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Approaches to Assessing Faculty Senate Effectiveness

Overview

In times of instability and uncertainty in the higher education environment for, calls for increased input from the academic community into institutional decision-making processes have mounted, as have recommendations for improving senate effectiveness.

Kezar, for example, contends that faculty senates lack processes necessary to solve the problems associated with the challenging and changing environment for colleges and universities. Noting that as universities have become more hierarchical and “the academic voice has become distanced from central institutional policy debate,” Shattock argues that “[s]enates . . . need to be reinvigorated to be organs of well-informed and serious policy debate.”

The roles that the faculty senate should play, as well as the degree of senate effectiveness in shared governance have been the subjects of longstanding debate, making assessment of senate effectiveness particularly challenging.

Even so, there are indications that assessing senate effectiveness is an issue for faculty and administrators alike. Findings from a recent study of faculty senates in Canada indicate a need for both greater clarity about the role and responsibilities of the senate and for assessing senate performance. The authors recommend conducting a senate self-assessment and engaging the broader institutional community in a discussion of “role and work of the academic senate in the context of university governance . . .”

Leadership

Noting that “effective organizations are only as effective as their leadership,” Adams argues that the role of senate leaders is critical to senate success.

---


6 Adams, J. (2014) Background and leadership traits to effectively lead faculty senates in California Community Colleges, p. 24.
Schoorman and Acker-Hocevar entreat senate chairs “to rethink our roles as faculty leaders in the multiple contexts of the academic community, engage in representative leadership, recognize that opportunities for voice must be accompanied by demonstrations of active listening and accountability, and realize that organizational structures (and their creation, alteration, or analysis) cannot be divorced from their political and cultural dimensions.”

Kezar maintains that senate leadership, including the capacity to develop and maintain trusting human relationships, matters a great deal to effective shared governance, especially since the structures and processes of shared governance are not static. The author identifies “the relationship between faculty and administrators (often epitomized by the relationship between senate chair and president)” as one of two key relationships necessary for effective governance.

Askling and Stensaker suggest that academic leaders capable of adapting to higher education’s changing environment are those who “attach meaning to paradoxical situations and . . . [illuminate] challenging dilemmas.” Drew argues that inter-relational capabilities, or “quality engagement, including the ability to deal with change,” represent a critical challenge for mid-level and senior university leaders. The author warns “that to neglect the human dimension is to fall short of the potential for task accomplishment, building and maintaining the team, and individual development of those involved.”

Senate leaders occupy a unique position in the academy. Above all else, according to Hubbell, a senate leader is a representative of the faculty. Senate presidents lead what are essentially volunteer organizations, and their role has been described variously as temporary, representative, symbolic, and amateurish. Typically, senate presidents are not elected to the position on the basis of their leadership qualifications. From a cultural perspective, senate leaders’ behaviors and actions are symbolically significant to both the senate and the institution. Campbell observes, “As leaders of the faculty, presidents of academic senates are center points of meaning making . . . .” and their role “builds on already-existing shared meanings within the academy.”

Based on interviews with 42 senate presidents, Campbell delineates three frames of reference of senate presidents. “Citizen” leaders are motivated by a sense of professional responsibility to the community, both the senate and the institution as a whole. The “skeptical” leadership style is described as a “lukewarm approach characterized by attempts to get faculty to conform to apathetic and indifferent expectations for governance.” The “careerist” leader “builds alliances with key individuals to leverage power, including access to resources, such as face-time with senior administrators and invitations to important meetings. This type of leader uses bargaining chips, for example, control over “setting agendas and nominating new faculty to key subcommittee positions.”

---
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senate leaders who incorporate multiple frames are flexible because they are able to view the organization from multiple perspectives.\textsuperscript{17}

**Assessing Senate Effectiveness**

Arguing that measuring senate effectiveness has often involved “an intuitive process of knowing when it works,”\textsuperscript{18} Minor identified factors that predict senate effectiveness based on a study of 750 four-year institutions. These factors include high levels of faculty involvement and interest in senate activities, significant influence over issues related to promotion and tenure, the selection of senior administrators, and in setting strategic and budget priorities. While Minor’s factors represent a model of senate effectiveness, they are not meant as measures of effectiveness for individual campus senates, given the diversity of colleges and universities and the composition of senates.\textsuperscript{19}

The lack of criteria related to effective senate leadership makes assessment difficult.\textsuperscript{20} In fact, according to Vilkinas and West, assessing leadership in higher education as a whole is marred by the “failure to link behavior to effectiveness,” the dependence on data gathered from leader self-perceptions, and the lack of benchmarks related to leadership behavior as important concerns.\textsuperscript{21}

Multi-rater feedback systems, commonly referred to as 360-degree feedback, that focus on leadership behaviors, and SWOT analyses, aimed at identifying external and internal influences that can affect organizational decision-making, are used extensively in the business world in the US. Increasingly, these tools have been adapted for use in other fields, including higher education.

**Overview of 360-Degree Feedback**

Multi-rater feedback systems are appealing because “multiple viewpoints from multiple sources produce a more accurate picture of one’s strengths and weaknesses than would a single reviewer’s evaluation.” In addition, individuals gain greater self-awareness through comparing their self-perception to those of others. Experts in the field argue that the appropriate use of 360-degree evaluation is for personal and professional development “although organizations with a history of successful implementation may eventually be able to use it for evaluation.”\textsuperscript{22}

The guiding principle of multi-rater feedback “is that people who work most closely with an employee see that person’s behavior in settings and circumstances that a supervisor may not...[T]he more complete the insight into an employee’s performance, the more likely he will understand what needs to be improved and how.”\textsuperscript{23}

The use of 360-degree feedback systems in US higher education is very rare, with the exception of the field of medicine. Berk, for example, recommends using 360-degree feedback to enhance the


professional development and performance improvement of medical faculty, administrators and other academic personnel.  

Adoption of multi-rater systems in higher education in other countries, however, is more extensive.

Based on findings of a study of senior leaders at an Australian University, Drew suggests that multi-rater feedback can be helpful with respect to continuous improvement of leadership effectiveness. Vilkinas and West employed 360-degree feedback in a study of academic leadership, which “focus[ed] on a set of behavioural measures intended to assess the extent and importance of academic leadership and its effectiveness.”

History of Multi-rater Feedback Systems

The origins of multi-rater feedback mechanisms can be traced to the 1930s and 40s and the emergent field of social psychology, the development of the Human Resources movement, and the creation of T-Groups.

In the aftermath of WWII, mounting interest among social psychologists in restoring “human relations generally and inter-group relations specifically” underpinned efforts to promote national well-being, growth and success. The Human Resource movement recognized the importance of interpersonal and group relations in creating and sustaining work-based systems. Some proponents of the movement suggested that “that informal group life affected individual productivity and motivation more than the characteristics of the labour process itself.”

The focus of T-Group theory and practice was the belief that effective feedback, “provided in the form of the here-and-now observations of other group members,” facilitated self-reflection and the development of self-knowledge, including an understanding of one’s behavior.

The corporate world’s adoption of 360-degree feedback systems was driven by the need for better mechanisms to evaluate employee performance in a changed business environment characterized by less hierarchical organizational structures that “encouraged interdependence and reliance upon more than just the few immediate coworkers required previously.” Traditional, top-down performance feedback yielded only one slice of information on performance, and failed to capture information about employee strengths and development needs; assessment information from multiple stakeholders provided a “more balanced, complete, accurate, and fair assessment.”

In industry, multi-rater feedback systems have grown in popularity over the past few decades for several reasons, including the increasing expectation that human resources units provide data on employee performance as well as their own, the technological ease of administering 360-degree feedback.

---


feedback, and a desire to keep up with highly successful organizations that found that the system provided organizational and individual benefits in an increasingly uncertain environment.31

**Effectiveness of Multi-rater Feedback Systems**

The effectiveness of 360-degree feedback systems depends on the quality of the planning, implementation, and evaluation process. According to Carson,

>[i]n order to achieve successful implementation, research suggests that organizations must, at a minimum, link the process to organizational goals and strategies, limit use of results to professional development, train all participants on the process and use of measurement instruments, promote an environment of trust and protect confidentiality, and provide coaches or mentors to help participants process and act upon the feedback.32

Feedback tools that are customized to the organization’s goals and strategies set the stage for more meaningful results and can even facilitate the creation of an open culture. The downside is that customizing feedback tools takes extra time and money.33 The use of generic surveys, rather than surveys tailored to a particular role and circumstances, however, can result in irrelevant feedback.

Carson states “For the feedback process to work, the right people have to be asked the right questions.”34 Rater training in providing meaningful feedback can help avoid negative consequences, such as poor-quality feedback and threats to morale and teamwork. Trained coaches or mentors can help management interpret results accurately and develop meaningful action plans.

According to Peiperl, organizations that successfully implement 360-degree feedback processes “recognize that 360-degree feedback systems, and peer appraisal programs in particular, are always works in progress-subject to vulnerabilities, requiring sensitivity to hidden conflicts as much as to tangible results, but nevertheless responsive to thoughtful design and purposeful change.”35

**Challenges and Drawbacks of Multi-rater Feedback Systems**

Peiperl states that “peer appraisal is difficult because it has to be.” Embedded in the process are four “inescapable paradoxes:” The Paradox of Roles, The Paradox of Group Performance, The Measurement Paradox, and The Paradox of Rewards. With respect to roles, raters “are torn between being supportive colleagues or hard-nosed judges.” Asking team members to assess group performance risks alienating individuals who are uncomfortable with comparing members with one another. As measurements, quantitative ratings fail to convey “the detailed, qualitative comments and insights that can help a colleague improve performance.” A focus on reward outcomes, such as a salary increase, may lead individuals to disregard constructive feedback.36

Ghorpade observes that “[i]n practice, the 360-degree process gets entangled with the appraisal process, thus creating the potential for confusion and erosion of its usefulness as a development

---

In addition, raters may rate an individual based on an overall impression of the ratee, instead of focusing on specific behaviors. Managerial involvement in the 360-degree process "may cause fear" and "invite judgment on individual performance by a wide range of participants." Lack of a follow-up plan can lead to the ineffective use of assessment information.

Opponents of 360-degree feedback systems cite the high costs and the risk of making people uncomfortable, which can adversely affect productivity. In addition, some study findings suggest that exposure to and completion of the feedback instrument is more effective in changing behavior than the feedback itself.

Using Multi-Rater Feedback Systems with Teams
While assessment of leaders can have a positive effect on team effectiveness, in some instances, 360-degree feedback has been used to assess the effectiveness of groups or teams. Peiperl suggests that appraisals of entire groups can be useful for improving connections and communication between groups.

Polzer argues that several criteria must be met for effective 360-degree assessments of teams:

*Teams are more likely to benefit from feedback when the team leader is open to receiving it and models appropriate responses to it; when team members have at least a modicum of respect for and trust in one another and are motivated to improve in order to achieve a shared goal; when the data are gathered by established methods and are used for development rather than evaluation; and when a qualified and trusted facilitator guides the team discussion and helps design follow-on steps for improvement.*

In a study of the effects of 360-degree evaluation on team behavior, Dominick et al. found that multi-rater assessment involving self-ratings and ratings of team members after the completion of a specific task helped improve interpersonal effectiveness.

Peiperl, however, warns that "most peer appraisals can't reveal what makes a great group tick.” High performing groups can dismiss peer evaluation as unnecessary. Low performing groups may view the evaluation as a “veiled attempt by the rest of the organization to assess blame. For peer evaluation of groups to be effective, careful attention must be paid to “group dynamics and work realities.”

SWOT Analysis
The origin of SWOT, which stands for strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, is attributed to Stanford University’s Albert Humphrey who, in the 1960s, led “a research project which ultimately developed his Team Action Model (TAM) which is a management concept that enables groups of
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executives to manage change. SWOT was to have originated from his ‘Stakeholders Concept and SWOT Analysis.’ In a review of the academic literature, however, “there is no documented history of SWOT.”

Nevertheless, the use of SWOT in businesses and other organizations is widespread. SWOT analyses, alone or in combination with other tools and methodologies, are typically used for two purposes: strategic planning and performance improvement.

An example from industry describes the use of SWOT analysis in strategic planning. In a discussion of closed-loop management systems, Kaplan and Norton write “In our experience, . . . breakdowns in a company’s management system, not managers’ lack of ability or effort, are what cause a company’s underperformance. By management system, we’re referring to the integrated set of processes and tools that a company uses to develop its strategy, translate it into operational actions, and monitor and improve the effectiveness of both.”

In closed-loop management systems, data informing an analysis of a company’s internal and external “situation” can be collected using tools to assess an industry’s macro-economic environment and internal capabilities and performance. A SWOT matrix is employed to “to summarize the conclusions from the external and internal analyses . . . . [and] to ensure that the strategy leverages internal strengths to pursue external opportunities, while countering weaknesses and threats (internal and external factors that undermine successful strategy execution).”

In higher education, the use of SWOT analyses is growing as colleges and universities “vie for market share and as senior administrators and boards of trustees increasingly bring marketing and cost-benefit perspectives to their work.”

An example from higher education illustrates the use of SWOT analysis as part of a process to evaluate a faculty senate.

In the mid-2000s, Cabrini College engaged in an effort to both revise the faculty handbook and institute a shared governance structure. A recommendation from the president to evaluate the governance structure after three years led to the development of a faculty task force charged with creating a collaborative review process to assess four dimensions of the governance structure: 1) equitable distribution of labor, (2) shared authority and responsibility, (3) communication, and (4) effective decision making.

The task force determined that the review should involve a qualitative process centered on a SWOT analysis, a complementary quantitative analysis of data from a survey of faculty and administrators, and an analyses of data compiled from both processes by an outside reviewer.

Acknowledging that the SWOT analysis is time-consuming, “the task force decided that it would be worthwhile not only for the data that would be collected but also for the discussion that would take place.”

The process involved separate SWOT analyses conducted by “each member of the governance committees and subcommittees as well as department chairs and administrators. In addition, all full-
time faculty members - tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track- would conduct a SWOT analysis of the faculty assembly as a whole."

The survey gave “the entire full-time faculty, senior administrators, and students involved in governance committees the opportunity to rate and share their assessment of the individual dimensions of governance along with their overall assessment of the structure.”

A second task force was convened “to monitor the self-study as it was conducted and to compile the data to be presented to the faculty cabinet and the external reviewer.” Reports generated by internal and external reviews resulted in a series of recommendations and lessons learned.51

In today’s session, we’ll discuss the role of senate leadership in faculty senate effectiveness, and the value and disadvantages of assessing senate effectiveness using 360-degree feedback and SWOT analyses.

Suggested discussion questions:

1. Which of Campbell’s “frames of reference” (citizen, skeptic, careerist, multiframe) best describe your senate leadership style or how your Senate leadership has operated in the past?

2. As a senate chair, have you faced challenges to the legitimacy of your leadership? Have you ever found yourself caught between faculty and administration, and if so, how did you handle that situation?

3. Is it better to lead the senate or effect change from the “ground-floor”?

4. Have you ever received any leadership training, either before or after becoming senate chair? If so, what elements of that training were useful? What do you wish you would have learned before becoming chair?

5. What would a 360 assessment of your Faculty Senate look like?
   a. Who would be involved?
   b. What challenges might you face?
   c. What types of questions need to be asked?

6. Who should see the results of the 360?

7. How do you think senate members would respond to the idea of doing a 360 assessment? What would they see as the purpose? For example, to improve senate effectiveness, discover weaknesses, or to complain?

8. What would a SWOT analysis of your senate entail? How could the results be used?

Core Readings.


Hubbell, L. (Fall 2010). Thankless but vital: The role of the faculty senate chair. *Thought & Action*, pp. 147-152.

Examples of Assessment Tools.


Survey Monkey: 360-Degree Survey Sample [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MVT6QLL](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MVT6QLL)


*UF Leader 360* is a multisource assessment that provides leaders with anonymous, questionnaire-based feedback from a variety of raters including colleagues, direct reports, supervisors, and customers. By soliciting feedback from a variety of people, leaders receive a full circle perspective on their leadership skills. Leaders invite a minimum of 15 people to complete the online assessment. Once the feedback is collected, the leader is provided with a summary report of the results. A coaching session is also included in the assessment process. The assessment is available for a fee of $75. If you are interested in scheduling an assessment for yourself or another leader in your unit, please call us at (352) 392-4626 or email us at UFleader360@ufl.edu.

Additional Resources.


Abstract: Student ratings have dominated as the primary and, frequently, only measure of teaching performance at colleges and universities for the past 50 years. Recently, there has been a trend toward augmenting those ratings with other data sources to broaden and deepen the evidence base. The 360 degrees multisource feedback (MSF) model used in management and industry for half a century and in clinical medicine for the last decade seemed like a best fit to evaluate teaching performance and professionalism. To adapt the 360 degrees MSF model to the assessment of teaching performance and professionalism of medical school faculty. The salient characteristics of the MSF models in industry and medicine were extracted from the literature. These characteristics along with 14 sources of evidence from eight possible raters, including students, self, peers, outside experts, mentors, alumni, employers, and administrators, based on the research in higher education were adapted to formative and summative decisions. Three 360 degrees MSF models were generated for three different decisions: (1) formative decisions and feedback about teaching improvement; (2) summative decisions and feedback for merit pay and contract renewal; and (3) formative decisions and feedback about professional behaviors in the
academic setting. The characteristics of each model were listed. Finally, a top-10 list of the most persistent and, perhaps, intractable psychometric issues in executing these models was suggested to guide future research. The 360 degrees MSF model appears to be a useful framework for implementing a multisource evaluation of faculty teaching performance and professionalism in medical schools. This model can provide more accurate, reliable, fair, and equitable decisions than the one based on just a single source.

Abstract: We examined the effects of peer feedback on subsequent behavior using a four-dimensional model of team behavior. Participants (N= 75) were randomly assigned to teams, and teams were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions: feedback, exposure, or control. In the feedback condition, participants rated themselves and each other using a 24-item behavioral observation scale after completing the first of two decision-making tasks. Before performing the second task, they received individualized feedback reports summarizing their self- and peer ratings. Those assigned to the exposure condition completed the behavioral observation scale after the first task but did not receive feedback. The second task was videotaped and rated by experts blind to experimental condition. Results showed significantly higher ratings for participants in the feedback and exposure conditions. The findings extend previous research on multisource feedback by isolating exposure to key behaviors as an important variable in behavioral improvement.

Abstract: It is proposed from this study that engaging productively with others to achieve change has never been more critical in educational environments, such as universities. Via semi-structured interviews with a cohort of senior leaders from one Australian university, this paper explores their perceptions of the key issues and challenges facing them in their work. The study found that the most significant challenges centred around the need for strategic leadership, flexibility, creativity and change-capability; responding to competing tensions and remaining relevant; maintaining academic quality; and managing fiscal and people resources. Sound interpersonal engagement, particularly in terms of change leadership capability, was found to be critical to meeting the key challenges identified by most participants. In light of the findings from the sample studied some tentative implications for leadership and leadership development in university environments are proposed, along with suggestions for further empirical exploration.

Abstract: Faculty participation in campus governance is declining nationwide. As higher education shifts toward market models of organization, boards and administrators increasingly apply bureaucratic modes of decision making to areas that used to be the domain of faculty members. All too often, administrators seem to sidestep faculty senates in favor of "more efficient" and "accountable" decision making that does not reflect faculty opinion or expertise. To explore this issue at the local level, a faculty committee at Boston College commissioned the School of Education to conduct a survey of shared governance. The authors participated in the survey and report its results in this article.

Kezar, A. (Fall 2004). What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, trust, and leadership, or structures and formal processes? New Directions for Higher Education, 2004 (127), pp. 35-46.
Abstract: Changing structures may be a less important factor in creating an effective approach to governance than leadership, relationships, and trust. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]

Abstract: The article provides evidence about the consequences of a radical organizational change of college governance systems. Various studies have claimed that higher education academic governance must be modified to adapt to new challenges. The article reviews frameworks related to the change process. Corporate approaches to decision-making have created divisiveness, lowered morale, and led to the decline of academic programs that are not profitable. The study suggests that radical organizational change in the governance of a campus has many negative consequences. Gradual change is preferable.

Abstract: Based on a national study of 750 4-year institutions, this study assesses the current state of
senates and identifies factors that contribute to senate effectiveness. Findings show that although cultural elements of campus governance are positive, faculty are dissatisfied with the quality of their involvement in decision making. Regression analyses show that high levels of faculty involvement in the senate and influence in particular areas of decision making are significant predictors of senate effectiveness. Based on the findings, the study raises questions aimed at advancing the study and practice of institutional governance with particular attention to the role of faculty senates. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]

Peiperl, M. A. (January 2001). Getting 360° feedback right. *Harvard Business Review, 79*(1), p1p. 42-147. Abstract: Over the past decade, 360-degree feedback has revolutionized performance management. But one of its components--peer appraisal--consistently stymies executives and can exacerbate bureaucracy, heighten political tensions, and consume lots of time. For ten years, Maury Peiperl has studied 360-degree feedback and has asked: under what circumstances does peer appraisal improve performance? Why does peer appraisal sometimes work well and sometimes fail? And how can executives make these programs less anxiety provoking for participants and more productive for organizations? Peiperl discusses four paradoxes inherent to peer appraisal: In the Paradox of Roles, colleagues juggle being both peer and judge. The Paradox of Group Performance navigates between assessing individual feedback and the reality that much of today's work is done by groups. The Measurement Paradox arises because simple, straightforward rating systems would seem to generate the most useful appraisals--but they don't. Customized, qualitative feedback, though more difficult and time consuming to generate, is more helpful in improving performance. During evaluations, most people focus almost exclusively on reward outcomes and ignore the constructive feedback generated by peer appraisal. Ironically, it is precisely this overlooked feedback that helps improve performance--thus, the Paradox of Rewards. These paradoxes do not have neat solutions, but managers who understand them can better use peer appraisal to improve their organizations. INSET: Managing the "Peer" in Peer Appraisal. [ABSTRACT FROM PUBLISHER]

Pennock, L., Jones, G., Leclerc, J. & Li, S. X. (September 2015). Assessing the role and structure of academic senates in Canadian universities, 2000-2012. *Higher Education, 70*(3,) pp. 503-518. Abstract: Academic governance is an important dimension of institutional self-governance. This paper reports on the findings of a new study of university senates (academic councils) in Canadian universities in order to analyze changes in structure and in senate members' perceptions of the structure and role of senates over the last decade. Following the basic design of a similar study in 2000, this study reveals that there have been modest changes to the structure and organizational arrangements of many Canadian university senates over the last 10 years, including the rationalization and reform of the committee structures at many institutions. Findings of the study suggest the importance of senate orientation programming, the need for better oversight and assessment of academic quality, some confusion or ambiguity about the respective roles of board, senate and the administration, and continuing controversy about the proper role of the senate in strategic planning, financial, research, and fund-raising issues and activities. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]


Rowlands, J. (November 2013). Academic boards: less intellectual and more academic capital in higher education governance? *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(9), pp. 1274-1289. 16p. Abstract: A historically informed analysis of the academic senate or board in Australian universities, and in the wider higher education environment, particularly the UK, indicates that the role and function of academic boards has fundamentally changed in the past 30 years. Within the context of universities being repositioned to serve global knowledge economies, a comparison between contemporary university governance structures and those from the 1960s and the 1990s provides evidence of a significant diminution of the power and status of boards relative to executive management, and a heightened focus on the functions of academic quality assurance. As Bourdieu would suggest, academic boards continue to hold more symbolic than real power, due to the rise of academic rather than intellectual capital. Consequently, academic boards have become a key site of struggle over the role and function of the multinational corporate university and academic work. [ABSTRACT FROM PUBLISHER]

Abstract: This article argues for a more critical contextualisation of multi-rater/source feedback mechanisms applying Foucault's conceptual template of technologies of objectification and subjectivity/self, as they relate to a mode of "self" government that is intricately entwined with psychological knowledge and expertise. An in-depth genealogical analysis is presented that traces the genesis of two prominent forms of multi-rater/source feedback mechanisms between 1940 and 2011: the educational innovation of the T-Group and the contemporary human resource practice of 360-degree feedback. We conclude that such practices have functioned to enfold individuals within relations of power and signification that impact upon individual self-governance, subjectivity, and identity. As such, the application of 360-degree feedback within contemporary organisational models is emblematic of a programme of government that relies for its effectiveness on the self-regulatory and self-developing capacities of the individual at work.


Abstract: For many faculty members in colleges of education, social justice is a concept they teach or a lens that frames their scholarship about efforts to combat injustice in settings outside the university. Rarely does it serve as a lens for understanding or guiding the ordinary activities of faculty service, such as engagement in faculty governance. Yet the increasing corporatization of universities and its concomitant threats to academic communities as inclusive and democratic decision-making spheres necessitates the study of faculty governance within a critical social justice framework. This article, contextualized in a multi-campus college of education in a large, public university on the east coast of the US, addresses how leaders in faculty governance extended the principles of diversity and social justice taught in their classrooms to leadership practice and democratic decision-making within a college of education. Highlighted are practical strategies for increasing faculty voice and leadership listening and a critical reflection on the implications of the struggle for democratic decision-making within autocratic, corporatized organizational cultures.


Abstract: The last decade has seen an acceleration of change in the way British universities have been governed, led and managed. This has substantially been driven by the instability of the external environment, which has encouraged a greater centralisation of decision-making leading to less governance and more management, but it is also a consequence of the growing convergence of the governance and management models of the pre- and post-1992 universities. The article identifies a rise in ‘the executive’ at the expense of the traditional components of university governance, governing bodies, senates, academic boards and faculty boards, and a growing tendency to push academic participation to the periphery. It describes the dangers implicit in such developments and suggests that they may lead to a loss in academic vitality and distinctiveness.


Abstract: Professionalism is identified as a competency of resident education. Best approaches to teaching and evaluating professionalism are unknown, but feedback about professionalism is necessary to change practice and behavior. Faculty discomfort with professionalism may limit their delivery of feedback to residents.


Abstract: Shared governance has been a key historical characteristic of higher education although this form of governance has come under increased pressure in recent decades. It is often argued that shared governance is less relevant for tackling the challenges related to a more dynamic environment of the sector. This paper discusses underlying premises for the current conceptions of shared governance and analyses how a sample of Nordic universities perceives the place and role of governance in their strategic development. It is found that most universities emphasise leadership and leadership development as a key measure to strengthen their governance capacity and it is argued that most universities seem to overlook the cultural and symbolic aspects of governance along the way. This may have serious
consequences for the internal legitimacy and trust when universities enter into demanding change processes. (Contains 1 table.)

**Abstract:** Activities emerging on the periphery of American universities and colleges of all types have challenged traditional conceptions of governance, particularly how to properly involve faculty. Examples of these activities are academic programs for non-traditional students, various auxiliary activities within institutions, and partnerships with communities and industry. This paper describes the US approach to governance and discusses how concerns about diminishing resources and increasing demand, competition and costs are causing institutions to become more managed and less influenced by faculty. The paper concludes with a discussion of recent recommendations for reform in the governance of American higher education.

**Abstract:** Cogovernance refers to the process of administrators consulting academicians, through committees of faculty members. Competitiveness, rapid change, and the uncertainty that arises from the absence of assured funding underlies the strength of American college presidents. In contrast to the administrative professionals, members of academic senate committees are part-time amateurs. (MLW)

**Abstract:** This paper reports results of analyses of data from an online 360° feedback survey with 19 heads of school, 23 line managers and 120 significant others (peers, academic staff and administrative staff) from Australian universities. It focuses on the heads' effectiveness, and the extent and importance of several leadership roles. A series of repeated measures analyses of variance that examined the differences between the heads' of school self-perceptions and the perceptions of their line managers and significant others were undertaken. The analysis of the effectiveness data showed that the heads' of school self-evaluations were lower (but not significantly so) than the scores from the other two groups. The three groups agreed on how much importance they ascribed to the leadership roles, and on the extent to which these roles were displayed by the heads of school. There were significant differences between the roles in the extent to which they were displayed and considered important. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]

**Abstract:** Academic boards play a key role in the maintenance of quality standards and the provision of strategic leadership on academic issues. The current research investigated the role provided at present to Australian universities through their academic boards. All universities described their academic boards as their principal academic body. The majority of the academic boards said in their terms of reference that they should spend most of their time and energy on activities associated with policy (including approving and implementing policy) and quality assurance. These activities are internally focused. Most of the academic boards did not think they should spend time being externally focused. External quality audits reported that most concentrated on activities associated with policy (including approving and implementing policy) and quality assurance. These activities are internally focused. Most of the academic boards were not seen to be spending time being externally focused.

**Dissertations.**

Adams, J. (2014) *Background and leadership traits to effectively lead faculty senates in California Community Colleges.*  
**Abstract:** Although the major responsibility for community college governance falls to presidents and administrators, researchers have recognized the integral role of faculty in governing higher education institutions. Few studies, however, have explored the effectiveness of contributions of faculty elected to community college academic senates. The purpose of this research was to investigate the background traits and leadership skills of elected academic senate presidents in order to identify both their perceptions of themselves as leaders and the perceptions of other faculty senate members. This study was based in the theory of transformational leadership in organizations and its impact on the effectiveness of organizations. The research question for this quantitative study focused on the extent to
which the elected academic senate presidents’ background and leadership traits affect the performance of faculty senates. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X; MLQ 5X) and supplemental demographic data were used with faculty at the 112 community colleges in a western state to measure the relationship between leadership behavior and organizational effectiveness. Data were analyzed using Pearson’s correlation and z and t tests. Results indicated that there is a significant relationship between senate presidents who were transformational leaders and more effective in leading faculty senates. The implications for social change include informing community college faculty senates and their presidents about effective leadership styles and skills and providing resources to improve faculty governance. The anticipated results are improved college governance, enhanced college service to their communities, and enriched education for their students.


Abstract: Faculty senates provide a forum for the discussion of all issues of concern to faculty members. Research and theoretical knowledge regarding faculty senates’ involvement in campus decision-making is limited (Minor, 2004). The principal purpose of this study is to determine if there are differences in the responsibility areas of faculty senate by type of institution and type of senate. The following research questions were investigated in the study: What are the differences in the responsibility areas of faculty senates?; what are the differences in the responsibility scores of faculty senates? what are the differences in the number of senate members in faculty senates?; and to what extent does type of senate, type of institution, and number of senate members predict the responsibility score of faculty senate? The data used in this study were extracted from The Faculty Senate Leader Survey 2009 (FSLS:09). The FSLS:09 collected information from senate leaders regarding the characteristics of the faculty senate and critical issues of concern to faculty at their institution. The sample consists of 434 faculty senate leaders identified in the search and were invited to participate in the Faculty Senate Leader Survey. Approximately 207 senate leaders of master's institutions and doctoral institutions in the United States responded to the survey. A total of 105 senate leaders of master's institutions and 102 senate leaders of doctoral institutions completed the Faculty Senate Leader Survey. Faculty senates tend to be responsible for ensuring academic freedom, committee appointments, curriculum and academic programs, and faculty grievances. Areas that faculty senates appear to have no responsibility or only advisory influence are retirement plans, faculty compensation, and campus facilities. The results also indicated that there are differences in the responsibilities of faculty senates by type of institution and type of senate.


Abstract: Multi-rater feedback, or 360-degree feedback, is a commonly used tool for employee development and performance appraisal. While an abundance of research exists around using this feedback tool for both development and appraisal, little research has determined the correlation, if any, between traditional performance appraisal results and developmental multi-rater feedback assessment. As many employee performance development plans include one or more of these elements, it is beneficial to understand how these assessments might overlap or diverge, in order to formulate a complete picture for use in outlining an employee development plan. The purpose of this study was to identify the relationship developmental multi-rater feedback assessments have to top-down, traditional single-rater performance appraisals. This research looked at Cereal Manufacturing Technicians (N=105) within a food processing facility, comparing results of an annual performance appraisal (conducted by the employee’s supervisor) to the results of that person’s multi-rater assessment. Results found that mean, median, and mode scores tend to be significantly higher in multi-rater assessments than in performance appraisals. A significant difference in standard deviations was also found between overall scores. Performance evaluations also showed greater variability and range in scores than did multi-rater feedback assessments. Comparison of individual multi-rater scores to individual performance appraisal scores found little, if any correlation. This study also showed that top performers on individual multi-rater assessments did not generally fall within the highest ranks of performance evaluation scores. Similarly, the lowest performers in one
assessments were not necessarily the lowest performers identified by the other assessment. However, top scorers (top 10%) on multi-rater assessments tended to score in the top half of performance evaluation scores. Likewise, those receiving the lowest multi-rater scores (bottom 10%) also tended to be rated within the bottom half of performance evaluation scores. Finally, this study found that multi-rater assessments and performance appraisals provide different outcomes and are, therefore, not interchangeable. As both provide valuable information, it is recommended that both a multi-rater (developmental) assessment and a performance (evaluative) appraisal be incorporated into an employee’s overall performance and development plan.


Abstract: This research project explored the impact of using 360-degree feedback and coaching for 33 leaders. Each participant received feedback on his or her strengths and developmental needs and worked with a coach to create an action plan for improvement. Overall improvement was rated by the coach using feedback from the participant and feedback providers along with the coach’s observations. The majority of participants (84%) were rated as demonstrating change (54% had major change and 30% had some change). The top trends for areas of strength that emerged from the data were competent (97%), likeable (48%), respected (36%), trustworthy (27%), and smart (15%). The top areas for development were communication (63%), assertiveness (24%), engaging one’s team/creating a team approach (18%), and improving work/life balance and stress (18%). The specific areas of communication were harsh communication (38%), the need to be more open (29%), and the need to be more proactive with communication (14%).

The literature review contains an overview of the background and history of 360-degree feedback and how to connect it to organizational strategy. It also reviews the best practice for obtaining feedback and the impact that feedback has on leadership coaching. The strengths and developmental needs of all participants were examined from a team and cultural perspective. The researcher posits that leaders can propel positive organizational change by beginning with 360-degree feedback and coaching of leaders. As leaders shift their behavior, they also shift the behavior of their teams and teams change culture. Recommendations for changing tribal behavior include coaching leaders, creating an abundance mentality, and including courage as an organizational competency.


Abstract: Shared governance and its effectiveness continues to be debated among scholars. This study examined the relationship between higher education organizational governance and faculty governance. It was based on two theoretical frameworks: four organizational governance models; and four faculty governance models. Both have been accepted and cited in higher education literature (Heaney, 2010). However, no study has examined the relationship between organizational governance with faculty governance as shared governance. There were 615 faculty senate leaders contacted nationwide according to institutional type: 207 doctoral; 208 masters; 200 baccalaureate. A total of 71 faculty senate leaders responded: 33 doctoral; 22 masters; and 16 baccalaureate. The study was ex post facto where participants completed the researcher-developed Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument. Data were analyzed according Cronbach’s alpha, descriptive, correlational, t-test, and MANOVA statistics. Results revealed that shared governance is alive and well across colleges and universities, but strongly influenced by a state’s political environment. The shared governance model that emerged is a political/influential model regardless of institutional type. It indicated faculty and administrators need to build coalitions to establish a power base for decisions while dealing with policy and policy change. The results indicated several implications and insights for future research. State political environments drive how organizational governance models and faculty governance models interact for shared governance. Current lack of resources have forced faculty and administrators to band together in various types of coalitions to build power structures to be more competitive for resources such as budget allocations, ownership of policies and procedures, curricular decisions, and accountability measures. Thus, shared governance perspectives should be expanded to include senior administrators on campuses. Additionally, although shared governance is present on campuses, information regarding how much sharing takes place and in what areas is lacking. Overall, across the spectrum of shared governance for operations and academics, research should examine the extent to which faculty are involved in decisions pertaining to academics and operations, as well as the extent to which administrators are involved in decisions.
pertaining to operations and academics. The issue is not so much as who is in control, but how are limited resources distributed?

Note: This collection comes from Brandeis University Faculty Senate Leaders Think Tank meeting materials originally compiled February 2017.