacking in other levels of participation.

Faculty committees are regarded as useful devices for securing faculty participation, especially in large departments and at the college and campus-wide levels where meetings of the whole faculty are impractical. Faculty senates labor under a severe disability in their capacity to provide opportunities for participation because of the exclusion of junior faculty members. In addition, their efficacy as a deliberative and decision-making body is frequently questioned, and their proceedings are not matters of widespread interest. A few think that a faculty senate's important function is to "constrain an ambitious administration" and pointed out that "it can, if necessary, even rebuke the President" (23, p. 67).

Ranked last among the devices, the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors is nonetheless credited with some usefulness, especially in decisions that concern faculty renumeration, personal matters, and issues of academic freedom. Many faculty respondents perceive the AAUP not a device to be used
under normal circumstances but as a court of lost resort; "it is a good safety valve; a place to go when all else fails" (23, p. 68).

Degree of Faculty Satisfaction with Its Role in Decision-Making

One major determinant of satisfaction or dissatisfaction is the relationship the faculty perceives between its conception of what its roles in decision-making ideally should be and what it believes its role is in reality. If the faculty perceives little correlation between its idealized role and its actual role, there is a high probability of dissatisfaction. Conversely, little or no disparity between the idealized and actual roles should produce satisfaction.

Dykes (23, p. 69) indicates that a discrepancy does, in fact, exist between certain respondents' conception of the faculty's ideal role in decision-making and its actual role. Only 2 per cent of the population of Dykes' study think the actual role of the faculty matches their conception of its ideal role.

Comments from these faculty members suggested that the discrepancy is primarily attributable to two related convictions—(a) that the faculty's actual involvement in decision-making is for the most part focused on rather insignificant matters, and (b) that the faculty should have a larger, more active, and more influential role in
the decision-making processes. According to those inter-
viewed, the truth of their first conviction renders
impossible the attainment of the second (23).

The interviewees complained about time consuming
committee work; the burden of keeping informed about
departmental, college, and institutional affairs; the
difficulty of finding time for meetings; the frustrations
of trying to secure agreement among strong-willed and
sometimes obstreperous faculty members; the agonizingly
slow workings of faculty government; and the academician's
propensity for haggling over details. Most respondents
recognize these points as obstacles to the more active,
more influential, and larger role they desire for the
faculty. There were few suggestions about how to overcome
these difficulties (23).

Clark (17) records that the faculty's unsatisfactory
role in decision-making is often blamed on the "administra-
tion." Judging from free comments, fully 25 per cent of
the faculty members in his study cite "administrative
aggrandizement" for what they see as the faculty's inade-
quate involvement and lack of influence. Others, more
cynical, blame administrative machinations.

On the other hand, Hedgepeth (32, p. 694) discovered
that an equal number of respondents suggests that consci-
centious efforts by various administrative officers to
secure meaningful faculty participation in decision-making
contributes significantly to faculty satisfaction. This idea comes especially from those who think that the faculty's role (while not what it ideally should be) is about what could be expected, given the existing conditions of higher education. Apparently, many of these people not only hold the administration blameless for the deficiencies in the faculty's role but, in fact, believe the administration is trying to secure for the faculty a more viable role in decision-making. Some respondents in this group place the responsibility for inadequate involvement squarely on faculty members themselves (32).

As universities grow larger and more complex, they tend to take on characteristics of other large organizations; structural superordination and subordination are accentuated, rules and regulations become more apparent, hierarchical authority increases, and universities move away from the characteristics of community and collegiality. This is recognized by Kerr (38, p. 59) who believes that universities "have become more bureaucratic."

One result of bureaucratization is that decisions tend increasingly to be placed in the hands of specialized experts who are somewhat removed from the rank-and-file members of the organization. As Clark (17, pp. 44-45) notes, specialists are appointed to various areas of administration, given authority, and expected to make decisions by the rulebook. Thus, in most large
organizations, a tug of war is engendered between administrators and staff professionals over who will make which decisions.

Collective Bargaining on the Campus

The faculty role in academic governance at institutions of higher education remains a topic of controversy, ambiguity, and misunderstanding among the faculty themselves, administrators and, more recently, state legislators. The events of the past decade have further clouded the issues, for over 120,000 faculty on approximately 600 campuses are now unionized (26, 30). Since 80 per cent of the colleges that have faculty bargaining agents are two-year colleges or former state teachers colleges that lack long histories of strong faculty involvement in governance, it is difficult to make comparisons with institutions where faculty influence has been relatively effective (9).

The research literature about collective bargaining and faculty-administration relations tends to become adversarial. Ladd and Lipset report that Observers argue that faculty unionization has increased the sense of an adversary relationship between faculty members and administrators, as well as between faculty unions and students. It seems clear that the advent of faculty participation in the decision-making process does change the role and image of groups within the academic community (39, p. 11).

Research (40, p. 566) on collective bargaining is beginning to address the effect on unionization upon
academic governance in its various manifestations (such as senates, departmental committees, and other decision-making mechanisms). Begin's (9, p. 582) study of twenty-six unionized institutions found that the faculty senates which predated unions were healthy and not significantly threatened by union enroachment. He notes the importance of contextual and individual institutional factors in accounting for much of the effect on unionization upon an institution's governance structure. Begin found, for example, that pre-unionization governance practices, the ability of traditional governance mechanisms to address institutional problems, and attitudes of administration and union leaders toward governance played an important role in the effects of unionization upon an institution's governance system (8, 9). Katz's (35) study of unionization at Temple University considers the institution's history and faculty characteristics in analyzing the effect of unionization upon academic governance. A case study (32) of a unionized New York college notes loss of confidence in the peer evaluation process and concludes that unionization exacerbated the already-existing adversarial faculty-administration relationship.

The latest approaches to the study of faculty unionization examine structural changes in governance systems subsequent to unionization. Mortimer and associates (45) completed several studies of academic collective bargaining
both on a national level and within the state of Pennsylvania. Mortimer's 1972 study with Lozier (46) of unionized governance found a "homogenization" of faculty status and power, while a later study with Richardson (47) notes the importance of presidential attitude in facilitating union-administration cooperation. A different approach was used by Kemerer and Baldridge (37), who surveyed presidents and union chairpersons of all unionized two- and four-year institutions. They found a democratizing of status among faculty and saw a trend toward standardization and quantification of evaluation procedures for promotion and tenure.

Kemerer and Baldridge (37, pp. 64-65) cite as primary motivations for faculty unionization (a) the preservation of existing decision-making power and autonomy, and (b) the desire of "deprived" faculty at other institutions to acquire decision-making power and autonomy. In Lee's (40) study several respondents at two institutions also indicated that a subordinante motive for many pro-union votes is the faculty's displeasure with presidents who make numerous decisions without consulting the faculty.

Faculty at neither of the private liberal arts colleges which were studied by Lee (40) had ever been afforded an effective role in campus decision-making. Presidents of both institutions were seen as paternalistic and had bitterly opposed faculty unionization. In both cases, faculty saw unionization as the only mechanism for
introducing faculty views and recommendations into the decision-making process. Although salary increases were a secondary motive in the unionization of at least two of the six institutions, respondents at all six institutions confirmed that the desire for substantial participation in academic governance was the primary motive of unionization. Impetus for unionization at the private liberal arts colleges, however, was generated internally.

After one year's experience with collective bargaining, one academic institution found that both the administration and union representatives who were interviewed characterized the consequences of the year of collective bargaining as primarily negative regardless of whether they were for, against, or neutral toward the process. The consequences involved the development of adversary relationships, truncated communication, formalized structure and procedure, and changes in the roles of the participants. Bargaining itself appeared to be approached as a competitive, exchange relationship (32, p. 691).

In the realm of relations between the administration and the faculty and staff, a cyclical effect occurred. When administrators perceived themselves as adversaries, their behavior tended to affect the faculty in ways that enhanced the latter's feelings of employer-employee divisiveness. "The cycle seems to renew itself and, as some stated, makes the campus certainly a less pleasant place and reduces everyone's effectiveness somewhat" (32, p. 705).
Ladd and Lipset indicate that union spokesmen repeatedly denied that formal collective bargaining will result in the replacement of 'collegial' relations with administrators by 'adversary' ones. Yet four years of negotiations . . . have clearly exacerbated the relationships" (39, p. 87).

Others also report the tendency toward adversary relations with the advent of collective bargaining (29, pp. 1-20; 30, p. 2; 57, pp. 6-7).

Formalized rules and procedures have become more plentiful as collective bargaining has arrived on the campus. The advent of faculty unions, with their concern for procedural due process, produces a proliferation of procedural rules that are accompanied by extensive evaluation processes and technical grievance procedures. Although bureaucratic red tape is time-consuming and brings increased paperwork, some union officials argue that some of the mandated procedures are important in ensuring fairness to all (for example, guaranteeing that department heads carry out their faculty evaluations) (37, pp. 6-7).

Although collective bargaining may or may not damage faculty-administration relations, research shows that faculty influence in local campus decision-making is probably the most significant consequence of collective bargaining for campus governance. In addition to increasing faculty influence, Kemerer and Baldridge remark on a trend that they term "democratization of influence" (37,
They report that as many institutions (where large unionized units have democratized the decision process) a "leveling action" has occurred, sometimes at the expense of previous powerholders (37, p. 7).

While faculty members' influence has reportedly increased, Kemerer and Baldridge also report that administrators perceive their own power as having decreased. They argue, however, that

despite the president's feelings of vulnerability, evidence indicates that there is actually a shift toward greater administrative power. Internally, more and more decisions are forced upward, away from departments, to the central administration (37, p. 174).

Although some campus administrations may in fact be gaining greater power as a result of collective bargaining, many administrators, particularly those on campuses within larger systems, have lost a degree of flexibility. For example, when contracts are negotiated on a statewide or system level, campus administrators may be relegated to advisory roles over matters on which they used to have final authority.

Garbarino (28) argues that the conflict of interest in decision-making relates to those matters within the scope of negotiations. Where negotiations are limited to financial matters, the conflict may ultimately be between the faculty and an external body, such as the legislative
or an executive agency of government. In such situations
the negotiations may well be directed toward obtaining
more favorable appropriations from the legislature and
may therefore have a minimal impact on faculty-administra-
tion relations.

Walters (57) discusses the comprehensive negotiations
that took place in certain Massachusetts state colleges.
Massachusetts has a board of trustees for a ten-campus
state college system. As of 1976, eight of the institu-
tions had chosen faculty bargaining agents—three chose
an affiliate of the AFT, and five chose an affiliate of
the NEA. In the initial contracts, the chief negotiator
for management was Walters, who was also deputy director
of the board of trustees. The state colleges had little
experience with faculty participation in governance, as one
would traditionally understand that term. In summary of
his views on the comprehensive negotiations, Walters says,

Comprehensive negotiations are based on the assump-
tion that the highest standards of faculty profes-
sionalism and a system of collegiality will be
preserved intact only if the union and campus repre-
sentatives can find creative ways to include campus
governance in collective bargaining without allowing
decision-making to become the exclusive property of
either the union or the institution. When the nego-
tiations began in 1969, the board of trustees pro-
posed that ways be sought in the contract to secure
for all faculty members, as well as the student
body, the status of collegial partner in the affairs
of the institution. Five assumptions were crucial to
this proposal. First, the mechanisms of governance
were to exist independently of control. Second, each
member of the faculty, whether a dues-paying member
of the union or not, would be entitled to participate
in the negotiated system of campus governance. Third, although the system of governance negotiated in the contract was advisory, its integrity would at all times be recognized by the administration. Fourth, the governance structure would be tripartite and would include faculty, students, and administration in the contractual process of decision-making. The fifth point established an exception to this fourth one recognizing the special and dominant interest of the faculty in workload, in matters affecting evaluation for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, and in the grievance procedures established by the contract. In these three areas the decision-making processes assigned a dominant role to faculty interests (57, pp. 6-7).

Summary

In this chapter, a survey of the literature was presented of the faculty and its effectiveness in the decision-making process. Under collective bargaining, the nature of faculty-administration relations in the decision-making process is a subject of much debate and little research. Since 80 per cent of the colleges that have faculty bargaining agents are two-year colleges or former state teachers colleges without long histories of strong faculty involvement in governance, it is difficult to make a comparison with institutions where faculty influence has been relatively effective.

The bases for faculty participation is presented in the argument that the primary work of an institution is the operation of an educational program; therefore, those who know most about the job—the professors—should be represented in governance. The classic argument against
this concept rests on the assumption that the function of the college's governing body is to maintain an impartial stewardship, balancing the interests of the various constituencies against public interests, which is explicit for tax-supported institutions and implicit in the privileged position of private institutions.

The reasons faculty members participate stem from the academician's (a) image of himself as an independent professional serving the high ideals of faculty autonomy and freedom in teaching and scholarship through his participation, (b) desire to secure personal or departmental vested interest, and (c) desire for a voice in decisions affecting faculty. All these reasons are rooted in the basic ethos of American culture. Research indicates that faculty participate traditionally in the five governance areas of (a) departmental staff meetings, (b) ad hoc faculty committees, (c) standing faculty committees, (d) the faculty senate, and (e) the local chapter of the AAUP.

Four basic arguments can be advanced to justify the need to have faculty participate in college governance. First, government is established by the consent of those governed. Second, the competence of the ordinary citizen is a valid claim for participation in government. Third, a fuller involvement of the personnel of an organization in the decision-making process is important, and fourth
participation in governance by groups can improve the quality of the decisions made.

The role of the participants is revealed in the competency and diversity of those who participate in the governance process. The faculty in many senses are peers of administrators. They are professional men and women, and each is an expert in his own area of knowledge. In the classroom or the laboratory where education and research takes place, the professor must play a strong role in determining institutional goals and methods.

In academic affairs, the role of the faculty is one of overwhelming influence, especially in such matters as degree requirements, curricula, student admission requirements, and academic standards. The faculty should function as a legislative branch; the administration should submit proposals and plans for decisions by the faculty and carry out the faculty's will.

Research to date indicates that the faculty's satisfaction as a result of participation in decision-making is in reality a dissatisfaction. The faculty perceives little correlation between its idealized role and its actual role.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSES

In Chapter I, the general design of the study was introduced along with the purposes, significance, and limitation of the research. Chapter III will describe in greater detail (a) the population, (b) the instrument, (c) the procedures for data collection, and (d) the analysis of the data.

Population

Six private black colleges in Texas were chosen for the research study. In actuality, there are eight black colleges in Texas. Aside from the fact that the two black colleges not represented in this study are not private institutions, the scrutiny to which the black public institutions have been subjected over the past four years calls into question the probability of obtaining their unbiased responses to the survey instrument. The faculty-administrator population of the cooperating colleges is small enough to allow the response of all faculty and administrators in each of the six participating institutions. The population of this study, therefore, consists of 194 faculty members and 53 administrators who serve a student population of 3,853.
Design and Methodology

Most surveys into institutional decision-making processes usually emphasize the well established universities (3, 5, 6, 8). Researchers have paid much less attention to community and state colleges, and almost none to small private black colleges or to their comparative differences. This oversight is particularly egregious in view of the fact that a task force of the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) (1) identified community and state colleges as the loci of the more intense discontent among faculty regarding existing governance practices. Coincidentally, these two types of institutions have been the most likely to unionize.

In recent years, the many studies that cover academic governance or institutional decision-making obviously have not focused on the particular participation of the faculty vis-a-vis the administration on certain issues; however, perhaps more importantly, such studies have neglected the possible differences in governance attributable to different religious preferences. By overlooking these potential typological differences, the studies offer incomplete, if not accurate, impressions of the governance practices for some large segments of higher education (1, p. 11). To fill a part of this gap, this study concentrates on small private black colleges.
The Issues

The AAUP emphasizes that issues will effectively determine the form of shared authority among various participants; "Difference in weight of each voice should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component (constituent) for the particular matter (issue) at hand" (2, p. 375). For this study, the issues chosen are those that do not obviously fall under either constituent's total control, such as grading procedures for faculty or business management for the administration. Five highly salient issues of potential importance to both constituencies were selected as matters over which authority should be shared, as follows:

1. APPOINTMENT: the hiring of new faculty members to fill vacated or newly created teaching positions within the institution.

2. PROMOTION: the advancement of faculty members to higher ranks on the academic scale.

3. TENURE: the awarding of the safeguard of academic freedom and permanent employment to faculty members completing successful periods of probationary service.

4. MERIT: special salary increments for faculty members recognized as performing their duties and obligations in a superior manner.

5. CURRICULUM: the modification of course offerings including description changes in existing courses as well as the introduction of entirely new programs (2, p. 375).

Most scholars agree that procedures which involve these five salient issues are of serious interest to both faculty and the administration (1, 7, 12).
Stages of Decision Making

An accurate assessment of the distribution of authority requires some recognition that participants' effectiveness is often related to the stage of the decision in which such participation occurs. The involvement of governing boards in tenure decisions may occur only at the final stage and take the form of acceptance or rejection of administrative or faculty recommendations.

The reported research divides the decision-making process into various stages and attempts to ascertain constituency involvement at each stage. In their sociological study of faculty mobility in higher education, Caplow and McGee (3) took a similar approach when they "divided the academic recruiting process into a number of stages and showed the proportion of active participation at each stage by officials in several levels of academic hierarchy" (3, p. 156). Keeton also notes the important significance of constituency participation at the appropriate stages or levels, and he recommends that "the system should provide effective means for constituencies to be heard and heeded at the level and locus where their particular concerns receive final disposition" (9, p. 147). Dahl, a political scientist, recognizes the significance and capriciousness of the process from the initiation stage to the choice stage, as well as the possibility of a crucially subsequent veto stage, when he attempted to "determine which individuals or agencies most often
initiated the proposals that were finally adopted or most often successfully vetoes the proposals of others" (4, p. 124). For the purposes of this study, the decision-making process is sequenced into initiation, consultation, recommendation, review, decision, and veto (1), as follows:

**Stage One:** *Initiation.*—Who sets the process in motion? Where does the impetus originate?

**Stage Two:** *Consultation.*—Once the process has been started, who is consulted? Does the initiator function as a separate entity or do others share in the process? Does the process go no further until a particularly persuasive individual or effective committee is consulted and, thereafter, the decision is a *fait accompli*?

**Stage Three:** *Recommendations.*—Beyond being consulted, who can make formal recommendations? An individual? A whole constituency? Combined constituencies? What happens to these recommendations? To whom are they made? What is their value? How are they handled? What is the quality of the recommendations? Does any one person's or committee's recommendation automatically decide the issue with all that goes before and after merely routine? Are informal recommendations possible and effective?

**Stage Four:** *Review.*—Does anyone review the recommendations and for what purpose? What effect does a review
function have on the recommendations already made? Can the recommendations be modified as a result of the review procedures? In what way? Here again, control can be exercised and the decision made at this particular stage if significant authority is possessed.

**Stage Five: The Decision.**—Who does make the decision or decisive choice on the issue? How? Do the prior four stages logically delimit the choice made or can an arbitrary selection be made that disregards all that preceded in the earlier phases of the process?

**Stage Six: Veto.**—Finally, when the choice has been made, can some controlling source negate all that has gone by vetoing the selection? Does such an action occur never or only rarely under the most unusual and justifiable conditions?

Effective control of any stage, but particularly the beginning and end of the process, could neutralize all other stages. Balanced involvement would constitute some form of shared authority.

The composite results of the examination of issue and stage of decision-making provides a framework for analyzing the data and making judgments about the distribution of authority. The results of the analysis permit a view of the distribution of authority by issue and institution according to the continuum (1).
Description of Model

In order to measure the distribution of authority, the Task Force (1) designed a five-zone continuum composed of administrative dominance, administrative primacy, shared authority, faculty primacy, and faculty dominance.

The design for the survey of selected institutions includes a model described by the American Association for Higher Education Task Force of 1967 which is used to analyze and evaluate the allocation of authority and the distribution with respect to specific issues, and is used to describe the general state of the faculty-administrative relations on a campus (1, p. 14).

Specifically, the continuum permits only two major distinctions in authority--divided separately (separate jurisdiction) or shared proportionately (joint participation). Divided exclusively between either the faculty or the administration, governance patterns fit either extreme of the continuum. Authority is exclusively divided when the separate constituents, in this case faculty and administrators, "wholly control certain areas described as their jurisdictions, managed without any mutual collaboration or negotiation with the other constituent" (7, p. 2). When authority is shared jointly by the two constituents, it falls somewhere between the ends of the AAHE continuum into one of the three interior zones, depending upon the proportion allotted each constituency. In the center zone, the authority would be almost equally shared.
The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument used in this study is the questionnaire developed and used by the American Association of Higher Education Task Force (1). Based upon the five-zone continuum model, a series of inquiries were designed for each stage to elicit factual responses from any individual on his or her participation in the decision-making process on the five issues (appointments, promotions, tenure, merit increase, and curriculum change) and the area of administrative matters under investigation. The quantity and quality of participation in the decision-making stages determines the process of governance at the institutions. Lindquist and Blackburn (10) and Lutz and Iannaccone (11) have publicized the significance of this assumption.

The questionnaire consists of forty-two items. There are six items under each of the five issues of appointment, promotions, tenure, merit, and curriculum. Twelve items are listed under the area of administrative matters.

The content validity of the questionnaire was tested in a pilot study administered to selected administrators and faculty of the College of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas. The questionnaire was distributed to each of the full-time faculty members and administrators of the colleges, which included department and division chairpersons and committee chairpersons.
Procedures for Collection of Data

Respondents were asked to describe sequentially their participation in the six stages of each issue as well as judge the involvement of other personnel. Responses of faculty members and administrators were recorded using the model to assist in the determination of the distribution of authority. Control by the administration suggest the administrative dominance end of the continuum; faculty control indicates the faculty dominance extreme. Somewhat equal control falls in the center zone of shared authority. Varying modifications fall between these three areas into the intermediate zones of administrative primacy in one direction and faculty primacy in the other.

Treatment of Data

A categorization was made for the group of respondents on each of the issues to correspond to the five separate points on the continuum for the six institutions. The data is presented in summations and percentages by items, stages of procedures, issues, and participating colleges. From these results, the relationships common to all of the participating colleges are presented statistically.

Summary

In this chapter, the population is described; the population is made up of the entire faculty and administrators from six private black colleges in Texas. The population
consists of 194 faculty members and 53 administrators who serve a student population of 3,853.

The design and methodology is divided into the issues and stages of decision-making. Five salient issues of potential importance to both constituencies were selected as matters over which authority should be shared. These issues are appointments, promotions, tenure, merit, and curriculum. The six stages that divide the decision-making process and the attempt to ascertain constituency involvement at each stage are initiation, consultation, recommendation, review, decision, and veto.

In order to measure the distribution of authority, a five-zone continuum was used that is composed of administrative dominance, administrative primacy, shared authority, faculty primacy, and faculty dominance. Specifically, the continuum permits only two major distinctions in authority: divided separately (separate jurisdiction) or shared proportionately (joint participation). Divided exclusively between either the faculty or the administration, governance patterns fit either extreme of the continuum.

The survey instrument used in this study is a questionnaire developed and used by the American Association of Higher Education Task Force (2). The series of questions were designed for each stage of the decision-making process to elicit factual responses based on the five-zone continuum
model. The 77 per cent response surpasses the percentage of anticipated response.

For the treatment of data, the respondents were categorized to correspond to the five separate points on the continuum for the six institutions. The data is presented in summations and percentages by items, stages of procedures, issues, and participating colleges. From these results, the relationships common to all of the participating colleges are presented statistically.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSES OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the analyses of data obtained from the survey instrument that was administered to 194 faculty members and 53 administrators at six private black colleges in Texas. Actual returns were received from 152 (76%) of the faculty and 37 (69%) of the administrators.

The data results are presented in tabular form. The format of the analyses presents the data findings according to survey responses and the research questions that were outlined in Chapter I.

Data Findings

The following presentation of data findings is organized by responses to the categories of the survey instrument. Statistics are included for each category of responses.

Response to Survey

Table I shows a numerical description of the responses from six private black colleges in Texas that participated in this research study. The table is subdivided by the responses of faculty, administrators, percentage for each group, and total percentage by degree of participation.
TABLE I

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSE
TO SURVEY BY INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Symbol</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Faculty Response</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
<th>Administrators Response</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
<th>Respondents Response</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
<th>Percent of Total Respondents Fac.</th>
<th>Admin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (M)</td>
<td>3,853</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I data reveal that, with the exception of College A, the number of faculty and administrators are remarkably similar. The faculty size of College A has a range of 49 to 58 per cent above that of the other five colleges, the size of the College A administrative group has a range of 18 to 27 per cent above that of the other five colleges. The student population of College A has a range of 44 to 54 per cent above the student populations of the other five institutions. The responses from all six institutions range from 25 to 94 per cent; the greatest number of responses came from College E and the smallest from College B. No other outstanding differences exist among the raw data for population responses.

Respondents were asked to respond to the survey instrument by circling a number by the question to indicate a response on the following one-to-five scale which they felt best described participation in decision-making in their institution:

1. Administrative Dominance: The administrator acts alone and has complete authority to make the decision;

2. Administrative Primacy: The administrator is responsible for making the decision but is expected to consult or confer with appropriate faculty;

3. Shared Authority: Administrators and faculty mutually agree on the final decision;
4. **Faculty Primacy**: The faculty is primarily responsible for making the decision but must first confer or consult with the administration;

5. **Faculty Dominance**: The faculty is solely responsible for making the decision and the final decision is accepted by the administration.

**Personnel Decisions**

Survey questions that pertain to personnel decisions are categorized according to faculty appointment procedures, promotion procedures, tenure procedures, and merit pay increase procedures. The data for these categories are shown in Tables II through V.

**Faculty appointment procedures**.—Table II shows the results of the responses of faculty and administrators, reported separately, to the six questions about their perceptions of the role of the faculty in faculty appointments. These data reveal that both faculty and administrators perceive the faculty as having a very small role in all areas that pertain to faculty appointments. By a 52.54 mean percentage, all respondents indicate that there is administrative dominance in faculty appointments; when the administrative primacy percentage (29.49) is included, the data indicate that 82.03 per cent of the respondents perceive administrators as having control of faculty appointments. When the data for administrative dominance and primacy are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical training</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental training</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social training</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table represents the distribution of training categories for both male and female participants.
combined, the administrators (87.84%) appear to be somewhat more confident than the faculty (76.21%) of administrator control in this area. Only 12.45 per cent of the respondents believe that there is any degree of shared authority in faculty appointment procedures.

Faculty promotions procedures.—Table III presents the results of the responses of faculty and administrators, reported separately, to the six questions about their perceptions of the role of the faculty in faculty promotions procedures. These data reveal that both faculty and administrators perceive the faculty as having a very small role in all areas that pertain to faculty promotions. By a 62.97 mean percentage, all respondents indicate that there is administrative dominance in faculty promotions; when the administrative primacy percentage (22.95) is included, the data indicate that 85.92 per cent of the respondents perceive administrators as having control of faculty promotions. When the data for administrative dominance and primacy are combined, the administrators (94.59%) appear to be more confident than the faculty (77.24%) of administrator control in this area. Only 18.43 per cent of the respondents believe that there is any degree of shared authority in faculty promotion procedures.

Faculty tenure procedures.—Table IV shows the results of the responses of faculty and administrators, reported
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Business</th>
<th>Total Expenditure</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Total Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Business</th>
<th>Total Expenditure</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Total Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- All values in USD.
- **Government** includes salaries, benefits, and operational costs.
- **Administration** includes marketing, research, and management costs.
- **Total Savings** represents the net profit or savings after all expenses are accounted for.
separately, to the six questions about their perceptions of the role of the faculty in faculty tenure proceedings. These data reveal that both faculty and administrators perceive the faculty as having a very small role in all areas that pertain to decisions on faculty tenure. By a 64.59 mean percentage, all respondents indicate that there is administrative dominance in faculty tenure proceedings; when the administrative primacy percentage (19.91) is included, the data indicate that 84.50 per cent of the respondents perceive administrators as having control of faculty tenure decisions. When the data for administrative dominance and primacy are combined, the administrators (96.21%) appear to be more confident than the faculty (72.77%) of administrator control in this area. Only 8.86 per cent of the respondents believe that there is any degree of shared authority in faculty tenure proceedings.

Faculty merit pay increase procedures.—Table V presents the results of the responses of faculty and administrators, reported separately, to the six questions about their perceptions of the role of the faculty in approving merit pay increases for faculty. These data reveal that both faculty and administrators perceive the faculty as having a very small role in all areas that pertain to this type of pay increase. By a mean percentage of 68.66, all respondents indicate that there is administrative dominance in proceedings
for faculty merit increases; when the administrative primacy percentage (19.61) is included, the data indicate that 88.27 per cent of the respondents perceive administrators as having control of faculty merit increases. When the data for administrative dominance and primacy are combined, the administrators (95.61%) appear to be more confident than the faculty (80.92%) of administrator control in this area. Only 6.96 per cent of the respondents believe that there is any degree of shared authority in faculty merit pay increase proceedings.

Data summary for personnel decisions.—Both the faculty and administrative respondents to this study believe that administrators dominate decisions that pertain to faculty personnel. All respondents agree that administrators dominate the decisions in regard to faculty appointments (52.54%), faculty promotions (62.97%), faculty tenure (64.59%), and faculty merit pay increases (68.66%). In each instance, also, when the data for administrative primacy is added to that for administrative dominance, the data unmistakably reflect the respondents' belief that there is administrative control over faculty personnel decisions. Only a small percentage of the respondents perceive any degree of shared authority in these areas of faculty personnel decision-making.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above represents a simplified example of data collected for various models and parameters.
Academic and Curriculum Decisions

Table VI shows the results of the responses of faculty and administrators, reported separately, to the six questions about their perceptions of the role of the faculty in selected academic and curriculum decisions. The perceptions of the respondents appear to be fairly equally divided along the continuum from administrative dominance to faculty primacy. One notable difference appears in the respondents’ perceptions of veto power over academic and curriculum processes; both administrators (86.49%) and faculty (57.89%) agree by a 72.19 mean percentage that administrators dominate the right of veto over academic and curriculum decisions. A second notable difference is that the 26.61 mean percentage for shared authority in the curriculum decision area is higher than for any other area investigated by this study.

Administrative Decisions

Table VII presents the results of the responses of faculty and administrators, reported separately, to the twelve questions about their perceptions of the role of the faculty in administrative matters that include physical plant and facilities, budget, and teaching load decisions. These data reveal that both faculty and administrators perceive the faculty as having a very small role in all areas that pertain to administrative decisions. By a 66.57 mean percentage, all respondents indicate that there is
administrative dominance of administrative decisions; when the administrative primacy percentage (22.75) is included, the data indicate that 89.32 per cent of the respondents perceive administrators as having control of administrative decisions. When the data for administrative dominance and primacy are combined, the administrators (96.17%) appear to be more confident than the faculty (82.46%) of administrative control in these areas. Only 7.98 per cent of the respondents believe that there is shared authority for administrative decisions.

Data Analyses by Research Questions

Chapter I presented the research questions for this study. The following data analyses responds to these research questions.

Research Question One

Research question one is designed to elicit information on the role of the faculty in decisions concerning personnel, curriculum, and administrative matters as perceived by the faculty respondents. Selected data from Tables II through VII address research question one. These data are shown in Table VIII.

The faculty respondents perceive themselves as having almost no control (5.54%) over any area of faculty personnel decision-making, although they believe that there is some
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty, Facilities, Budgets, and Teaching Load Problems</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>K.</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>L.</td>
<td>K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Location of administrative building problems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Number of student problems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Number of faculty problems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Number of budgetary problems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Number of teaching load problems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty, Problems</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Location of administrative building problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Number of student problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Number of faculty problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Number of budgetary problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Number of teaching load problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty, Problems</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Location of administrative building problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Number of student problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Number of faculty problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Number of budgetary problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Number of teaching load problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty, Problems</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Location of administrative building problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Number of student problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Number of faculty problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Number of budgetary problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Number of teaching load problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VIII
THE ROLE OF THE FACULTY IN DECISION-MAKING
AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Area</th>
<th>Administrative Dominance M%</th>
<th>Administrator Primacy M%</th>
<th>Shared Authority M%</th>
<th>Faculty Primacy M%</th>
<th>Faculty Dominance M%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>34.21</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>50.53</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>45.66</td>
<td>27.11</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>56.91</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>22.12</td>
<td>27.63</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>9.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. Matters</td>
<td>55.21</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shared authority (13.43%). The faculty feel that they have more influence in curriculum decisions (26.92%) and that there is more shared authority (27.63%) in this area than in any other. In the area of administrative matters, the faculty perceive their role as minimal (3.20%).

**Research Question Two**

Research question two concerns the administrators perceptions of the role of the faculty in decisions on personnel, curriculum, and administrative matters. Selected data from Tables II through VII address this research question. These data are presented in Table IX.

The administrator respondents perceive the faculty as having very little influence in any area of decision-making with the exception of the curriculum area. For decisions that affect the curriculum, the administrators perceive the authority as shared (25.58%) to some degree.

**Research Question Three**

Research question three concerns the specific areas in which there is either considerable shared authority or no shared authority. Table X shows the data on shared authority as perceived by both administrator and faculty respondents. The data indicate that although there is minimal shared authority in the majority of decision areas according to both groups of respondents, the faculty perceive a shared
TABLE IX
THE ROLE OF THE FACULTY IN DECISION-MAKING AS PERCEIVED BY ADMINISTRATOR RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Area</th>
<th>Administrative Dominance M%</th>
<th>Administrator Primacy M%</th>
<th>Shared Authority M%</th>
<th>Faculty Primacy M%</th>
<th>Faculty Dominance M%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>63.07</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>83.51</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>80.41</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>75.60</td>
<td>17.97</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>26.21</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>25.58</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. Matters</td>
<td>77.93</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
authority in all areas to a greater extent than is perceived by the administrators.

TABLE X

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF DEGREE OF SHARED AUTHORITY IN SIX DECISION-MAKING AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Area</th>
<th>Mean % of Administrators</th>
<th>Mean % of Faculty</th>
<th>Mean % of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Appointments</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Promotions</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Tenure</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Merit Increases</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic &amp; Curriculum</td>
<td>25.58</td>
<td>27.63</td>
<td>26.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean %</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Four

Research question four asks, "Do the perceptions of faculty members and administrators differ by institution?" Table XI presents a compilation of data for the mean responses for administrative dominance, compared for the six colleges. The area of administrative dominance was selected for comparison because both administrators and faculty appear to perceive administrators as dominating all except one decision areas. Since the colleges were not investigated by
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Decision Making</th>
<th>College A</th>
<th>College B</th>
<th>College C</th>
<th>College D</th>
<th>College E</th>
<th>College F</th>
<th>Total Mean Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of A</td>
<td>% of P</td>
<td>% of A</td>
<td>% of P</td>
<td>% of A</td>
<td>% of P</td>
<td>% of A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Matters</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other variables (such as enrollment, degree programs, etc.), comparison can be made only by degree of response. The data in Table XI also indicates the total mean percentage for the responses from both administrators and faculty for administrative dominance; a further comparison with these data indicates that there are no outstanding differences among the responses when compared by college.

**Research Question Five**

Research question five contains eleven questions that concern specific areas of the decision-making process. The data for these questions are drawn from specific survey instrument responses that are included in Tables II through VI.

**a. Who initiates the process?**—Table XII presents the data that pertain to the locus for initiating the decision-making process for the three decision-making areas. Both administrators and faculty agree decisively that administrators initiate the decision process in all areas except for curriculum. In most areas, the administrators perceive their control as greater than is perceived by the faculty.

**b. Who is consulted after the process begins?**—Table XIII presents the data that pertain to the locus for consultations after the decision process is initiated. These data indicate that both administrative and faculty respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Area</th>
<th>Combined Percentages for Administrative Dominance and Primacy</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M% of Administrators</td>
<td>M% of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Appointments</td>
<td>59.46</td>
<td>67.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Promotions</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>74.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Tenure</td>
<td>89.19</td>
<td>68.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Merit Increases</td>
<td>89.19</td>
<td>65.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>24.32</td>
<td>26.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration*</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>85.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Combined data from Table VII, questions 2 and 8.
TABLE XIII
RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE LOCUS FOR CONSULTATIONS
AFTER THE DECISION PROCESS HAS BEGUN FOR
THREE DECISION-MAKING AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Area</th>
<th>Combined Percentages for Administrative Dominance and Primacy</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M% of Administrators</td>
<td>M% of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Appointments</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Promotions</td>
<td>86.49</td>
<td>73.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Tenure</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>71.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Merit Increases</td>
<td>91.89</td>
<td>80.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum*</td>
<td>41.45</td>
<td>46.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>97.29</td>
<td>80.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Combined data from Table VI, questions 2, 2a, and 2b.
agree decisively that the consultation process is controlled by administrators except in the curriculum area.

c. **Who can make formal recommendations?**—The data in Table XIV show that both administrators and faculty perceive administrators as having decisive control of making formal recommendations except in the curriculum area. The administrators perceive their power to be greater in this regard than does the faculty.

d. **To whom are the recommendations made?**—The data for this question are presented in Table XV. Administrators and faculty unanimously agree that administrators are the recipients of all formal recommendations.

e. **How are the recommendations handled?**—An examination of Tables XIII, XIV, and XV indicates that the perogative for making recommendations lies in the hands of administrators except in the curriculum process. Both administrators and faculty agree with this assessment.

f. **Does anyone review the recommendations?**—Table XVI presents the data in answer to this question. Both administrators and faculty agree in their perception of administrators as strongly holding the right of review for all recommendations. Only in the curriculum process do administrators appear to have less review authority.
TABLE XIV

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE LOCUS FOR INSTIGATION
OF FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE DECISION
PROCESS FOR THREE DECISION AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Area</th>
<th>Combined Percentages for Administrative Dominance and Primacy</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M% of Administrators</td>
<td>M% of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Appointments</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Promotions*</td>
<td>90.54</td>
<td>72.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Tenure**</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>68.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Merit Increases</td>
<td>89.19</td>
<td>69.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td>26.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>85.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Combined data from Table III, questions 3 and 3a.
**Combined data from Table IV, questions 3 and 3a.
TABLE XV
RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE LOCUS FOR RECEIPT OF FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE DECISION PROCESS FOR THREE DECISION AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Area</th>
<th>Combined Percentages for Administrative Dominance and Primacy</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M% of Administrators</td>
<td>M% of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Appointments</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Promotions</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>82.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Tenure</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>78.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Merit Increases</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>84.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>75.68</td>
<td>38.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XVI

RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE LOCUS FOR REVIEW OF FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE DECISION PROCESS FOR THREE DECISION AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Area</th>
<th>Combined Percentages for Administrative Dominance and Primacy</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M% of Administrators</td>
<td>M% of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Appointments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Promotions</td>
<td>97.29</td>
<td>79.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Tenure</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>74.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Merit Increases</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>35.14</td>
<td>41.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>84.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g. What effect does a review function have on the recommendations already made?—The data from Table III, question 4 responds to this question. Of the administrators, 97 per cent perceive themselves as the decisive element in the review function; 79 per cent of the faculty also perceive the administrators as fulfilling this capacity.

h. Can the recommendations be modified as a result of the review procedure?—The data in Table III, question 4a answers this question. One hundred per cent of the administrators and 81 per cent of the faculty perceive administrators as having the authority to modify recommendations.

i. Who makes the final choice on the issue?—Table XVII presents the data in answer to this question. There appears to be little doubt as to the perceptions of both administrators and faculty that administrators have the authority to make the final choice on all decision issues with the exception of curriculum decisions in which the faculty shares in the process.

j. When are arbitrary decisions made that disregard all the preceding actions?—The data in Table VII, question 6, answers this question. One hundred per cent of the administrators and 89 per cent of the faculty perceive administrators as having the power to make arbitrary decisions in administrative matters.
### TABLE XVII

**Respondents' Perceptions of the Locus of Final Choice in the Decision Process for Three Decision Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Area</th>
<th>Combined Percentages for Administrative Dominance and Primacy</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Administrators</td>
<td>% of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Appointments*</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>86.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Promotions</td>
<td>94.59</td>
<td>84.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Tenure</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>82.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Merit Increases</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>90.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum**</td>
<td>52.70</td>
<td>51.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration***</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>82.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Combined data from Table II, questions 3 and 4.
**Combined data from Table VI, questions 2d and 5.
***Combined data from Table VII, questions 6 and 10.
k. When a promotional choice has been made, who can negate all that has gone before by vetoing the selection?—Table III data responds to this question. Both administrators (100%) and faculty (90.80%) agree in their perceptions of administrators as having veto power over a promotional selection. Table XVIII, however, is a compilation of the perceptions of all respondents on veto power for all three decision areas. Both groups agree that administrators have the power of the veto in all decision areas.

Summary of Data Findings

Following is a summary of the data findings that are presented in this chapter:

1. In regard to faculty personnel decision-making, the data findings are as follows:

   a. Faculty appointment procedures.—Administrators (63.07%) perceive themselves as having dominant control of faculty appointment proceedings, and the faculty agrees that there is administrative dominance and primacy. By a 52.54 mean percentage, all respondents agree that there is administrative dominance in this area of decision-making.

   b. Faculty promotions procedures.—Administrators (75.40%) perceive themselves as having dominant control of faculty promotion proceedings, and the majority of the faculty (50.53%) agrees. By a 62.97 mean
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Area</th>
<th>Combined Percentages for Administrative Dominance and Primacy</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M% of Administrators</td>
<td>M% of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Personnel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Appointments</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Promotions</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>90.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Tenure</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>80.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Merit Increases</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>90.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>73.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>93.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percentage, all respondents agree that there is
administrative dominance in this area of decision-
making.

c. Faculty tenure procedures.—Administrators
(83.51%) perceive themselves as having dominant control
of faculty tenure proceedings, and the faculty agrees
that there is administrative dominance and primacy. By
a 64.59 mean percentage, all respondents agree that
there is administrative dominance in this area of
decision-making.

d. Faculty merit pay increase procedures.—Adminis-
trators (80.41%) perceive themselves as having dominant
control of the procedures for faculty merit pay in-
creases, and the majority of the faculty (56.91%) agrees.
By a 68.66 mean percentage, all respondents agree that
there is administrative dominance in this area of
decision-making.

2. Academic and curriculum decision procedures.—For
all selected areas of academic and curriculum decision-
making, the perceptions of the respondents are fairly equal
along the continuum from administrative dominance to faculty
primacy although both administrators (86.49%) and faculty
(57.89%) agree that administrators have the right of veto
over these decision-making areas. Also, the respondents'
perceptions of shared authority (26.61%) is higher in this
area than for any other selected decision-making area.
3. Administrative decision procedures.—Administrators (77.93%) perceive themselves as having dominant control over the selected areas of administrative decision-making, and the majority of the faculty (55.21%) agrees. By a 66.57 mean percentage, all respondents agree that there is administrative dominance in this area of decision-making.

4. Perceptions of faculty regarding the role of faculty in decision-making.—Faculty perceives its role in all areas of faculty personnel proceedings as minimal (5.54%). Although faculty perceives its role as somewhat larger in curriculum areas (26.92%), its role regarding decisions in administrative matters also is perceived as minimal (3.20%).

5. Administrators' perceptions of the role of the faculty in decision-making.—Administrators perceive the role of faculty in faculty personnel decision areas as minimal (1.05%). Although administrators perceive the faculty as having some influence (25.99%) on curriculum decision, they view the decision-making influence of the faculty as nonexistent in the selected administrative decision areas.

6. Differences of perceptions by institutions.—On the basis of responses to the survey questions, there appears to be little difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty among the six colleges.

7. Following are specific findings regarding steps in the decision-making process:
a. Both administrators and faculty decisively agree that administrators initiate the decision process in all selected decision-making areas except, in part, for the curriculum process.

b. All respondents agree that the consultation process is controlled by administrators for all selected decision-making areas except, in part, for the curriculum area.

c. Although the faculty appears to be able to make formal recommendations to some degree for curriculum matters, the respondents agree that administrators decisively control the formal recommendations process.

d. All respondents decisively agree that administrators are the recipients of all recommendations for all selected decision-making areas.

e. For all selected decision-making areas, both administrators and faculty decisively agree that all types of recommendations, except, in part, for the curriculum area, are handled by administrators.

f. All respondents strongly agree that the majority of recommendations are reviewed by administrators for all decision-making areas; only in the curriculum process do administrators have a lesser review authority.

g. All respondents decisively agree that administrators hold the right-of-review for recommendations.
h. In regard to the modification of recommendations subsequent to the review procedure, both administrators and faculty decisively agree that only administrators have this authority.

i. With the exception of curriculum decisions, in which faculty shares the process, all respondents agree that administrators have the authority to make final choices in all selected decision-making areas.

j. Administrators and faculty decisively agree that only administrators are able to make arbitrary decisions that disregard all previous actions.

k. The perceptions of all respondents is decisive regarding administrators' sole ability to veto previously made faculty promotional selections. All respondents also agree that only administrators have veto power in all three selected decision areas.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Summary

The problem with which this study was concerned is the participation of the faculty in the decision-making processes in six small private black colleges in Texas. The purposes of the study were to measure and describe the degree of faculty participation in decision-making areas that include faculty personnel decisions (appointments, promotions, tenure, and merit pay increases), curriculum, and administrative matters.

Data for this study were collected by the use of a survey instrument that was evaluated and pilot tested. The questionnaires were distributed to the deans of academic affairs in the six colleges, who distributed copies to the administrators and faculty.

All faculty and administrators in the six colleges comprise the population of the study (N=247). Individuals were classified on the basis of their responsibilities (65%) as either administrators or faculty. Included in the administrative group were presidents, vice presidents (or deans of academic affairs or of applied or liberal arts, as
indicated), and department or division chairpersons. Responses were received from 152 (76%) of the 194 faculty members and 37 (69%) of the 53 administrators. The collected data were analyzed by percentages of responses to the questions on the selected areas of decision-making.

Following is a summary of the data findings for this study:

1. In regard to faculty personnel decision-making, the data findings are as follows:

a. Faculty appointment procedures.—Administrators (63.07%) perceive themselves as having dominant control of faculty appointment proceedings, and the faculty agrees that there is administrative dominance and primacy. By a 52.54 mean percentage, all respondents agree that there is administrative dominance in this area of decision-making.

b. Faculty promotions procedures.—Administrators (75.40%) perceive themselves as having dominant control of faculty promotion proceedings, and the majority of the faculty (50.53%) agrees. By a 62.97 mean percentage, all respondents agree that there is administrative dominance in this area of decision-making.

c. Faculty tenure procedures.—Administrators (83.51%) perceive themselves as having dominant control of faculty tenure proceedings, and the faculty agrees
that there is administrative dominance and primacy. By a 64.59 mean percentage, all respondents agree that there is administrative dominance in this area of decision-making.

d. Faculty merit pay increase procedures.--Administrators (80.41%) perceive themselves as having dominant control of the procedures for faculty merit pay increases, and the majority of the faculty (56.91%) agrees. By a 68.66 mean percentage, all respondents agree that there is administrative dominance in this area of decision-making.

2. Academic and curriculum decision procedures.--For all selected areas of academic and curriculum decision-making, the perceptions of the respondents are fairly equal along the continuum from administrative dominance to faculty primacy although both administrators (86.49%) and faculty (57.89%) agree that administrators have the right of veto over these decision-making areas. Also, the respondents' perceptions of shared authority (26.61%) is higher in this area than for any other selected decision-making area.

3. Administrative decision procedures.--Administrators (77.93%) perceive themselves as having dominant control over the selected areas of administrative decision-making, and the majority of the faculty (55.21%) agrees. By a 66.57 mean percentage, all respondents agree that there is administrative dominance in this area of decision-making.
4. Perceptions of faculty regarding the role of faculty in decision-making.—Faculty perceives its role in all areas of faculty personnel proceedings as minimal (5.54%). Although faculty perceives its role as somewhat larger in curriculum areas (26.92%), its role regarding decisions in administrative matters also is perceived as minimal (3.20%).

5. Administrators' perceptions of the role of the faculty in decision-making.—Administrators perceive the role of faculty in faculty personnel decision areas as minimal (1.05%). Although administrators perceive the faculty as having some influence (25.99%) on curriculum decisions, they view the decision-making influence of the faculty as nonexistent in the selected administrative decision areas.

6. Differences of perceptions by institutions.—On the basis of responses to the survey questions, there appears to be little difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty among the six colleges.

7. Following are specific findings regarding steps in the decision-making process:

   a. Both administrators and faculty decisively agree that administrators initiate the decision process in all selected decision-making areas except, in part, for the curriculum process.

   b. All respondents agree that the consultation process is controlled by administrators for all selected
decision-making areas except, in part, for the curriculum area.

c. Although the faculty appears to be able to make formal recommendations to some degree for curriculum matters, the respondents agree that administrators decisively control the formal recommendations process.

d. All respondents decisively agree that administrators are the recipients of all recommendations for all selected decision-making areas.

e. For all selected decision-making areas, both administrators and faculty decisively agree that all types of recommendations, except, in part, for the curriculum area, are handled by administrators.

f. All respondents strongly agree that the majority of recommendations are reviewed by administrators for all decision-making areas; only in the curriculum process do administrators have a lesser review authority.

g. All respondents decisively agree that administrators hold the right-of-review for recommendations.

h. In regard to the modification of recommendations subsequent to the review procedure, both administrators and faculty decisively agree that only administrators have this authority.

i. With the exception of curriculum decisions, in which faculty shares the process, all respondents agree
that administrators have the authority to make final choices in all selected decision-making areas.

j. Administrators and faculty decisively agree that only administrators are able to make arbitrary decisions that disregard all previous actions.

k. The perceptions of all respondents is decisive regarding administrators' sole ability to veto previously made faculty promotional selections. All respondents also agree that only administrators have veto power in all three selected decision areas.

Conclusions

Based on the data findings for this study the following conclusions appear to be warranted:

1. In regard to faculty personnel decision areas (appointments, promotions, tenure, and merit pay increases), the faculty perceive they have a minimal role in the decision-making processes. The only area in which the faculty appear to believe they participate to any degree is making recommendations.

2. In regard to the curriculum area of decision-making, the faculty believe they have more influence on this process than on any of the other decision-making areas. Even in this area, however, the faculty believe they have neither dominance or primacy; this is the only decision-making area in
which there is perceived to be some degree of shared authority although administrators retain the right of veto.

3. In regard to the decision-making area of administrative matters, the faculty perceive they have a minimal role in these processes.

4. Although the role of the faculty is somewhat influential in curriculum decision-making, the faculty perceives its influence in decision-making, generally, as practically nonexistent.

5. Administrators perceive the role of the faculty in the selected decision-making areas as practically nonexistent, even though administrators do agree that the faculty has a slight degree of influence on curriculum decisions.

6. Except for a small part by the faculty in the initial curriculum decision-making process, the perceptions indicate that administrators dominate all the steps in the decision-making process that include initiation, consultation, recommendations (receipt, handling, review, and modification), final choice, and veto power.

7. In effect, since administrators appear to dominate the initiation, consultation, and recommendation processes of decision-making, the processes of review and modification, which they also dominate, would appear to serve little purpose as far as faculty perceptions are concerned.

8. Since in every area of decision-making, the administrators perceive their influence as greater than is perceived
by the faculty, either the power of the administrators is, in fact, greater than the faculty believes, or the faculty is allowed to believe that it has more influence on decision-making than it, in fact, has.

Implications

An awareness of the concerns of faculty regarding the issues studied should assist administrators in developing more effective ways of administering small private black colleges. Administrators and faculty may wish to jointly determine the parameters of the participation of each group. Territorial rights have long been traditional. It may be that these traditional areas need some modification.

Mutual respect can be more easily developed if each group understands and agrees to the role of the other. Knowledge of the results of cooperative decisions must be made clear to all participants. Such knowledge would prevent problems of lack of trust from developing.

Clearly faculty must continue to participate actively in personnel matters and should be involved at every level until a final decision is reached. Curriculum matters should undoubtedly be more clearly in the jurisdiction of the faculty. However, administrators must still provide an institutional view of programmatic concerns.
Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations for future research are made:

1. This study should be replicated using both public and private black colleges; such a study could clarify the influence of the government on the decision-making processes.

2. This study should be replicated using certain other variables in order to discover what influence is exerted on the decision-making process by control (religious denomination), enrollment, section of the United States, faculty qualifications, and degree programs.

3. A study should be made that compares the decision-making processes in predominantly black and white colleges.

4. A study should be made of the decision-making processes in private and public black colleges in states that allow collective bargaining for faculty members in order to compare the influence of such an intermediary on faculty power.

5. A study should be made to determine the specific areas in which faculty wish or do not wish to participate.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Letter Requesting Permission to Conduct Survey

November 12, 1980

Dear Dr.

Please be advised that Mr. Vernon vanBolden, Assistant Professor of Music at Bishop College, is in the process of completing his course work and preparing for his doctoral project.

Mr. vanBolden's doctoral project is entitled "The Effective Participation of the Faculty in the Decision-Making Process in Six Historically Black Colleges in Texas." The six colleges to be involved in the study are Jarvis Christian, Huston-Tillotson, Paul Quinn, Wiley College, Texas College, and Bishop College.

Mr. vanBolden would like permission to visit your campus and distribute a survey questionnaire to your faculty on or about the last week in February, 1981, or the first week in March, 1981.

This communication, therefore, is to request official permission to allow Mr. vanBolden to distribute the survey questionnaire to your faculty. A copy of the survey questionnaire will be forwarded to you prior to the date of appearance if approval is granted.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely yours,

/s/

Richard A. Rollins
Vice President for Planning, Management, and Evaluation

RAR/jvg

cc: Mr. Vernon vanBolden
APPENDIX B

Letters of Permission to Conduct Survey

Jarvis Christian College
Hawkins, Texas 75765
December 4, 1980

Dr. Richard Rollins
Vice President for Planning,
Management, and Evaluation
Bishop College
3837 Simpson-Stuart
Dallas, TX 75241

Dear Dr. Rollins:

We will be pleased to assist Mr. Vernon vanBolden in his doctoral study. I am sure that when Mr. vanBolden sends a copy of the survey questionnaire, he will also indicate his needs with regard to time. Please ask Mr. vanBolden to allow approximately two weeks advance notice in order for me to schedule this activity.

Very truly yours,

/s/
Lee Hensley
Dean of Academic Services

LH:cjh
Huston-Tillotson College  
Austin, Texas 78702  
December 9, 1980

Dr. Richard A. Rollins  
Vice President for Planning,  
Management and Evaluation  
Bishop College  
3837 Simpson-Stuart  
Dallas, Texas 75241

Dear Dr. Rollins:

Please know that Mr. Vernon vanBolden is hereby been approved to distribute a survey questionnaire to our faculty during the months of February or March, 1981.

We wish Mr. vanBolden well and I would appreciate the receipt of the questionnaire for our files.

Do have a Merry Yule and a happy, 1981.

Sincerely,

/s/

Exalton A. Delco, Jr.  
Vice President for  
Academic Affairs

EADjr.:c
Paul Quinn College  
Dean of Instruction  
Waco, Texas 76704  
November 18, 1980

Mr. Richard A. Rollins  
Vice President for Planning, Management, and Evaluation  
Bishop College  
3837 Simpson-Stuart  
Dallas, Texas 75241

Dear Mr. Rollins:

Thank you for your letter of November 12, 1980, and your consideration of Paul Quinn College and the contribution of its staff in the doctoral project of Mr. vanBolden. We would consider it a privilege to cooperate in this project.

We would appreciate receiving a copy of the proposed questionnaire before it is distributed to our faculty and staff. However, be assured of official permission to distribute the questionnaire at a time to be set later. The framework of the last of February or the first part of March, 1981, seems acceptable.

If I can be of any further assistance, please feel free to contract me.

Yours,

/s/

L. C. Wood, Ph.D  
Dean of Instruction

ljd
Dr. Richard A. Rollins  
Vice President for Planning  
Management, and Evaluation  
Bishop College  
3837 Simpson-Stuart  
Dallas, Texas 75241

Dear Dr. Rollins:

Wiley College would be happy to participate in the study conducted by Mr. Vernon vanBolden. He has permission to submit questionnaires to our faculty at any convenient time. I personally will be pleased to work with him in every way possible.

You are to be commended for staying with the ship during trouble times. I am happy things are working our for Bishop.

Sincerely,

/s/

David R. Houston  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

DRH/wj
APPENDIX C

Pilot to Research Instrument

Pilot Study

The instrument on the following pages was constructed by the "Task Force" of AAHE in 1967. It was designed to measure the degree of faculty participation in the decision-making process at Roosevelt University. I submit the "instrument" to you for your approval and consideration in regard to this research.

Please respond to the following:

1. Are instructions clear and concise?  Yes  No  Comment __ __ __

2. Do the questions have a bearing on the study?  Yes  No  __

3. Is the content biased or loaded in a particular direction?  Yes  No  __

4. Are the questions suitable?  Yes  No  __

5. Is the questionnaire readable and easily understood?  Yes  No  __

6. Validity (Does it elicit what it is supposed to?)  Yes  No  __

7. Are the questions brief?  Yes  No  __

8. Are the types of questions right and appropriate?  Yes  No  __

9. Are the questions free from delicate material that the respondent may resist?  Yes  No  __

10. Are the items clear and unambiguous?  Yes  No  __

________________________________________________________________________ Examiner
Dear Colleague:

As a part of the requirement for the doctoral degree in higher education at North Texas State University, I am studying faculty participation in decision-making. Your response to the attached questionnaire will provide the data necessary to complete the study.

No faculty member, administrator or institution will be identified in order to secure the most effective responses. Should you wish a copy of the results of the study, please indicate by checking the appropriate response.

Please complete the response and mail it to me as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

V. vanBolden

Dr. Dwane Kingery,
Chairman Advisory Committee

[ ] I would like a copy of the results of the study.
[ ] I do not want a copy of the results of the study.
APPENDIX E

Survey Instrument

The following five definitions will be used to indicate the degree of participation in decision-making by the personnel on your campus. Select the number corresponding to the most appropriate description as you respond to the items on the following pages.

1. The administrator acts alone and has complete authority to make the decision. (Administrative Dominance)

2. The administrator is responsible for making the decision but is expected to consult and/or confer with appropriate faculty. (Administrator Primacy)

3. Administrators and faculty mutually agree on the final decision. (Shared Authority)

4. The faculty is primarily responsible for making the decision but must confer or consult with the administration. (Faculty Primacy)

5. The faculty is solely responsible for making the decision and the final decision is accepted by the administration. (Faculty Dominance)

Please circle the number that indicates the answer that you feel best describes participation in decision-making in your college, utilizing the definitions above.

Example: Students' role in institutional government is decided by: (1) 2 3 4 5

The administrator acts alone and has complete authority to make the decision. Number 1 is circled (1).
PERSONNEL MATTERS

Appointments

1. How are new faculty employed to fill vacated teaching positions?
   1 2 3 4 5

2. How are newly created teaching positions filled within the institution?
   1 2 3 4 5

3. Who control reappointments?
   1 2 3 4 5

4. Who control non-renewals?
   1 2 3 4 5

5. Who sets the process in motion to hire new faculty?
   1 2 3 4 5

6. Who provides the momentum necessary for the initiation?
   1 2 3 4 5

Promotions

1. Who sets the process in motion when a faculty member is to be advanced to a higher rank?
   1 2 3 4 5
   a. Who provides the momentum?
      1 2 3 4 5

2. Once the process has been started, who is consulted?
   1 2 3 4 5

3. Beyond being consulted, who can make formal recommendations?
   1 2 3 4 5
   a. What happens to the recommendations?
      1 2 3 4 5
   b. To whom are the recommendations made?
      1 2 3 4 5

4. Who reviews the recommendations?
   1 2 3 4 5
   a. Which group controls if recommendations can be modified?
      1 2 3 4 5

5. By whom is the decisive choice (decision) made on the issue?
   1 2 3 4 5
6. When the decision has been made, can some controlling force negate all that has gone before by vetoing the promotion? If so, how is the veto power administered? 1 2 3 4 5

Tenure

1. When a faculty member is to be tenured, who sets the process in motion? 1 2 3 4 5
   a. Where does the momentum originate? 1 2 3 4 5

2. When a faculty member is tenured, who is consulted? 1 2 3 4 5

3. Who recommends that a faculty member be tenured? 1 2 3 4 5
   a. What happens to the recommendations? 1 2 3 4 5
   b. To whom are tenure recommendations made? 1 2 3 4 5
   c. How are tenure recommendations handled? 1 2 3 4 5

4. Which of the five components of authority reviews recommendations? 1 2 3 4 5

5. When a person has been selected to receive tenure, which of the five components of authority makes the decision? 1 2 3 4 5

6. When the decision has been made to tenure a faculty member, can one of the components negate the action by vetoing what has been done? If so, how is it done? 1 2 3 4 5

Merit

When a faculty member is recognized as performing duties and obligations in a superior manner and is rewarded with special salary increments

1. Who sets the process in motion? 1 2 3 4 5

2. Once the process has been started, who is consulted? 1 2 3 4 5
3. Who can recommend a member for merit pay?  
   a. To whom are the recommendations made?  
   b. How are the recommendations handled?  
4. When a faculty member is recommended for merit salary increments, who reviews the recommendation?  
5. After the recommendations have been made and reviewed, who makes the decision on the issue?  
6. After the decision has been made, who has the power to veto the situation?  

ACADEMIC MATTERS

Curriculum

1. When course offerings are modified, which decision-making authority sets the process in motion?  
   a. When description changes are made in existing courses, who sets the process in motion?  
   b. In your institution, who is responsible for the introduction of new programs?  
2. Who is consulted on teaching assignments?  
   a. Who is consulted on degree requirements?  
   b. Who is consulted on admission requirements?  
   c. Who sets up the criteria for membership on departmental committees?  
   d. Types of degrees offered is decided by?
3. When there are changes to be made in the curriculum, the changes are generally recommended by: 1 2 3 4 5
   a. The recommendations for curriculum changes are then acted on by: 1 2 3 4 5
4. When there is a need for reviewing recommendations that involves the curriculum, this is done by: 1 2 3 4 5
5. Who makes the decision on any curriculum issue? 1 2 3 4 5
6. When the decision has been made, who has the power to veto the decision? 1 2 3 4 5

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Plants, Facilities, Budgets, and Teaching Loads

1. The staff sizes of teaching areas are usually decided by: 1 2 3 4 5
2. When building programs are initiated and facilities needs are established, who initiates the action? 1 2 3 4 5
3. Once the building programs and facilities are started, who is consulted? 1 2 3 4 5
4. Who makes the formal recommendations for facilities and such beyond being consulted? 1 2 3 4 5
5. If the recommendations for facilities and building programs have to be reviewed, who does the reviewing? 1 2 3 4 5
6. If initiation, consultation, recommendations and review can delimit the choices made, which of the authoritative bodies has the power to make an arbitrary selection that disregards all others that preceded it? 1 2 3 4 5
7. The controlling source that usually negate all that has gone before by vetoing the selection can be recognized as that of: 1 2 3 4 5
8. Decisions involving chairpersons, academic deans, and presidents, are usually initiated by:

9. Decisions that have to do with budgetary planning are usually handled by:

10. When the subject of average teaching loads is discussed, the authority to act and make decisions is left to:

11. The "authority" of faculty in government comes under a special area usually reserved for:

12. When the specifications for students extracurricular rules are written, the deciding authority is usually:
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