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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.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

American colleges are complex social institutions. Colleges and universities operate using diverse means and ways to carry out daily duties, functions, and responsibilities (Morphew, 1999). The complexity and the uniqueness of colleges and universities stem from the nature of activities on which academic institutions were built (Lookwood & Davies, 1985). These activities are teaching, research, and service to the institution and the community. Colleges and universities have a system that facilitates these complex means and operations. This system is known as shared governance.

The word, governance, implies a hierarchical decision-making structure (Blau, 1994; Gayle, Tewarie, & White, 2003), and “shared governance is a process used by many colleges and universities to make major decisions concerning the institutions while involving institutional stakeholders,” (Minor, 2001, p.31). According to Olson (2009), shared governance differs from other types, because it gives various constituencies a role in key decision-making processes, and allows certain groups to exercise primary responsibility for specific areas of decision making. These constituency groups generally consist of trustees, administrators, faculty, staff, students, alumni, and community members (Millett, 1980). When these constituency groups have different expectations about institutional missions, goals, and governance structure, shared governance becomes problematic (Gayle, Tewarie, & White, 2003).

“Shared governance is a unique characteristic of the United States higher education system; it is often misunderstood and difficult to define,” (Lechuga, 2004, p.95). Shared governance varies from institution to institution, because every college and
university has its own definition of it (Minor, 2001; Kezar, 2004), and every constituency
group has its own perspective and interpretation of shared governance. Thus, any
definitions of the term must be customized to support the needs of that particular
institution or group (Gayle, Tewarie, & White, 2003).

Many institutions are currently having a debate regarding the roles of faculty,
administrators, and boards in shared governance and the decision-making process
(Lechuga, 2004). Rosovsky (2001) contended that the president of the college or
university should have greater authority over the institution, and shared governance
should be limited to academic matters rather than campus operations. The faculty should
have authority over the curriculum and academic personnel matters, and the board of
trustees should retain legal responsibility for all other aspects of the institution (Ruml &
Morrision, 1959; Besse, 1973; Birnbaum, 1988).

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American
Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities
and Colleges (AGB) collaborated on a statement that addressed the issue of shared
governance in academic institutions (American Association of University Professors,
2001). Leaders of these national associations believed that academic institutions were
becoming less autonomous, and shared governance needed to be appropriately addressed
(American Association of University Professors, 2001). Leaders were concerned for the
general welfare of academic institutions as well as the ability of the constituency groups
in academic institutions to communicate with each other effectively (American
Association of University Professors, 2001). If shared governance was appropriately
addressed, the capacity to solve educational problems would increase (American Association of University Professors, 2001).

The Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities made an attempt to establish a mutual understanding of how college and university governance should operate (Gayle, Tewarie, & White, 2003). The purpose of the statement was to clarify the roles of the board of trustees, the president, the faculty, and the students in university governance and illustrate mutual interdependence (Kezar & Eckel, 2004).

Although these national associations collaborated to construct the Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, the AGB collaborated with presidents, trustees, administrators, and faculty members to devise a statement that reaffirms the responsibility of the board of trustees to be the governing body of an institution (Ingram, 1999). AGB changed its perspective of faculty’s role in shared governance, because boards of trustees are ultimately responsible for the governance of their institutions. The statement appeared during a time when many institutions of higher education were dealing with the viability of tenure, concerns of faculty power was diminishing, great umbrage over the increasing numbers of part-time faculty members, lack of evidence of student learning, and increasing tuition costs (Ingram, 1999).

The AGB’s Statement on Institutional Governance clearly indicates that “ultimate responsibility for the institution rests in its governing board,” and is not a shared responsibility with faculty (Association of Governing Boards, 1998, p.5). Furthermore, presidents of institutions must have the authority to make quick decisions with more discretion and less consultation (Association of Governing Boards, 1998). Faculty
members have a tendency to think of themselves as being the institution; this mentality can be challenging to the board of trustees’ and the president’s authority over the institution (Besse, 1973; Birnbaum, 1988).

In the *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* (American Association of University Professors, 2001), faculty members are purported to have primary responsibility in the following areas: curriculum, methods of instruction, degree requirements, research, faculty status, faculty appointments, faculty promotions, tenure, and dismissals. In many institutions, faculty issues are presented to the administration by faculty representatives who have been elected by the faculty of the institution or organizations made up of faculty members. These organizations are known as faculty assemblies, faculty councils, or faculty senates.

Faculty senates provide faculty members a voice in institutional governance (Pope & Miller, 1999), and they can be an integral part of governance on college campuses (Minor, 2004). In general, faculty senates tend to have primary jurisdiction over curriculum and academic policies. Faculty senates also represent faculty views and opinions on institutional policies and practices. The main purpose of faculty senate is to create and maintain institutional environments that preserve academic freedom and foster the free exchange of ideas (Minor, 2004).

The involvement of faculty senates in the governance of an institution depends upon the model of governance that the institution implements. The most commonly used models to study university governance and the organizational nature of institutions are the bureaucratic, collegial, and political models (Baldridge, 1971).
The bureaucratic model establishes a hierarchical system and a formal chain of command (Bess & Dee, 2008). The chain of command serves as the means of communication, and reinforces the established authority of the personnel in the institution (Bess & Dee, 2008). The bureaucratic model emphasizes the regularization of procedures; that is, the practice of implementing and following procedures is routinely done (Bess & Dee, 2008).

The collegial model does not follow the same chain of command or hierarchy of authority as the bureaucratic model. Instead, it is based on one-level of authority in which all consistencies are equally empowered. The collegial model emphasizes shared authority and nonhierarchical relationships (Birnbaum, 1988; Bess & Dee, 2008), so that the members of the institution engage in a high degree of personal interaction and decisions are made as a consensus (Birnbaum, 1988; Bess & Dee, 2008).

Unlike the collegial or bureaucratic models, decisions are made by those who persistent small groups and coalitions in the political model (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). “The pressure that groups can exert places strict limitations on formal authority in the bureaucratic sense,” (Riley & Baldridge, 1977, p.15). Decisions are negotiated compromises between competing groups, rather than directives from the office or person charged with making the formal decision (Riley & Baldridge, 1977). Leaders of the institution are mediators and negotiators between opposing groups. External pressures highly influence the internal governance process of the institutions, which further complicates the political atmosphere (Riley & Baldridge, 1977).
Statement of the Problem

Faculty discontent with shared governance has become more and more evident in institutions of higher education (Helms & Price, 2005), because many faculty members believe that shared governance does not exist at their institution (Helms & Price, 2005). Faculty members have reported being dissatisfied with the quality, quantity, and outcome of their involvement beyond the department level in academic governance (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982; Lee, 1991). Faculty dissatisfaction with the governance system at their institutions has caused disruptions in campus operations (Birnbaum, 1991). When faculty members are unable to communicate with, collaborate with, or even agree with students, administrators, and board members of their institution, the collegial environment becomes disrupted and the educational process is impeded.

Administrators have proposed that governance can be improved by clarifying and specifying each member’s role in the institution (Birnbaum, 2004). This in turn leads to increased bureaucratization and strong administrative influence which faculty tend to oppose (Birnbaum, 2004). In order for the institutional decision-making process to be expeditious and efficient, institutions have adopted bureaucratic systems (Rhoades, 1995; Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Trustees and administrators are increasingly making decisions in areas that used to be under the control of faculty members (Helms & Price, 2005). This in turn creates dissonance and distrust between faculty members and administrators.

Faculty senates often serve as the voice of the faculty on many campuses, but limited information is available regarding faculty senates and their effectiveness. No
complete census is available of the number of faculty senates that exists in the United States. Research and theory are limited regarding faculty senate involvements in campus decision-making (Minor, 2004). Most of it focuses on faculty’s involvement in governance, but little of it focuses on faculty perceptions of their involvement (Minor, 2003). Instead, the perceptions of faculty leadership and faculty involvement in governance have come from administrators rather than faculty.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to contribute to the literature regarding faculty senates and faculty senates’ role in college and university governance. The findings of this study will add to the literature by identifying the areas of responsibilities of faculty senates, and to what degree senates have authority in the identified responsibility areas. Additionally, the researcher seeks to determine if there are differences in the areas of responsibilities (ex. budget planning, curriculum, faculty workload) of faculty senates based on type of institution and type of senate. This will be done by answering the research questions proposed in this study.

Research Questions

1. What are the demographics of faculty senate leaders?

2. What are the differences in the areas of responsibilities of faculty senates?
   a. By type of senate?
   b. By type of institution?

3. What are the differences in the responsibility scores of faculty senates?
   a. By type of senate?
4. What are the differences in the number of senate members in faculty senates?
   
   a. By type of senate?
   
   b. By type of institution?

5. To what extent does type of senate, type of institution, and number of senate members predict the responsibility score of faculty senate?

Significance of the Study

The findings from this study can be beneficial to governing boards, administrators, faculty, educational researchers, and policymakers. The information could be used to improve and strengthen shared governance in institutions across the nation by using the findings to initiate dialogue between the constituencies. The findings will also add to the existing literature by providing a better understanding of faculty participation in college and university governance. The general public will gain an understanding of the faculty senate leaders who work in the institutions of higher education that serve the members of society.

Limitations of the Study

The study will consist of the 105 senate leaders of master’s institutions and 102 senate leaders of doctoral institutions who participated in the Faculty Senate Leader Survey. Although the Faculty Senate Leader Survey contains many variables, only the variables that directly align with the proposed research questions will be investigated in this study.
Another limitation to the study is the respondents’ understanding and interpretation of the language in the Faculty Senate Leader Survey. Definitions were not provided for the terms used in the survey; therefore, the meaning and usage of certain terminology was left to the interpretation of the participant; for example, shared governance. Test reliability and validity have not been officially established for the Faculty Senate Leader Survey; however, the Faculty Senate Leader Survey has been tested for face validity and content validity. Response bias and incomplete responses also are limitations to the study.

Although participants were asked to rate the level of responsibility on 14 identified responsibility areas of faculty senates on the Faculty Senate Leader Survey, not all possible areas of responsibility were included. Not enough variance in response for this item. It is difficult to fully assess the level of responsibility of faculty senates without a full range of all possible responsibilities. The analysis of the range of responsibility of faculty senates were restricted to the set answer options; this being “no responsibility,” “senate serves in advisory capacity only,” or “senate has responsibility.”

Delimitations of the Study

The study will only focus on faculty senate leaders. The National Study of Faculty Leadership currently does not have information regarding faculty senate leaders of baccalaureate institutions and 2-year institutions. Although plans are currently in the making for collecting information on faculty senates at baccalaureate institutions, it was not available during the time of this study. Not having data on baccalaureate institutions limits the ability to generalize to all higher education institutions overall; this limits the
limits the analysis of institutional type. The findings of this study will only be applicable to faculty senates at doctoral and master’s institutions.

**Definition of Terms**

Throughout this study, several terms will be used frequently; therefore, it is important to clearly define and express the researcher’s usage of these terms.

Faculty Senate Leader- is defined as the executive officer who presides over the faculty senate or other similar governing body, and is the lead representative of that organization.

Advisory capacity- the faculty senate has the ability to make formal recommendations in a specific area, or the faculty senate is asked by the administration to provide feedback or advice in a specific area.

Mixed Senates- academic senates that are composed of other constituencies in addition to faculty such as students, administrators, or staff (Birnbaum, 1991).

Pure Senates- academic senates that are composed of faculty members only and governed exclusively by faculty members (Birnbaum, 1991).

Responsibility areas- are 14 identified responsibility areas on the Faculty Senate Leader Survey in which faculty senate leaders indicated the level of authority that the faculty senate at their institution has over these responsibility areas. The responsibility areas are defined as follows: academic freedom, accreditation, assessment of learning, budget planning, committee appointments, compensation, curriculum and academic programs, diversity and equity, facilities, faculty
grievances, student conduct, tenure and promotion, retirement, and faculty workload.

Shared governance- “a process of decision making used by colleges and universities concerning the institution while involving institutional stakeholders,” (Minor, 2001, p.31).

Institutional Governance- is the structure and process of authoritative decision making across issues that are significant for external and internal stakeholders within an institutional (Gayle, Tewarie, & White, 2003).

Organization of the Study

This research study is divided into five chapters. The first chapter contains an introduction to the study, the significance of the study, delimitations and limitations of the study, and definitions of terms used in the study. The second chapter is a review of the literature that focuses on shared governance, the faculty senate, and faculty leadership. The third chapter contains the research methodology of the study. The fourth chapter is the results of the data analysis of the study, and the final chapter is a summary of the dissertation research including the findings and implications of the study, as well as recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, the theoretical framework that provides the foundation for this study will be explained. Literature regarding models of university governance and faculty senates, and attitudes toward faculty senates will also be included. The existing research studies regarding faculty senates are thoroughly reviewed in addition to the case studies and opinion columns which provide some supporting information to the research findings.

The literature regarding faculty senate’s role in governance is limited, and empirical research is extremely limited. Notable exceptions include the work of Mason (1972), Gilmour (1991), Pope & Miller (1999), Tierney & Minor (2003), and Minor (2003; 2004). Literature that specifically focuses on faculty senate’s role in university governance is primarily composed of opinion columns and a few case studies. Research and theoretical knowledge regarding faculty senate’s involvement in campus decision-making is scarce (Minor, 2004). Information regarding faculty senates is limited and tends to be personal narratives and accounts of individual experiences (Pope & Miller, 1999).

Theoretical Framework

Because colleges and universities are complex social organizations, organization theory can be used to explain the organizational behavior of the members of the institutions, as well as the structural factors that have an influence on behavior. Organization theory describes how organizations are designed and structured, and explains the behaviors of people in organizations (Robbins, 1990). Organization theory
has evolved for decades. There are two main perspectives regarding organization theory: the closed-system perspective and the open-system perspective (Robbins, 1990). “A system is a set of interdependent parts arranged in a manner that produces a unified whole; for example, societies, human bodies, and factories (Robbins, 1990, p.12).” The system perspective is a useful framework to conceptualize organizations in order to understand the patterns and actions within the organization boundaries, and to gain insight why organizations are resistant to change (Robbins, 1990).

An open system is a system that interacts with its external environment (Robbins, 1990). Open systems are input-output transformation systems that depend on their environment for survival (Robbins, 1990). Daniel Katz’s and Robert Kahn’s theoretical framework of environmental perspective and Herbert Simon’s bounded rationality are examples of open system ideology.

A closed system is a system that is self-contained and ignores the effect of the environment on the system (Robbins, 1990). It receives no energy from an outside source and no energy is released to its surroundings. Ralph Davis’ theoretical framework of rational planning and Max Weber’s bureaucracy are examples of closed system ideology.

Weber’s theory of bureaucracy explains how organizations, such as institutions of higher education, are social structures comprised of hierarchical authority, a division of labor, and formal rules and procedures (Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1978; Robbins, 1990; Hatch, 1997). The word bureaucracy has many different connotations; therefore, it is important to explicitly define bureaucracy as it relates to the bureaucratic model in higher education. “Bureaucracy is a type of organization designed to
accomplish large-scale administrative tasks by systemically coordinating the work of many individuals,” (Blau, 1956; Birnbaum, 1988, p.107).

Weber’s concept of hierarchy of authority provides part of the framework for this study. “Hierarchy reflects the distribution of authority among organizational positions, and authority grants the position holder certain rights including the right to give direction to others, and the right to punish and reward work effort and behavior,” (Hatch, 1997, p.164). The right to give direction to others, the right to punish work effort and behavior, and the right to reward work effort and behavior are called positional powers (Hatch, 1997). Positional powers belong to the position and not the position holder (Hatch, 1997).

“Authority empowers position holders to influence those who are responsible to them; this influence is exercised via downward communication,” (Hatch, 1997, p.164). The hierarchy of authority defines the formal reporting relationships that map out upward communication (Robbins, 1990; Hatch, 1997). For example, the president of the institution gives a directive to the chief academic officer or vice-president of academic affairs. The chief academic officer or vice-president of academic affairs then relays the directive to the deans of the academic colleges/schools, after which the deans implement the directive in their colleges/schools. The president’s directive flows down the line of communication by each position level implementing the instructions that were given by the person in a higher position level. Upwards communication operate inverse of downward communication. The deans of the colleges/schools report to the chief academic officer or vice-president of academic affairs who reports to the president. Organizations such as the faculty senate and student government are operatives of
bureaucratization in which decision-making authority in certain areas is distributed to them by the board of trustees (Kezar & Eckel, 2004).

Bureaucracy has its weaknesses. Goal displacement, inappropriate application of rules and regulations, employee alienation, the concentration of power in the hands of a few, and rule-bound behavior of bureaucrats are among the criticisms of the bureaucratic model (Robbins, 1990). Rules and regulations become more important than achieving goals that the organization loses its effectiveness (Robbins, 1990). Bureaucracy generates an enormous amount of authority in the hands of a few (Robbins, 1990).

University Governance

University governance varies from institution to institution. Although there is no commonly shared definition of university governance, the definition as defined by Gayle, Tewarie, & White (2003) will be used in this study: institutional governance refers to the structure and process of authoritative decision making across issues that are significant for external and internal stakeholders within institution. Typically on a college campus, the board of trustees, administrators, faculty, and students each play a role in university governance.

Board of Trustees

The boards of trustees are accountable for the mission and heritage of their institutions and the values that guide and shape higher education (ABG, 2010). They are equally accountable to the public and to their institutions’ constituents (ABG, 2010). According to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, the boards of trustees retains ultimate responsibility and full authority to determine the
mission of the institution, and is responsible for the strategic direction of the institution as well as overall institutional planning (AGB, 2010). However, the board should collaborate with the president, senior administrators, and faculty leaders to determine the strategic direction of the institution (AGB, 2010).

The board cannot delegate their ultimate fiduciary responsibility for the academic quality and fiscal integrity of the institution (AGB, 2010). Defining the respective roles of administrators and faculty in regard to academic programs and protecting academic freedom is the responsibility of the board (AGB, 2010). The State on Board Responsibility for Institutional Governance (2010) makes it explicitly clear that the board of trustees is responsible for the following: monitoring the quality of educational programs and pedagogy; appointing and assessing the performance of the president; and delegating authority to members of the institution. The delegation of authority to members of institution is an important piece of this study, because this study is investigating the delegation of authority to faculty members. In following the hierarchy of authority in an institution, the president is second in the chain of command.

*The President*

The president is the chief executive officer of an academic institution (American Association of University Professors, 1966). The president of the institution is in charge of a range of daily functions that are important to the success of the institution (Morphew, 1999). It is the president who officially represents the institution to members of society (American Association of University Professors, 2001). The president should also have the responsibility of selecting academic deans with consultation from faculty members
(American Association of University Professors, 2001). It is the president’s responsibility to ensure that the standards and procedures within an institution conform to the policies established by the board of trustees including sound academic practice (American Association of University Professors, 2001). Although the president has many responsibilities, the ability to plan, organize, direct, and represent are essential. Lastly, the president is responsible for the overall working of the institution (Miller, 1999).

The role of the president is evolving. More and more the president of the institution invests time and energy into fundraising and lobbying (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989; Miller, 1999). Institutions are selecting presidents from corporate and business settings rather than academic environments. Having a background in corporate enterprises, could influence some presidents to have a negative perception of faculty involvement in university governance. Instead of viewing faculty involvement as a structural foundation in decision-making, it is viewed more as a procedural standard with no value attached (Miller, 1999).

Usually, the president is at the top of the hierarchy of authority with the exception of the board of trustees. Information follows upward to the president which assists the president in decision-making. Once the decisions have been made, the information flows downward to the vice-presidents, deans, department chairs, directors, and so forth.

The Provost

After the president, the provost is next in line in the chain of command. The position of provost has evolved into the academic leadership position that was once held by the president (Miller, 1999). The provost has authority over the following: faculty
workload, faculty compensation, disciplinary excellence, promotion and tenure, the
evaluation of academic programs, research, libraries, continuing education, schools,
centers, and institutes (Miller, 1999).

The provost is also in charge of overseeing activities pertaining to intellectual
property, technology transfer, research collaborations with industry, and trademark
licensing (Miller, 1999). The provost is responsible for the formulation and
administration of academic policy in consultation with the academic deans and the
faculty senate (Miller, 1999). Following the chain of command, the provost reports
directly to the president regarding all functions and operations of the institution. In the
absence of the president, the provost acts as the president’s representative and oversees
all academic matter affecting faculty and students (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum,
1989; Miller, 1999).

The Faculty

Faculty members have primary responsibilities in the following areas: curriculum,
methods of instruction, degree requirements, research, faculty status, faculty
appointments, faculty promotions, tenure, and dismissal (AAUP, 2001). According to
Mortimer and McConnell (1978) faculty have primary authority over the curriculum and
faculty status. Mortimer and McConnell (1978) describe primary authority as the ability
to take action that has the force of legislation. The authorization for the president and the
board of trustees to grant degrees rests with the faculty (AAUP, 2001). Overall, faculty
members have control over academic affairs (Mason, 1972; Mortimer & McConnell,
Faculty members have the right to decide what to teach and how to teach it (Mason, 1972). As scholars in their particular field, faculty members are charged with judging the work of their colleagues (American Association of University Professors, 2001). The faculty of the institution serve as a check and balance system for each other. However, faculty authority is shifting from protecting the rights of the collective faculty to protecting the autonomy of separate disciplines, and the autonomy of the individual faculty member (Baldridge, 1971).

The Students

Students’ participation in university governance is essential to the campus community (Golden & Schwartz, 1994). Many institutions have a student senate, student council, or student government association that advocates for interests of the student body (Kerr, 1991; Love & Miller, 2003). Senates and councils provide students a venue to formally communicate with faculty and administrators regarding their concerns. However, when students feel their concerns and opinions are not being heard by the faculty or administrators of the institution, students may assert themselves by means of activism (Love & Miller, 2003). By using methods such as protesting, boycotting, and demonstrating, students get more attention, more respect, and ultimately more power (Love & Miller, 2003). “Student governments may even get involved in external political activities that affect the institution, such as declaration of war and environmental issues (Cuyjet, 1994, p.74).

Student participation in university governance has evolved for the years (Love & Miller, 2003). Presently, many institutions grant students authority over aspects of
student life and student activities such as Homecoming (Love & Miller, 2003). According to Golden & Schwartz (1994), student government’s primary responsibilities are collecting and distributing student activity fees. Student opinions have yet to be given strong consideration by faculty members regarding course offerings and other curricular matters (Love & Miller, 2003).

Although the Statement on Government on Colleges and Universities addresses roles of board of trustees, the president, and the faculty in university governance, it does not fully address the role of students (AAUP, 2001). It does state that the needs of students are important to the educational experience and that ways should be found to include students in the decision-making process (American Association of University Professors, 2001). The Statement on Government on Colleges and Universities further states that students have the right to expect a structured educational process, the right to due process, the right to hear speakers of their choosing, and the right to be heard in academic settings without fear of institutional reprisal (American Association of University Professors, 2001).

Models of University Governance

There are third models of university governance that institutions often implement: the collegial model, the bureaucratic model, and the political model. A model is a perceptual frame that focuses attention on particular organizational dimensions (Birnbaum, 1988, p.83). No model can be a perfect representation of a complex system such as a college or university (Birnbaum, 1988). However, these models of university
governance provide a theoretical framework for the organizational behavior of institutions.

The collegial model, bureaucratic model, and the political are the most commonly used models of institutional governance (Baldrige, 1971). The bureaucratic model is highly based on Weber’s theory of bureaucracy. The collegial model does not necessarily follow the concept of chain of command or hierarchy of authority as the bureaucratic model does. Instead, the collegial model describes authority as being one-leveled with all constituencies equally empowered.

*The Collegial Model*

“The collegial model focuses on consensus, shared power, common commitments and aspirations, and leadership that emphasize consultation and collective responsibilities,” (Birnbaum, 1988, p.86). The members of the institution interact as equals and value the right and opportunity for discussion of academic and campus issues (Birnbaum, 1988). The collegial model does not emphasize hierarchical structure and administrative procedures due to the fact all members of the institution have equal standing.

In a collegial modeled institution, the majority of the faculty members hold doctoral degrees (Birnbaum, 1988; Ponton, 1996). Faculty members are expected to be scholars, but there is little pressure to conduct independent research with publishing obligations (Birnbaum, 1988). Respect from peers and career advancement is largely based on the faculty member’s ability to teach and advise students (Birnbaum, 1988; Ponton, 1996). Although the collegial institution can have a faculty senate, the role of the
senate is usually unclear (Birnbaum, 1988). Faculty members live close to the institution and socializing between students and faculty members is common (Birnbaum, 1988; Ponton, 1996).

It is the administrator’s duty to provide student services and represent the interests of the institution to the public (Birnbaum, 1988). Administrators are not placed above the faculty or the institution as a whole. Instead “the administration is understood to be a servant leader to the college and carries out the will of the college” (Birnbaum, 1988, p.89). The administration is composed of faculty members who have agreed to serve as administrators for a limited time; after which they return to their classroom responsibilities (Birnbaum, 1988). The president of the institution is recommended to the board of trustees of the institution by a unanimous faculty search committee (Birnbaum, 1988). Therefore, the president is viewed as being elected by the members of the institution rather than being appointed (Birnbaum, 1988). The president of the institution exerts influence rather than control of the members of the institution (Ponton, 1996).

There are limitations to the collegial model. The collegial model does not explain how conflicts are managed at the institutional level (Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1977). According to Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley (1977), decision making by consensus has been identified as a weakness in the collegial model. Bolman and Deal (1984) developed a similar model called the human resource frame. The human resource frame focuses on the needs of members and describes many of the characteristics in Baldridge’s (1971) collegial model.
The Bureaucratic Model

The word bureaucracy has many different connotations; therefore, it is important to explicitly define bureaucracy as it relates to the bureaucratic model in higher education. “Bureaucracy is a type of organization designed to accomplish large-scale administrative tasks by systemically coordinating the work of many individuals,” (Birnbaum, 1988, p.107; Blau, 1994).

The basis of the bureaucratic model is that “bureaucratic structures efficiently relate organizational programs to the achievement of specified goals,” (Birnbaum, 1988, p.107). A hierarchical structure is created when lines of authority and lines of communication are established (Birnbaum, 1988). There are vertical lines that connect these offices. “The structure of an institution affects how offices interact and influence each other,” (Birnbaum, 1988, p.110). “The function of each office is codified in rules and regulations, and officers are expected to respond to each other in terms of their roles, not their personalities,” (Birnbaum, 1988, p.111). The rules and regulations are designed to protect and restrict; coordinate and block; channel effort and limit it; permit universalism and provide sanctuary for the inept; maintain stability and impede change (Birnbaum, 1988; Blau, 1994).

According to Birnbaum, the highest level of authority is the president of the institution, and the lowest level is the department chair (Birnbaum, 1988; Blau, 1994). This is not consistent with most institutions’ hierarchy of authority. The board of trustees is established as the highest level of authority at most institutions.
The faculty’s obligations to teaching and research limit their involvement in formulating policies and participating in the governance of the institution (Blau, 1994, p.165). Administrators of the institution are appointed and not elected by the members of the institution (Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1977). Administrators have the authority and power to implement decisions without the consent or approval of the members of the institution (Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1977). Consequently, many decisions and may overshadow faculty authority (Blau, 1994).

There are several advantages to the bureaucratic model. The bureaucratic model promotes skill specialization and aids supervisors in sharing expertise with subordinates (Baldridge, 1971; Bess & Dee, 2008). The model ensures accountability by departmental managers, and promotes delegation of authority and responsibility (Baldridge, 1971; Bess & Dee, 2008).

There are limitations to the bureaucratic model. The model explains formalized authority and power, but does not explain informal authority or power (Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1977). The model multiplies interdepartmental dependencies, which can make coordination and scheduling difficult (Baldridge, 1971; Bess & Dee, 2008). Most of the decision making is reserved for senior supervisors and upper-level administrators (Baldridge, 1971; Bess & Dee, 2008). Bolman and Deal (1984) developed a similar model called the structural frame. The structural frame emphasizes roles and relationships and describes many of the characteristics in Baldridge’s (1971) bureaucratic model.
The Political Model

“Organizational politics involves acquiring, developing, and using power to obtain preferred outcomes in situations in which groups disagree (Pfeffer, 1981; Birnbaum, 1988). Politics is the pursuit and exercise of power to achieve desired objectives (Birnbaum, 1988, p.140).

Unlike the collegial or bureaucratic models, decisions are made by those who persist, usually by small groups of political elites who govern most major decisions in the political model (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989, p.58). “The pressure that groups can exert places strict limitations on formal authority in the bureaucratic sense,” (Riley & Baldridge, 1977, p.15). Whereas the bureaucratic model in which higher-level officials usually prevail over lower-level officials, the political model makes it possible to form collations that can be stronger than the authority of high-level officials (Birnbaum, 1988). A coalition is formed when an individual or groups joins with another individual or group in order to achieve a level of power and influence that cannot be achieved alone (Birnbaum, 1988).

Coalitions can be used to preserve the balance of power or swing the balance of power (Birnbaum, 1988). “The dominant coalition in the organization controls the structures and processes through which organizational decisions are made,” (Bess & Dee, 2008).

“These groups articulate their interests in many different ways, bringing pressure to bear on the decision-making process from any number of angles and using power and force whenever it is available and necessary,” (Baldridge, 1988, p.8). Each program,
department, and school/college has its own “politics” which further causes unrest on campus. Conflict is not uncommon in highly political-driven institutions, and conflict increases as resources become scarce (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). Higher-level administrators, such as the president, tend to lead the institution by serving as a mediator rather than a bureaucrat. Decisions are negotiated compromises between competing groups, rather than directives from the office or person charged with making the formal decision (Riley & Baldridge, 1977). Bolman and Deal (1984) developed a similar model called the political frame. The political frame focuses on the conflict over scarce resources roles and describes many of the characteristics in Baldridge’s (1971) political model.

Types of Institutions

It has been repeatedly stated that university governance varies from institution to institution (Birnbaum, 1988). There are observable differences based on the type of institution. Forty-four percent of faculty at doctoral institutions agreed that their institution is managed effectively whereas 43% disagreed (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989). Forty-six percent of faculty at master’s institutions agreed that their institution is managed effectively whereas 41% disagreed (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989). Sixty-one percent of faculty at baccalaureate institutions agreed that their institution is managed effectively whereas 30% disagreed (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989).
Faculty Senates

At most institutions, to have a general meeting of all the faculty members would be too large to permit effective transactions of business (Mason, 1972). Hence a faculty senate is able to provide a venue for faculty participation in university governance without the whole ensemble of faculty at the institution (Mason, 1972).

Mason (1972) states that faculty senates have a general legislative authority over educational matters concerning the institution as a whole. However, faculty senates do not have authority over internal affairs of a college, school, or department unless the matters occur that materially affect the interests of the institution (Mason, 1972). When it comes to the senate making decisions, there should be a consensus in action (Mason, 1972). Faculty senates have jurisdiction over the following: standards for admission, selection, and retention applicable to all students of the institution; requirements for granting of degrees applicable to all students of the institution; curricular requirements; instructional standards throughout the institution; promotion and facilitation of academic and instructional research; procedures for faculty participation in the selection and retention of deans; standards for public information programs dealing with educational matters; standards of academic freedom throughout the institution, and standards for student affairs (Mason, 1972, p.131).

Membership

The membership of faculty senates can vary from institution to institution. The membership of faculty senate typically consists of faculty representatives who are elected from their departments, schools, and colleges (Mason, 1972). There may also be
representatives from the administration who may or may not have the power to vote (Mason, 1972). However, the faculty senate should not be smaller than fifty members and administrators should not form the majority (Mason, 1972). Senates that are composed of constituencies other than faculty are referred to as mixed senates (Birnbaum, 1991). The size of the senate can range from 35 to 90 members with a faculty-administrator ratio between 2:1 and 10:1 (Mason, 1972). Gilmour (1991) found that the average membership of institutions with senates was 58 members with a median of 44 members. Gilmour (1991) also found a relationship between the number of senate members and institutional size. “The mean for institutions with less than 2,000 students was 55 members; for 2,000 to 10,000 students, 43 members; for 10,000 to 20,000 students, 48 members; and for greater than 20,000 students, 106 members,” (Gilmour, 1991, p.29).

Eighty-four percent of institutions with senates have a representative structure (Gilmour, 1991). The representatives of faculty senate should serve 3-year terms with one consecutive reelection term (Mason, 1972). Mason (1972) suggests that faculty should try to rotate the representative position within their department, college, or school.

Committees

It is standard for faculty senates to have committees and subcommittees work on legislative pieces in specific areas and present them to the entire senate (Mason, 1972). It is customary for the committee to approve or recommend legislation before it is presented to the entire senate (Mason, 1972). The number of committees and type of committees vary from institution to institution. The following are examples of committees of faculty senate: executive committee, finance and budgeting committee,
promotion and tenure committee, faculty grievances committee, educational policy committee, research policy committee, student affairs committee, academic standards committee, community relations committee, and committee on committees (Mason, 1971). Seventy-three percent of institutions with faculty senates have an executive committee (Gilmour, 1991). In a more current study, it was found that 57 percent of baccalaureate institutions with faculty senates have an executive committee, 75 percent of master institutions, and 87 percent of doctoral institutions (Tierney & Minor, 2003).

Faculty senates are understudied (Minor, 2003). It should be understood that the faculty senates vary greatly from institution to institution (Lieberman, 1971). Faculty senate representatives can either be elected by departments, colleges/schools, a combination of both, or institution-wide. At some institutions, faculty senate representatives are appointed by administrators (Lieberman, 1971).

**Pure Faculty Senates**

Faculty senates that are composed of faculty members only and governed exclusively by faculty members are sometimes referred to as pure senates (Birnbaum, 1991). Eighty-five percent of faculty senates in doctoral and master institutions are chaired by an elected faculty member (Tierney & Minor, 2003).

**Mixed Faculty Senates**

Not all faculty senates represent only faculty, or have exclusive faculty representation. Mixed faculty senates are senates that are composed of other constituencies in addition to faculty such as students, administrators, or staff (Birnbaum, 1991). Over sixty percent of institutions have mixed senates with administrative
representation, fifty percent with student representation, and thirty percent with staff representation (Baldridge & Kemerer, 1976).

Opinions vary regarding whether mixed faculty senates are beneficial to faculty. Mixed senates with administrative representatives cannot effectively represent faculty interests or faculty issues (Baldridge & Kemerer, 1976). Mixed senates create an opportunity for administrators, faculty, and students to enter a partnership for shared responsibility and cooperative action (Mason, 1972).

Research Studies on Faculty Senates

Pope & Miller (1999) conducted an exploratory study that investigated the demographic profile of faculty senate leaders. The researcher used a stratified random sample of faculty senate leaders of doctoral institutions and comprehensive colleges/universities and liberal arts colleges, and community colleges. The institutions were selected based on their Carnegie Classification. It is not indicated how faculty senate leaders were identified. It is important to note that the researchers group comprehensive and baccalaureate institutions together. Three-hundred surveys requesting demographic profile information were mailed to faculty senate leaders. A total of 223 surveys were returned: 76 doctoral institutions, 64 comprehensive institutions/liberal arts colleges, and 83 community colleges (Pope & Miller, 1999). The results of the study indicated that the majority of faculty senate leaders were males (54%) and full professors (40%) (Pope & Miller, 1999). In regards to academic disciplines, 42% of faculty senate leaders represented liberal arts, 13% communications, and 10% medicine (Pope & Miller, 1999).
Although one of the purposes for this exploratory study was to provide more descriptive data of faculty senate leaders, there is much descriptive information that was not reported. Race/ethnicity information, number of years at the institution, number of years as faculty senate leader, leadership experience, and age are lacking from this study.

Minor (2003) conducted a national study on faculty senates specifically investigating factors that contribute to senate effectiveness. Minor developed four models to establish a conceptual framework to investigate faculty senates: traditional, influential, dormant, and cultural (Minor, 2003). Traditional faculty senates maintain control in areas that have traditionally been the domain of the faculty: curriculum, program requirements, tenure, and promotion (Minor, 2003). There limited influence on matters concerning budgets, strategic, planning, and external relations (Minor, 2003). Traditional faculty senates function to preserve and represent the interest of the faculty during the decision-making process. Influential faculty senates have authority over all academic matters as well as matters concerning budgets, athletics, and development (Minor, 2003).

Influential faculty senates are well organized, proactive, and assertive. Their interests extend beyond faculty related issues, but to the institution as a whole (Minor, 2003). Dormant faculty senates are usually inactive and exist as a ceremonial pastime for faculty (Minor, 2003). These senates do not have a role in the decision making process (Minor, 2003). Cultural faculty senates are influenced by the cultural dynamics of the institution (Minor, 2003). Informal processes maneuvered by senior faculty members may weigh more heavily on decision outcomes rather than the formal processes of the faculty senate (Minor, 2003). As the cultural dynamics change in the institution, so does a
cultural faculty senate’s decision making process (Minor, 2003). Minor (2003) notes that some faculty senates can fall betwixt or across models, and that no model is more effective than another.

Using the Carnegie Classification of Higher Education Institutions, the sample consisted of 150 doctoral institutions, 302 master institutions, and 311 baccalaureate institutions. The study yielded a high rate response rate with 119 (79%) doctoral institutions responding, 236 (78%) master institutions responding, and 233 (75%) baccalaureate institutions responding. A total of 588 institutions participated in the study. A 35-item web based survey was sent to participating institutions asking for descriptive information about the faculty senate’s involvement in institutional governance. Five individuals from each institution were asked to complete the survey: the chief academic officer, the faculty senate leader, and three department chairs from various disciplines. Of the 749 faculty senate leaders that were asked to participate, 509 completed the survey.

The results of the study indicated that 83% of the respondents believed shared governance is an important part of their institution's value and identity. When asked “I agree that there is a high level of faculty interest in senate activity on my campus,” 54% of baccalaureate institutions agreed, 39% of master institutions agreed, and 19% doctoral institutions agreed (Minor, 2003).

It was found that faculty senates had varying degrees of decision making involvement. Ninety-two percent of baccalaureate institutions had substantial influence over undergraduate curriculum, 85% of master institutions, and 81% of doctoral institutions. Twelve percent of respondents reported that the faculty senate at their
institution had substantial influence in setting strategic and budget priorities (Minor, 2003). Sixty percent of respondents reported that budget problems as the most critical issue currently effecting their institution (Minor, 2003). Seventeen percent of respondents reported that the faculty senate at their institution had substantial influence in conducting evaluations the president and chief academic officer (Minor, 2003).

Although this study provided some interesting findings, several questions arise from the findings. First, what are some examples of institutions with faculty senates that fit the traditional, dormant, cultural, and influential models? Second, were the three faculty members selected from various disciplines apart of faculty senate, and were there differences by disciplines? Lastly, were the faculty senates in this study mixed senates or pure senates? The type of faculty senate could have a major effect on the level of effectiveness of senate and determine the level of involvement of faculty members participating in the decision-making process.

In 2004, Minor continued to contribute additional information on understanding faculty senates. He created a theoretical framework for classifying senates into four models by which researchers could study faculty senates. Minor developed the models of faculty senates based on the information he collected from visiting twelve institutions, and forty-two telephone interviews with faculty senate leaders (Minor, 2004). Minor interviewed seven individuals at each institution: the president, chief academic officer, faculty senate leader, a senior academic officer, and faculty from various disciplines. The interviews lasted an hour and were composed of open-ended questions (Minor, 2004).
Through the data analysis, Minor created four models of faculty senate: functional senates, influential senates, ceremonial senates, and subverted senates (Minor, 2004).

“Functional senates primarily operate to represent and protect the interest of faculty in university decision making,” (Minor, 2004, p.348). They tend to have authority over curriculum, faculty promotions, tenure, and academic standards, but minimal influence over nonacademic areas (Minor, 2004). “The structure of functional senates is relatively traditional,” (Minor, 2004, p.348). Members of the senate are elected by faculty; however, functional senates can be mixed senates composed of deans and other administrators (Minor, 2004).

Presidential and administrative authority is often strong at institutions with functional senates (Minor, 2004). As a result, senates are not assertive and usually do not set their own agenda, but instead respond to the actions of the administration and issues that arise on campus (Minor, 2004).

“Influential senates” have a tendency to be viewed as partners in campus governance (Minor, 2004). Influential senates tend to have authority over curriculum, faculty promotions, tenure, and academic standards (Minor, 2004), and unlike functional senates, influential senates take part in decision-making regarding the following: campus development, strategic planning, athletics, institutional budget, and the selection of new senior administrators (Minor, 2004). These senates represent faculty and protect their interests, and assume responsibility for improving the overall quality of the institution (Minor, 2004). “These senates usually maintain a collaborative, rather than a confrontational relationship with the administration,” (Minor, 2004, p.351). The
administration perceives these senates as legitimate governing authorities and respect them (Minor, 2004). Minor also describes influential faculty senates as collegial.

“Ceremonial senates” have a tendency to be inoperable, inactive, or passive (Minor, 2004). Ceremonial senates include elect new officers and make decisions regarding the academic calendar (Minor, 2004), but decision-making regarding academic standards is decentralized. Faculty in departments, schools, and colleges control these matters (Minor, 2004). Ceremonial senates advocate very little for faculty interests, because they have low interest in institutional governance (Minor, 2004). The administration usually does not consult ceremonial senates when making decisions (Minor, 2004).

“Subverted senates” tend to have authority over curriculum, tenure, and faculty promotions (Minor, 2004). Although these senates have operable structures that involve formal proceedings, informal processes determine decision-making (Minor, 2004). Characteristically, these senates are counterproductive, resistive, and negative (Minor, 2004), and reflect a long history of tension, distrust, and confrontation between the faculty and the administration (Minor, 2004). Their leadership lacks effective communication skills, thereby increasing the tension between the two constituency groups (Minor, 2004).

Tierney and Minor (2003) conducted a study of faculty participation, the nature of faculty authority, attitudes toward shared governance, and the effectiveness of specific venues for expressing faculty views. They developed a web-based survey that was sent to baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral institutions. Chief academic officers, faculty senate
leaders, and three department chairs at each institution were asked to participate in the study (Tierney & Minor, 2003). Of the 3,761 individuals who received the survey, 2,010 responded yielding a 53 percent response rate (Tierney & Minor, 2003).

The results of the survey indicated that 85 percent of faculty senates in doctoral and master institutions are chaired by an elected faculty member (Tierney & Minor, 2003). Eighty-six percent of the institutions with faculty senates meet 6 or more times per year, and 10 percent meet less than 5 times a year (Tierney & Minor, 2003). Fifty-three percent of all senate leaders meet at least once per month with the president or chief academic officer of the institution, and 33 percent reported that they had never met with the board of trustees (Tierney & Minor, 2003).

The survey contained questions regarding satisfaction with the faculty senate, and the respondents indicated strong dissatisfaction with faculty senates. Twenty-two percent of the respondents reported that faculty senates were not an important governing body (Tierney & Minor, 2003). Fifty-three percent of the respondents reported a low level of interest in senate activities, 43 percent indicated that involvement in the faculty senate is not highly valued, and 31 percent reported the goals of the senate were not clearly defined (Tierney & Minor, 2003).

The survey included questions regarding faculty decision-making authority, and the results indicated that faculty had substantial influence over the undergraduate curriculum (Tierney & Minor, 2003). Ninety-two percent of the respondents at baccalaureate institutions reported strong influence over undergraduate curriculum, 85
percent of respondents at master’s institutions, and 81 percent of respondents at doctoral institutions (Tierney & Minor, 2003).

Tenure and promotion decisions were the second highest rated area of influence. Seventy-four percent of the respondents at baccalaureate institutions reported strong influence over tenure and faculty promotion, 67 percent at master institutions, and 69 percent at doctoral institutions (Tierney & Minor, 2003).

Institutional budget planning was the lowest rated area of influence. Sixteen percent of baccalaureate institutions reported little influence over institutional budget planning, 12 percent of master institutions, and 13 percent of doctoral institutions (Tierney & Minor, 2003).

Evaluating the president of the institution and chief academic officer was the second lowest rated area of influence. Nineteen percent of respondents at baccalaureate institutions reported little influence over evaluating the president of the institution and the chief academic officer, 17 percent at master institutions, and 13 percent at doctoral institutions (Tierney & Minor, 2003).

Tierney & Minor (2003) made the following deductions from this study: faculty have low interest and confidence in faculty senates; faculty believe they have authority over undergraduate curriculum and promotion and tenure guidelines, and when administrators and faculty have differing perceptions regarding what role faculty have in governance, the level of trust between the two decreases.

Gilmour (1991) also conducted a national survey about faculty and administrator involvement in governance at their institutions. The survey was sent to the presidents and
senate leaders at 800 institutions across the country (Gilmour, 1991). A total of 402 institutions responded to the survey yielding a 50.2% response rate (Gilmour, 1991). Of the 402 institutions, 91 percent indicated that a senate existed on campus (Gilmour, 1991). Two-year institutions were least likely to have a senate (Gilmour, 1991). Sixty-eight percent of the senates assemble monthly, 15 percent biweekly, and the remaining 17 percent, semiannually, quarterly, or weekly (Gilmour, 1991). The results also indicated that 84 percent of all the senate leaders had served for one year, and 16 percent had served for two years or more (Gilmour, 1991).

The respondents were asked to indicate if the senate had authority in the following areas: curriculum, degree requirements, course approval, new education programs, admissions, research policy, faculty affairs, student affairs, budget and planning, staff affairs, administrator review, and search committees (Gilmour, 1991). The level of authority was categorized into three areas: determinant, formal recommendation, and informal advice (Gilmour, 1991). Only 19 percent had determinant authority over faculty affairs, while 72 percent had formal recommendation authority (Gilmour, 1991). Twenty percent of the senates had determinant authority over curriculum, while 75 percent have formal recommendation authority (Gilmour, 1991). Authority over student affairs was almost evenly split between formal recommendation authority (47%) and informal advice (48%) (Gilmour, 1991). Authority over research policy was majority formal recommendation (71%), and 21 percent informal advice. No senate reported having determinant authority over budget and planning. It was evenly split between formal recommendation (49%) and 51 percent provides informal advice (Gilmour, 1991).
The results further indicated that almost half of senates have formal recommendation over administrator reviews (51%), while 46 percent have informal advice authority (Gilmour, 1991). Although the research listed search committees as one of the areas, the type of search committee was not indicated. It is assumed that the search committee refers to administrative search committees such as presidents, chief academic officers, and deans. Sixty-five percent of senates have formal recommendation authority while 31 percent provide informal advice (Gilmour, 1991).

Attitudes toward Faculty Senates

There is a tendency for both administrators and faculty members to have low opinions of faculty senates. Some administrators view the faculty senate as a slow and an ineffective organization (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). When calls for responsive solutions are needed, administrators cannot depend on faculty senates to make decision expeditiously (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Faculty senates were not created to develop strategies for competing with for-profit institutions and prioritizing programs; hence, some administrators do not feel faculty senates understand the business and marketing operations of the institution (Kezar & Eckel, 2004).

According to Helm & Price (2005), a faculty senate is an indication than an institution is elite, because faculty senates signify a commitment to academic standards. Faculty participation in the faculty senate is not consistent (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Faculty members have a tendency to attend senate meetings when controversial matters are being discussed; however, attendance at regularly scheduled meetings may waver
significantly enough to effect quorum (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Collective bargaining units are sometimes viewed more effective than faculty senates in addressing faculty issues.

Factors that Influence Perceptions

Although senate members are elected by their constituents, there are several factors that can influence their perceptions. “The unique combination of regulation by national, state, local, institutional bodies, and professional organizations guide the main production functions of higher education, and generate significant challenges for institutions seeking straightforward rules that can be used to provide efficient guidance for policy and action,” (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 888). All these external and internal factors influence the decision-making process and influence the perceptions of the decision-makers. Power highly influences the perceptions of others. “Power is the ability to get others to do something that they would not otherwise do, and reflects the ability to provoke changes in others as well as potential ability to do so,” (Dahl, 1961; Bess & Dee, 2008, p.541). It can diminish the autonomy of others and suppress resistance, and power can be used to bring about positive change (Bess & Dee, 2008). Power can be exercised in the form of recommendations, advice, rational arguments as well as direct actions (Bess & Dee, 2008). Persons who are in positions of power can positively or negatively influence the perceptions of others.

Organizational politics have a tendency to arise when people begin to think differently and want to act differently than the established status quo (Morgan, 1998; Bess & Dee, 2008). “Politics is the use of influence in ways not officially sanctioned by

Summary

Organization theory and the models of university governance provide a theoretical framework for studying the organizational and structural behavior of higher education. The key elements of the bureaucratic model are hierarchical structures, well-defined rules and regulations, and formal chains of command. In a bureaucratic model, decision-making is characterized as a top-down process which legitimizes administrative control (Scott, 1992; Pusser, 2003). The collegial model is based on collective action and shared values. Decision-making is a democratic process with action guided by consensus and authority is shared throughout the institution (Pusser, 2003). The political model is composed of coalitions and interest groups. The decision-making process is facilitated by means of bargaining, negotiating, and mediating.

The review of the literature indicates that the areas of responsibilities of faculty senates have been fairly consistent over the 30 years. Curriculum, degree requirements, and promotion and tenure are among the most consistent. The research studies indicate that the makeup of faculty senates can vary, although none of the research studies indicated if there are significant differences between mixed and pure faculty senates. The literature further implies that the role faculty senate plays in the governance of their institution has varied factors. The type of institution, the number of faculty, motivation levels, and cultural dynamics are some of the key factors.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The research questions, data collection, research variables, and data analysis procedures are explained in this chapter. The purpose of this study is to identify the scope of responsibilities of faculty senates, and to determine to what degree senates have authority in the identified responsibility areas. Additionally, the researcher seeks to determine if there are differences in the scope of responsibilities (ex. budget planning, curriculum, faculty workload) of faculty senates based on type of institution and type of senate. The research questions in this study have been constructed to be answered using quantitative methodology.

Research Questions

1. What are the demographics of faculty senate leaders?

2. What are the differences in the responsibility areas of faculty senates?
   a. By type of senate?
   b. By type of institution?

3. What are the differences in the responsibility scores of faculty senates?
   a. By type of senate?
   b. By type of institution?

4. What are the differences in the number of senate members in faculty senates?
   a. By type of senate?
   b. By type of institution?

5. To what extent does type of senate, type of institution, and number of senate members predict the responsibility score of faculty senate?
Null Hypotheses

The following are the null hypotheses for the research questions:

H2a: There is no significant difference in the responsibility areas of faculty senate between pure faculty senates and mixed faculty senates.

H2b: There is no significant difference in the responsibility areas of faculty senate between master’s institutions and doctoral institutions.

H3a: There is no significant difference in the responsibility scores of pure faculty senates and mixed faculty senates.

H3b: There is no significant difference in the responsibility scores between master’s institutions and doctoral institutions.

H4a: There is no significant difference in the number of senate members in pure faculty senates and mixed faculty senates.

H4b: There is no significant difference in the number of senate members in faculty senates at master’s institutions and doctoral institutions.

H5: There is no significant relationship between type of senate, type of institution, the number of senate members, and the responsibility scores of faculty senates.

Data Collection Methods

Data from the Study of Faculty Leadership will be used for this study. Upon receiving official approval from the Center for Higher Education at Ohio University to use the data, the data will be converted into a SPSS data file.
The National Study of Faculty Leadership

The Center for Higher Education at Ohio University in collaboration with the American Association of University Professors developed a study that focuses on faculty leadership. The Study of Faculty Leadership is designed to assess faculty’s role in shared governance and to collect information about faculty leaders. Department chairs, program coordinators, and deans are examples of faculty leaders. The Faculty Senate Leader Survey is the inaugural survey of the faculty leadership study. The survey was developed by Center for Higher Education at Ohio University in collaboration with the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

The Faculty Senate Leader Survey

The Faculty Senate Leader Survey collects information about faculty senates and faculty senate leaders. The survey consists of 41 items across 9 sections: (a) demographics and background, (b) critical issues facing higher education, (c) public trust, (d) scope of responsibilities (ex. budget planning, curriculum, faculty workload), (e) budget planning, (f) policies, (g) faculty opinions, (h) leadership, and (i) final thoughts. In the first section, demographic and background characteristics were collected such as sex, age, race/ethnicity, and academic discipline.

In the critical issues facing higher education section, respondents were asked to rate how critical issues of concern were to faculty at their institution. The issues included: accountability, fiscal constraints, job security, lack of state support, and strategic planning, and others.
Respondents were asked questions about the causes of the erosion of public trust in higher education. The following are examples of the possible reasons given for erosion: “increasing tuition rates,” “bachelor degrees becoming necessary to obtain jobs,” and “lack of student safety and security.”

In the section on scope of responsibilities, the respondents were asked to indicate the level of responsibility the faculty senate has at their institution. The following is a list of the scope of responsibility areas: accreditation, assessment of student learning, budget planning, committee appointments, compensation, curriculum and academic programs, ensuring academic freedom, equity and diversity, facilities, faculty grievances, faculty workload, promotion and tenure, retirement, and student conduct.

The senate leaders were asked to rate how their institution allocates funds to different areas in the section on budget. The following are examples of the areas: administrative salaries, athletics, facilities, research support, and student activities. In the section on policies, the respondents were asked questions pertaining to faculty workload policies, diversity and equity policies, Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), and tenure and promotion policies. In the section on faculty opinions, senate leaders were asked to rate the following: faculty morale at their institution, faculty members’ involvement in student affairs activities, and the amount of authority faculty have in the assessment and evaluation of student learning.

In the leadership section, information regarding the senate chair’s leadership experiences and activities was collected. The following are examples of some of the information that was collected in the leadership section of the survey: number years
serving as senate leader, leadership positions held other than senate leader position, and perception of preparedness to handle responsibilities and duties as senate leader. In the last section of the survey, senate leaders had the opportunity to provide their final thoughts on faculty senate leadership.

Sampling Frame

The target population for this study is faculty senate leaders of master’s and doctoral institutions in the United States of America. A faculty senate leader is defined as the executive officer who presides over the faculty senate or other similar governing body, and is the lead representative of that organization.

A sample of accredited degree granting doctoral and master’s institutions was obtained from the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education using the National Center for Education Statistics Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Using the list of higher education institutions extracted from IPEDS, each institution’s website address was identified and listed. The researcher searched each institution’s website to identify the faculty senate’s website, and/or the contact information for the faculty senate leader. 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.
Operational Definition of the Variables

The following are the research variables of interest in this study: areas of responsibilities (ex. budget planning, curriculum, faculty workload), responsibility score, type of senate, type of institution, and number of senate members.

Responsibility Areas

The areas of responsibilities variables are 14 responsibility areas on the Faculty Senate Leader Survey. The respondents reported their perceived level of responsibility in these areas. The 14 responsibility areas are: (a) ensuring academic freedom; (b) assessment of student learning; (c) accreditation; (d) budget planning; (e) committee appointments; (f) compensation; (g) curriculum and academic programs; (h) equity and diversity; (i) facilities; (j) faculty grievances; (k) promotion and tenure; (l) retirement; (m) student conduct; and (n) faculty workload. The available responses were “senate has responsibility = 3,” “senate serves in an advisory capacity only = 2,” or “senate has no responsibility = 1.” The senate leader indicated the level of authority the faculty senate has in each of the responsibility areas. The level measurement for this variable is ordinal. This variable will be the dependent variable in Research Question One.

Responsibility Score

The responsibility score is derived by calculating the total score of the scope of responsibilities items on the Faculty Senate Leader Survey. The responsibility score is calculated by adding all of the 14 responsibility areas scores which provides the total score for this item. This variable is the dependent variable in Research Question Two and Research Question Four.
Type of Senate

The type of senate refers to whether the faculty senate is a pure senate or a mixed senate. The review of the literature indicated that mixed senates and pure senates are structured differently and function differently (Birnbaum, 1991). The Faculty Senate Leader Survey contained a question about the membership of the senate/faculty assembly. The available responses were: “faculty only,” “faculty and administrators,” “faculty, administrators, and students,” and “other (please specify).” If senate leaders reported that their senate is composed of faculty members only, it was coded as pure senates. This aligns with the definition of pure senates in Chapter One as academic senates that are composed of only faculty members (Birnbaum, 1991). If senate leaders reported that their senate was composed of faculty members and administrators, or faculty members, administrators, and students, it was coded as mixed senates. Mixed senates are defined in Chapter One as academic senates composed of faculty and other constituencies (Birnbaum, 1991).

The researcher will review the responses of senate leaders who indicated “other” and specified the composition of the senate at their institution. Responses that indicate the senate is composed of other constituency groups in addition to faculty members will be coded as mixed senates. This variable is nominal and is an independent variable in each research question. The chart below provides a breakdown of the variable.

Type of Institution

The type of institution refers to whether the institution is a master’s institution or doctoral institution. The institutions in this study are accredited, degree granting, 4-year
institutions obtained from the 2005 Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. This variable is nominal and is an independent variable in each research question.

Number of Senate Members

Respondents were asked to provide the total number of senate members in the faculty senate at their institution. This is a ratio variable and is a dependent variable in each Research Question Three and a predictor variable in Research Question Four.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability ensures the instrument operates with consistency, but validity ensures the instrument operates accurately (Brown, 1996). Validity is the degree to which an instrument measures what it claims to be measuring (Brown, 1996). Test reliability and validity have not been officially established for the Faculty Senate Leader Survey; however, the Faculty Senate Leader Survey has been tested for face validity and content validity. Face validity refers to how well an instrument visually appears to be valid (Brown, 1996). Instruments that do not visually appear to be valid may be rejected or discarded by participants; therefore, it is important for instruments to have strong face validity (Howell, 2004). The construct validity of an instrument measures how well the instrument performs in practice from the standpoint of the experts who use it (Brown, 1996). Measures will be taken to establish some reliability of the Faculty Senate Leader Survey for the purpose of this study.

Cronbach’s alpha is a commonly used measure of internal consistency reliability (Howell, 2004). Internal consistency reliability evaluates individual items in comparison
with one another in order to determine their ability to give consistently appropriate results (Howell, 2004). Internal consistency ranges between 0 and 1. An alpha of 0.6-0.7 indicates acceptable reliability, and 0.8 or higher indicates good reliability (Howell, 2004). Cronbach's alpha will generally increase when the correlation between the items increase (Howell, 2004). Cronbach’s alpha is defined as follows: \( \alpha = \frac{N \cdot c}{V + (N-1) \cdot c} \); where \( N \) is equal to the number of items, \( c \) is the average inter-item covariance among the items, and \( V \) equals the average variance (Howell, 2004). The goal in designing a reliable instrument is for scores on similar items to be related, but for each to contribute some unique information as well.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Descriptive statistics, factor analysis, \( t \)-tests, and regression analysis will be used to analyze the data. The data will first be screened for missing data. Cross tabulations tables, chi-square tables, descriptive summary tables, \( t \)-tables, factor analysis output, and regression models will be generated using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). SPSS is a computer program used for statistical analysis.

**Factor Analysis**

Research Question One will be analyzed using factor analysis. Factor analysis is a statistical method that allows information contained in a large number of questions to be summarized in a smaller set of factors (Goho & Blackman, 2009). The method reduces the number of factors and detects and confirms structure in the relationships between factors. It also analyzes interrelationships among a large number of factors and to explain the factors in terms of their common underlying dimensions (Goho & Blackman, 2009).
There are different types of factor analysis; however, an exploratory factor analysis will be used in this study.

An exploratory factor analysis discovers the structure of a set of factors by grouping factors that are correlated (Goho & Blackman, 2009). In order to conduct an exploratory factor analysis, the factors must be extracted, the number of relevant factors must be selected, and the factors must be rotated to maximize the set of relationships (Goho & Blackman, 2009). To extract the factors, the common factor analysis method will be used. The criterion for selecting factors is to retain all factors with eigenvalues in the sharp descent part of the plot before the values level off (Goho & Blackman, 2009). A scree plot will be used to display the highest eigenvalues and to determine the number of factors for extraction (Goho & Blackman, 2009). An oblique rotation will be used to rotate the selected factors to maximize the relationship between the factors (Goho & Blackman, 2009). An oblique rotation allows the factors to be correlated and takes into account the relationships that may be present between factors (Goho & Blackman, 2009).

The basic requirement for factor analysis to work is to have ordinal data variables. The level of measurement for the areas of responsibility variables in Research Question One is ordinal.

Factor analysis will be performed on the 14 areas of responsibilities variables. A correlation matrix and a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy test will be used to determine the appropriateness of using factor analysis. SPSS will be used to select the combination of variables whose shared correlations explain the greatest amount of total variance. This will be the first factor. Factor analysis will then extract a second
factor, and the procedure continues for a third factor and so on, until all the 14 responsibilities variables have been extracted. Assuming the analysis is able to extract factors from the 14 responsibilities variables, t-tests will be conducted to determine if there are differences by type of senate and type of institution in the extracted areas of responsibilities.

**T-tests**

Research Questions Two through Four will be analyzed using t-tests. A t-test is an inferential statistical test used to evaluate the difference between two means (Howell, 2004). However, before a t-test can be conducted the assumptions for the test must be met in order for the results to be accurate.

The assumption of normality is that each population follows a normal curve (Howell, 2004). The assumption of homogeneity of variances assumes that each population has equal variance (Howell, 2004). The assumption of independence of observations assumes that all observations are independent of one another (Howell, 2004).

A histogram will be used to determine if the data are normally distributed. When the normal curve is imposed upon the histogram, it will provide an indication as to whether the data are normally distributed or not. Based on this information, a determination can be made if the assumption of normality has been met.

A Levene’s test will be used to determine if the sample drawn from the population has equal variance. The null hypothesis for the Levene’s test states that the variances are equal. If the p-value is greater than .05, the null hypothesis is true which indicates the
variances are equal or not significantly different; therefore, the assumption is met. If the
\( p \)-value is less than .05, the null hypothesis is rejected which indicates the variances are
significantly different. In regards to the assumption of independence of observations, it is
assumed the participants completed the survey on their own, and did not interact with
other participants that would influence their observations.

If the assumptions are not met, a chi-square test for independence will be used.
Nonparametric statistics do not require the data to fit a normal distribution (Howell,
2005). Chi-square tests for independence will be used to determine whether the
distribution of frequencies over the categories of one variable are independent of the
distribution of frequencies over the categories of a second variable (Howell, 2005; Aaron,
Aaron & Coups, 2008). However, chi-square tests do require that no individual be
counted in more than one category (Aaron, Aaron & Coups, 2008).

The chi-square is calculated by first determining the observed and expected
frequencies (Aaron, Aaron & Coups, 2008). Then the observed frequency is subtracted
by the expected frequency in each cell (Aaron, Aaron & Coups, 2008). The differences
are squared and the squared differences are divided by the expected frequency for its cell
(Aaron, Aaron & Coups, 2008). Lastly, the all the results are added up for each cell. The
frequencies will be set up on a contingency table, in which two variables will be crossed
and the numbers in each combination are placed in each of the resulting cells (Aaron,
Aaron & Coups, 2008).
Regression Analysis

Research Question Four asks if the following variables predict the responsibility scores of faculty senate: type of senate, type of institution, and number of senate members. The prediction of one variable from knowledge of one or more variables is known as regression. A regression analysis will be used to answer this question.

Certain assumptions must be met in order for the results to be accurate. In order to meet the assumptions of linearity, homoscedasticity, and normality, a residual plot and a histogram will be used. In addition to meeting these assumptions, it will be important to check for multicollinearity. Although multicollinearity does not bias the results, it can produce large standard errors in the related predictor variables (Howell, 2004). However, a large amount data can reduce the error (Howell, 2004).

The regression equation is as follows: \( y = bX + a \). The predicted value (\( Y \)) is estimated from the regression equation (Howell, 2004). The slope of the regression line (\( b \)) is the amount of change in \( Y \) for a 1-unit difference in \( X \). The intercept (\( a \)) is the value of \( Y \) when \( X = 0 \). The residual is the difference between the obtained and predicted values of \( Y \) (Howell, 2004). When the squared difference of the residuals are minimized, it is known as a least squares regression (Howell, 2004).

When the regression analysis is conducted, a regression output will provide an analysis of variance table that provides the overall significance of the regression model. The \( F \)-test will be used to test the overall significance of the regression model. The null hypothesis for the \( F \)-test states all of the regression coefficients are equal to zero. The \( F \) value is calculated with the following formula: \( F = \frac{M_{\text{group}}}{M_{\text{error}}} \). If value of \( F \) is higher
than the critical value of $F$ for the given level of significance, the hypothesis is rejected. If the p-value is smaller than .05, the predictor variables reliably predict the dependent variable. If the $p$-value is greater than .05, the predictor variables do not reliably predict the dependent variable.

Other statistics are provided in the regression output as well. The $t$-statistic will provide indication as whether the coefficients are equal to zero. Large $t$-values indicate that the hypothesis can be rejected. The correlation coefficient will indicate the strength of the relationship between the two variables. The correlation coefficient is always a value between -1 and 1 (Howell, 2004). The closer the value is to -1 or 1, the stronger the relationship. $R$-squared is the proportion of variance in the dependent variable which can be predicted from the predictor variables. $R$-squared provides the overall strength of association of the variables.

Using the forward entry method, the predictor variables (type of senate, type of institution, and number of senate members) will be entered one at a time based on based on the designated significance value .05. The process ceases when there are no additional variables that explain a significant portion of additional variance. The regression equation will first calculate which predictor variable has the highest bivariate correlation with the responsibility scores of faculty senates. The predictor variable that explains the greatest amount of additional variance will be entered next. However, the second predictor variable will only be included if it explains a significant amount of additional variance. The process will continue for the third predictor variable until no additional variables significantly explain additional variance.
Summary

This chapter contained the methods and procedures that will be used to answer the research questions in this study. The research variables, data collection, and statistical methodology were identified and presented. Chapter Four contains the results of the study. The final chapter includes a discussion of the findings of the study, its limitations, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

One of the primary purposes of this study was to determine if there are differences in the responsibility areas of faculty senates based on type of institution and type of senate. In this chapter, the descriptive statistics of the research variables and the data analysis of the research questions proposed in Chapter One and Chapter Three will be presented.

Since type of institution and type of senate are variables that are analyzed in each of the research questions, the descriptive statistics of these variables will be presented first. Type of institution refers to whether the institution is a master’s institution or doctoral institution. Senate leaders from 105 master’s institutions and 102 doctoral institutions responded to the Faculty Senate Leader Survey. Although a total of 207 senate leaders participated in the survey, not all surveys were fully completed by responding to each survey item; therefore, these analyses are restricted to those who responded to the survey items. Missing data are not calculated in the analyses.

Type of senate refers to whether the faculty senate is a pure senate or a mixed senate. The Faculty Senate Leader Survey contained a question regarding the membership of the faculty senate. The available responses were: “faculty only,” “faculty and administrators,” “faculty, administrators, and students,” and “other, please specify.” If senate leaders reported that their senate is composed of faculty members only, it was coded as a pure senate. This aligns with the definition of pure senates in Chapter One as academic senates that are composed of only faculty members (Birnbaum, 1991). If senate leaders reported that their senate was composed of faculty members and administrators,
or faculty members, administrators, and students, it was coded as a mixed senate. Mixed senates are defined in Chapter One as academic senates composed of faculty and other constituencies (Birnbaum, 1991).

For the type of senate variable, 198 respondents indicated the composition of the faculty senate at their institution. Of the 198 responses, 110 were classified as pure faculty senates and 88 were classified as mixed faculty senates (See Table 1). Although 198 senates were able to be classified, 9 senate leaders did not respond to the item which prevented the researcher from identifying the type of senate.

### Table 1

**Number of Pure Senates and Mixed Senates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pure Senates</th>
<th>Mixed Senates</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td><strong>198</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question One**

The first question: What are the demographics of faculty senate leaders? The majority of senate leaders who responded to the survey were white, non-Hispanic (93%). The remaining 7% consisted of African-American, Asian, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, and biracial persons. Sixty percent of the respondents were males and 40% are females.

At master’s institutions, the majority of senate leaders are between the ages of 45 and 64 (79%). A very small percentage (2%) of senate chairs are under the age of 35.
Most have been faculty members for over 11 years at their institutions (68%). Only 2% have been faculty for less than 5 years. At doctoral institutions, the majority of senate leaders have been faculty member for 11 years (71%). Only 2% have been faculty members for less than 5 years. The majority of senate leaders are between the ages of 45 and 64 (79%). A very small percentage (4%) of senate chairs are above the age of 71.

Research Question Two

The second research question: What are the differences in the responsibility areas of faculty senates by type of senate and type of institution?

In order to identify if there was a difference between pure and mixed faculty senates as well as master’s and doctoral institutions in the responsibility areas of faculty senates, cross tabulation tables were created and independent samples t-tests were conducted. The cross tabulation tables show how faculty senate leaders identified the level of responsibility of faculty senate in each of the responsibility areas. The cross tabulation tables indicated that faculty compensation, faculty grievances, retirement, and faculty workload had differing responsibility levels compared to the other responsibility areas (See Table 2).
Table 2.

Cross Tabulation Tables of Responsibility Areas by Type of Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senate has responsibility</th>
<th>Advisory capacity only</th>
<th>No responsibility</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Freedom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accreditation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Appointments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum and Academics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senate has responsibility</th>
<th>Advisory capacity only</th>
<th>No responsibility</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Grievances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The numbers indicate that 55% of pure senates have advisory influence over faculty compensation, while 63% of mixed senates have no responsibility in faculty compensation. Most of the pure senates (57%) have responsibility over faculty grievances, but only 42% of mixed senates have responsibility over faculty grievances. Another notable difference was found in retirement. Sixty-three percent of mixed senates have no responsibility in retirement, while about half of pure senates have no responsibility in retirement. However, 40% of pure senates do have an advisory influence in retirement. Approximately 57% of mixed senates and 50% of pure senates have advisory influence over faculty workload. The cross tabulation tables showed that committee appointments, faculty grievances, and retirement had differing responsibility levels compared to the other responsibility areas (See Table 3).
Table 3.

*Cross Tabulation Tables of Responsibility Areas by Type of Institution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senate has responsibility</th>
<th>Advisory capacity only</th>
<th>No responsibility</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Freedom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accreditation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Appointments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Senate has responsibility</th>
<th>Advisory capacity only</th>
<th>No responsibility</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum and Academics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity and Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Grievances</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senate has responsibility</th>
<th>Advisory capacity only</th>
<th>No responsibility</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retirement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Conduct</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Workload</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of senates are responsible for committee appointments (82% of master’s institutions and 65% of doctoral institutions). Fifty-eight percent of doctoral institutions and 42% of master’s institutions are responsible for faculty grievances. Forty-six percent of doctoral institutions have advisory influence in retirement, but 68% of master’s institutions have no responsibility in retirement.
Table 4.

*T-tests Results for Responsibility Areas by Type of Senate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility Area</th>
<th>Pure Senates Mean</th>
<th>Mixed Senates Mean</th>
<th>Pure SE</th>
<th>Mixed SE</th>
<th>Calculated t-value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Learning</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Planning</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Appointments</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Academics</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and Equity</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Grievances</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Workload</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes significant results.
The results of the $t$-tests for independent samples indicated there are significant
differences in some of the responsibility areas of faculty senates by type of senate. Table
3 displays the results for the responsibility areas by type of senate. The responsibility
areas that were found to have significant differences by type of senate were compensation
($t(194)=0.477, p<.003$), faculty grievances ($t(195)= 2.131, p<.034$), retirement ($t(194)=
1.929, p<.055$), and faculty workload ($t(195)= 3.133, p<.002$). The researcher rejected the
null hypotheses for compensation, faculty grievances, retirement, and faculty workload.
However, the researcher failed to reject the null hypotheses for the following
responsibility areas: academic freedom, assessment of learning, accreditation, budget
planning, committee appointments, curriculum and academics, diversity and equity,
facilities, tenure and promotion, and student conduct.
Table 5.

*T-tests Results for Responsibility Areas by Type of Institution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Master’s Institutions</th>
<th>Doctoral Institutions</th>
<th>Master’s SE</th>
<th>Doctoral SE</th>
<th>Calculated $t$-value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Learning</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Planning</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Appointments</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Academics</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and Equity</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Grievances</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-3.10</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-3.13</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Workload</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes significant results.
The results of the $t$-tests for independent samples indicated there are significant differences in some of the responsibility areas of faculty senate by type of institution. Table 5 displays the $t$-test results for the responsibility areas by type of institution. The responsibility areas that were found to have significant differences by type of institution were committee appointments ($t(189)= 2.414, p<.017$), faculty grievances ($t(188)=-3.107, p<.002$), and retirement ($t(194)= -3.138, p<.002$). The researcher rejected the null hypothesis for committee appointments, faculty grievances, and retirement. However, the researcher fails to reject the null hypothesis for the following responsibility areas: academic freedom, assessment of learning, accreditation, budget planning, compensation, curriculum and academics, diversity and equity, facilities, tenure and promotion, student conduct, and faculty workload.

Because budget planning, committee appointments, faculty grievances, and faculty workload failed the assumption of equal variances, chi-square tests of independence were conducted to test for a relationship between the two variables. The results of the chi-square tests of independence indicated that there is an association between these responsibility areas and type of senate. The analyses yielded the following: $X^2(2,N=197)=6.433, p<.04$ for budget planning, $X^2(2, N=197)=7.71, p<.021$ for committee appointments, $X^2(2, N=197)=11.087, p<.004$ for faculty grievances, and $X^2(2, N=197)=8.56, p<.014$ for faculty workload.

Factor analysis was conducted on the responsibility areas in order to reduce the number of factors and identify structure in the relationships between factors. Four factors were identified in the analysis. Factor One is composed of responsibilities usually shared
by administrators and faculty consisting of faculty grievances, compensation, faculty workload, retirement, and tenure and promotion.

Factor Two is composed of responsibilities usually managed by faculty consisting of curriculum and academic programs, student conduct, committee appointments, and ensuring academic freedom. Factor Three is composed of responsibilities usually managed by administrators consisting of facilities and budget planning. Factor Four consisted of assessment of learning and accreditation which are responsibilities usually overseen by faculty members.

Figure 1: Scree Plot
Table 6 contains the rotated factor loadings which are the correlations between the variable and the factor. Because these are correlations, the values can range from -1 to +1. When conducting the factor analysis, the researcher used SPSS to remove low correlations of .3 or less in order to focus on the stronger correlations and to make it easier for interpretation.

Since the factor analysis was able to reduce the number of factors to four, $t$-tests for independent samples were then conducted on the four factors and the type of senate variable and type of institution variable in order to explore further differences. The results indicated that differences were found in Factor 1 ($t(184) = -3.005, p < .003$) and Factor 2 ($t(184) = 2.336, p < .021$) by type of institution. Differences were also found in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility Areas Rotated Factor Matrix.</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Grievances</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Workload</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure and Promotion</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Academic Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>.576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td></td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Learning Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 1 by type of senate ($t(184) = 3.103, \ p < .002$). No differences were found in Factor 3 or Factor 4 by type of institution or type of senate.

**Research Question Three**

The third research question: What are the differences in the responsibility scores of faculty senates by type of senate and type of institution?

In order to identify any differences between pure and mixed faculty senates as well as master’s and doctoral institutions in the responsibility scores of faculty senates, $t$-tests for independent samples were conducted. The results of the $t$-tests indicated there is a significant difference in the responsibility scores of faculty senate by type of senate ($t(196) = 2.176, \ p < .031$), but not by type of institution ($t(196) = -1.61, \ p > .109$). The average responsibility score for pure senates was 28.672 with a standard error of 0.474. The average responsibility score for mixed senates was 27.102 with a standard error of 0.547. Since the results indicate there is a significant difference in the responsibility scores of faculty senates by type of senate, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis.

The average responsibility score for master’s institutions was 27.4 with a standard error of 0.528. The average responsibility score for doctoral institutions was 28.561 with a standard error of 0.489. The mode for the scope of responsibilities variable was 2. Since the results indicate there is not a significant difference in the responsibility scores of faculty senates by type of institution, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

**Research Question Four**

The fourth research question: What are the differences in the number of senate members in faculty senates by type of senate and type of institution?
The mean, standard error, and the standard deviation were calculated for the number of senate members by type of institution and the number of senate members by type of senate. A summary of the descriptive statistics for the total number of senate members is displayed in Table 7.

Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Institutions</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>40.829</td>
<td>2.888</td>
<td>27.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Institutions</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>59.526</td>
<td>5.341</td>
<td>51.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Senates</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>53.617</td>
<td>9.625</td>
<td>97.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Senates</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57.67</td>
<td>4.407</td>
<td>39.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>50.436</td>
<td>3.152</td>
<td>42.415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to identify if there was a difference between pure and mixed faculty senates as well as master’s and doctoral institutions in the number of senate members in faculty senates, \( t \)-tests for independent samples were conducted. The results of the \( t \)-tests indicated that there is a significant difference in the number of senate members by type of senate \( (t(179)=-2.037, p<0.043) \) and by type of institution \( (t(140.93)=-3.079, p<.002) \).

Because the Levene’s Tests for Equality of Variances indicated the assumption of equal variances was violated for number of senate members by type of institution, the \( t \)-test results reported above are based on calculations for equal variances not assumed. However, a Mann-Whitney \( U \) test was used to determine if there is a significant association in the number of senate members by type of institution. The Mann-Whitney \( U \)
is a nonparametric test that makes no assumptions about the distribution of the data. The results of the test indicated there is a significant association in the number of senate members by type of institution ($z=-3.91$, $p<.001$). Master’s institutions had an average rank of 75.36, while doctoral institutions had an average rank of 105.80. Since the results indicated there are significant differences in the number of senate members by type of institution and type of senate, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis.

**Research Question Five**

The fifth research question: To what extent do type of senate, type of institution, and number of senate members predict the responsibility score of faculty senate?

The results of the correlation analysis indicated that the responsibility scores of faculty senates and number of senate members had a weak association with $r=.219$. The correlation between the responsibility scores and type of senate was also weak with $r=.150$. The correlation between responsibility scores and type of institution was the weakest with $r=.104$.

The analyses of these data confirmed the prediction and produced a correction of .219 between the number of senate members and the responsibility scores of faculty senate ($r^2=.048$), which is significant at the alpha level of .05 ($F(1, 179)=9.029, p=.003$). The regression equation has a slope $=.025$ ($t(179)=3.005, p=.003$). Since the results indicate that the number of senate members accounts for approximately 4% of the variation in the responsibility scores of faculty senate, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis (See Table 8 and Table 9).
In the second model, the analyses of these data confirmed the prediction and produced a correlation of .287 between the responsibility scores of faculty senate and number of senate members in addition to type of senate ($r^2=.082$), which is significant at the alpha level of .05 ($F(2, 178)=7.97, p=.001$). The regression equation has a negative slope $=-1.851$ ($t(178)=-2.574, p=.011$). Since the results indicate that the number of senate members and type of senate accounts for approximately 8% of the variation in the responsibility scores of faculty senate, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis (See Table 8 and Table 10).

Table 8.

*Regression Model Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>9.029</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>6.628</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), number of senate members.
b. Predictors: (Constant), number of senate members, type of senate.
c. Dependent Variable: Responsibility scores.

Table 9.

*Coefficients Table Summary for Model 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>26.717</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Senate Members</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Responsibility Scores
Table 10.

**Coefficients Table Summary for Model 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>29.211</td>
<td>1.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Senate Members</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Senate</td>
<td>-1.851</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Responsibility Scores

The results indicated that type of institution did not significantly predict the responsibility scores of faculty senate ($r^2=.013$), which is not significant at the alpha level of .05 ($F(1, 196)=2.592, p=.109$). The regression equation had a slope =1.161 ($t(196)=1.61, p=.109$). Since the results indicate that the type of institution accounts for approximately 1% of the variation in the responsibility scores of faculty senate, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

In summary, the first research question was if there were differences in responsibility areas of faculty senate by type of senate and type of institution. Cross tabulations, factor analysis, and $t$-tests for independent samples were used to answer this question. The second research question asked if there were differences in the responsibility scores of faculty senate by type of senate and type of institution. $T$-tests for independent samples were used to answer this question. The third research question asked if there were differences in the number of senate members of faculty senate by type
of senate and type of institution. *T*-tests for independent samples and Mann-Whitney U tests were used to answer this question. Lastly, the fourth research question asked if type of senate, type of institution, or number of senate members predicted the responsibility scores of faculty senate. Correlation analysis and regression analysis were used to answer this question. In Chapter Five, the researcher will provide a summary of the research study and its findings. Implications of the study and suggestions for future research will also be discussed.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, a summary of the study will be presented as well as the findings and conclusions of the research, and finally recommendations for future studies. The primary purpose of this study was to contribute to the literature regarding faculty senates and the role of faculty senate in shared governance. Additionally, the researcher sought to determine if there were differences in the responsibility areas of faculty senates based on type of institution and type of senate.

The target population consisted of faculty senate leaders at doctoral and master’s institutions. The data source for this study was the Faculty Senate Leader Survey: 2009. Approximately 105 senate leaders from master’s institutions and 102 senate leaders from doctoral institutions responded to the survey. The researcher was able to identify 110 pure faculty senates and 89 mixed senates in the sample based on the 199 respondents who reported the composition of the faculty senate at their institution. Fifty-seven percent of faculty senates at master’s institutions are pure senates, and 54% of faculty senates at doctoral institutions are pure senates.

Although the Faculty Senate Leader Survey contained many variables, only the variables that directly aligned with the proposed research questions were investigated in this study. Only the completed responses to the items of interest were analyzed. The sample size for this study was restricted to the 207 respondents who participated in the Faculty Senate Leader Survey. This study did not include faculty senate information from baccalaureate institutions or 2-year institutions as it was not available when this research study was being conducted. Not having data on baccalaureate institutions and 2-year
institutions limits the ability to generalize to all higher education institutions with faculty
senates. Therefore, the findings of this study are applicable to faculty senates at doctoral
and master’s institutions only.

This research study was divided into five chapters. The first chapter contained an
introduction to the study, the significance of the study, delimitations and limitations of
the study, and definitions of terms used throughout the study. The second chapter
contained a review of the literature that focused on the concept of shared governance, the
theoretical framework guiding the studies, research studies regarding faculty senates, and
the perceptions of faculty senate. The third chapter contained the research methodology
of the study. In the fourth chapter, the data analyses are presented, and the final chapter is
a summary of the dissertation research including the findings and conclusions of the
study, and recommendations for future research.

Findings of the Study

Research Question One

The demographics of faculty senate leaders appear to have remained fairly
consistent for the last decade. Pope & Miller (1999) found that 54% of faculty senate
leaders were male. The findings of this study support that the majority of senate leaders
are male, and has increased to 60% which is a 6% increase over the last decade. At
master’s institutions, the majority of senate leaders are between the ages of 45 and 64
(79%). A very small percentage (2%) of senate chairs are under the age of 35. Most have
been faculty members for over 11 years at their institutions (68%). Only 2% have been
faculty for less than 5 years. At doctoral institutions, the majority of senate leaders have
been faculty member for 11 years (71%). Only 2% have been faculty members for less than 5 years. At master’s institutions, the majority of senate leaders are between the ages of 45 and 64 (79%). A very small percentage (4%) of senate chairs are above the age of 71. Overall, the majority of faculty senate leaders have been faculty members at their institution for a significant amount of time, as well as held the position of faculty senate leader during their middle age years.

There is not a significant representation of faculty of color in senate leadership positions. This may be due to the current disparity of minorities in faculty positions. Most of the senate leaders who participated in this study have more than 11 years of experience as a faculty member at their institution. Having over a decade of experience at an institution allows one to witness the leadership changes, politics, growth, cultural shifts, and tribulations of the institution. This knowledge could potentially benefit the senate leader in strategically placing faculty senate in a position of influence in the shared governance at the institution.

By having experience as the leader of the faculty senate, senate leaders should be able to provide some mentorship to aspiring faculty members who wish to lead the senate. In order to address the disparity of minorities and females in senate leadership, senate leaders who are finishing their last terms could encourage qualified faculty of color and female faculty to consider running for the position. Potential faculty senate leaders who may not have enough experience could possibly be mentored in order for them to be viable candidates for the position.

_Note:_ Research Question Two
The focus of Research Question Two was to determine if there were differences in the responsibility areas of faculty senates by type of senate and type of institution. Using t-tests for independent samples, the results indicated there were significant differences by type of senate in the following responsibility areas: compensation, faculty grievances, retirement, and faculty workload. In regards to faculty compensation, 55% of pure senates have advisory influence over the matter, while 63% of mixed senates have no responsibility in faculty compensation. Most of the pure senates (57%) have responsibility over faculty grievances, but only 42% of mixed senates have responsibility over faculty grievances. A major difference was found in the responsibility area of retirement. Sixty-three percent of mixed senates have no responsibility in retirement, while about half of pure senates have no responsibility in retirement. However, 40% of pure senates do have an advisory influence in retirement. Approximately, 57% of mixed senates and 50% of pure senates have advisory influence over faculty workload. Since pure senates are composed of faculty only, it is understandable why pure senates have more responsibility authority regarding faculty compensation, faculty grievances, and retirement as opposed to mixed senates.

The results also indicated there were significant differences by type of institution in the following responsibility areas: committee appointments, faculty grievances, and retirement. Eighty-two percent of master’s institutions and 65% of doctoral institutions are responsible for committee appointments. Fifty-eight percent of doctoral institutions and 42% of master’s institutions are responsible for faculty grievances. Forty-six percent
of doctoral institutions have advisory influence in retirement, but 68% of master’s institutions have no responsibility in retirement.

For Research Question Two, an exploratory factor analysis was used to determine if any underlying factors existed in the responsibility areas. The results indicated there were 4 underlying factors. These results allowed the researcher to group or categorize the responsibility areas by areas usually managed by faculty, administrators, or both. Although the factor grouping is not precise, the majority of responsibility areas fit the categories. The first factor consisted of responsibilities that have a tendency to be shared by both faculty and administrators: faculty grievances, compensation, faculty workload, retirement, and tenure and promotion. The second factor consisted of responsibilities that are usually managed by faculty: curriculum/academic programs, committee appointments, and ensuring academic freedom. The third factor consisted of responsibilities usually managed by administrators: facilities and budget planning. The fourth factor consisted of responsibilities usually managed by faculty: accreditation and assessment of learning.

Since the factor analysis was able to reduce the number of factors to four, and t-tests for independent samples were used to determine if there were differences by type of senate variable and type of institution in the four factors. The results indicated that there were differences in Factor 1 and Factor 2 by type of institution. No differences were discovered in Factor 3 or Factor 4. It is concluded that doctoral institutions tend to have more influence in areas usually managed by both faculty and administrators as well as areas solely managed by faculty compared to master’s institutions. In regards to
differences by type of senate, it was concluded that pure faculty senates tend to have more influence in areas managed by both faculty and administrators compared to mixed faculty senates. No differences were found in the remaining factors.

Overall, faculty senates tend to be responsible for ensuring academic freedom, committee appointments, curriculum and academic programs, and faculty grievances. These are areas that faculty members have historically been charged to protect and managed and is inherent to their profession. Although some faculty have expressed these responsibilities are being threaten by institutional administrations and public influences, this still tends to be the case at most college and universities. The areas that faculty senates appear to have no responsibility or only advisory influence are faculty retirement, faculty compensation, and campus facilities. These are areas that are usually managed by administrators. These are areas that administrators are routinely responsible for managing at most colleges and universities. It is ideal for faculty to have advisory influence in regards to their retirements and compensation as these areas directly effect their well-being.

Research Question Three

The focus of Research Question Three was to determine if there were differences in the responsibility scores of faculty senates by type of senate and type of institution. Using t-tests for independent samples, the results indicated there was a significant difference by type of senate but not by type of institution. The average responsibility score for pure senates was 28.672 and for mixed senates 27.102. The average responsibility score for master’s institutions was 27.4 and 28.561 doctoral institutions.
Although the $t$-test detected significance in the means of pure senates and mixed senates, the averages of the responsibility scores are very close. Overall, there was little range or variance in the responsibility scores of faculty senates.

The mode for the scope of responsibilities variable was 2, which means that most faculty senate leaders indicated their faculty senate had “advisory influence only” in the majority of the responsibility areas. Since this was the case, it was difficult to determine the level of responsibility of faculty senates. However, the results show that pure senates may have higher responsibility scores than mixed senates, and doctoral institutions may have higher responsibility scores than master’s institutions.

**Research Question Four**

The focus of Research Question Four was to determine if there were differences in the number of senate members by type of senate and type of institution. Using t-tests for independent samples, the results indicated that there is a significant difference in the number of senate members by type of institution. Doctoral institutions tended to have more senate members ($M=59.52$) than master’s institutions ($M=40.82$). Since doctoral institutions tend to be larger than master's institutions and have more faculty than master’s institution, it would be expected that the number of senate members needed to represent the faculty at-large would be significantly more than master’s institutions. Gilmour (1991) found that the average membership of institutions with senates was 58 members. This finding appears to be consistent with the average membership of faculty senates at doctoral institutions found in this study.
Because the Levene’s Tests for Equality of Variances indicated the assumption of equal variances was violated for number of senate members by type of institution, the \( t \)-test results reported above are based on calculations for equal variances not assumed. However, a Mann-Whitney \( U \) test was used to determine if there is a significant association in the number of senate members by type of institution. The Mann-Whitney \( U \) is a nonparametric test that makes no assumptions about the distribution of the data. The results of the test indicated there is a significant association in the number of senate members by type of institution. Master’s institutions had an average rank of 75.36, while doctoral institutions had an average rank of 105.80.

The results of the \( t \)-tests indicated that there is a significant difference in the number of senate members by type of senate. Mixed senates had more senate members \((M=57.67)\) than pure senates \((M=53.61)\). Because mixed senates can be composed of a combination of faculty, administrators, students, and staff, the need for a certain amount of representation from each constituency group would be expected. The number of constituency groups that are a part of the senate may increase the number of members in senate.

It could be the case that the faculty voice is diluted in the mixed senates due to the added options and perceptions of other constituency groups. For example, pure senate faculty leaders indicated having more responsibility in areas such faculty workload, faculty grievances, and retirement than mixed senates. This stands to reason given that these issues are more relevant for faculty members than for other constituency members at the institution. What was not explored was the influence of the number of senate
members has on the responsibilities of faculty senate. It has often been stated that there is “power” in numbers. This hypothesis has yet to be tested as it relates to faculty senates. If there are more members apart of the faculty senate, would this position the faculty senate to be more active and involved in the shared governance system at their institution? Would a faculty senate with more members improve or hinder the relationship between faculty and administrators? Future research could address these questions.

Research Question Five

The focus of Research Question Five was to determine the extent in which type of senate, type of institution, and number of senate members predicts the responsibility scores of faculty senate. Correlation and regression analyses were used to answer this question. All the predictor variables had weak relationships with the dependent variable. The results of the correlation analysis indicated that the responsibility scores of faculty senates and number of senate members had a weak association of \( r = .219 \). The correlation between the responsibility scores and type of senate was also weak with \( r = .150 \). The correlation between responsibility scores and type of institution was the weakest with \( r = .104 \). The poor correlation is due to the limited variance of the responsibility scores of the faculty senates. If there is little variance in the responsibility scores of faculty senates, it is difficult to determine if a correlation exists with other variables.

In the first model, the analysis confirmed the prediction between the number of senate members and the responsibility scores of faculty senate (\( r^2 = .048 \)), which is significant at the alpha level of .05 (\( F (1, 179) = 9.029, p = .003 \)). The results indicate that
the number of senate members accounts for approximately 4% of the variation in the responsibility scores of faculty senate.

In the second model, the analyses of these data confirmed the prediction and produced a correlation of .287 between the responsibility scores of faculty senate and number of senate members in addition to type of senate ($r^2=.082$), which is significant at the alpha level of .05 ($F(2, 178)=7.97, p=.001$). Although the results indicated that number of senate members and type of senate can predict the responsibility scores of faculty senate, the predictor variables account for very little variance (8%). Because there was not a lot of variability in the responsibility scores of faculty senates, this made determining the amount of variance of the predictor variables difficult.

Conclusions to the findings of this research question are limited due to the variability in the responsibility scores of faculty senates. Drawing from the findings of the previous research questions, type of senate, type of institution, and number of senate members could very predict the level of responsibility of faculty senates. The results of the previous research questions have indicated that there are differences between the variables; therefore it could be inferred that these variable could possibly assist in determining the level of responsibility a faculty senates will most likely have.

Recommendations for Future Research

This research study has provided several possibilities for future research on faculty senates and faculty senate’s role in shared governance. First, the researcher recommends that the Faculty Senate Leader Survey: 2009 be revised and improved. For example, greater range is needed for item responses in order to better analysis the
collected data and fully understand the responsibility levels of faculty senate. As previously stated in this study, respondents are limited to the following options: “senate has no responsibility,” “senate has advisory capacity only,” or “senate has responsibility.” Additional questions could be included in the survey in order to probe for information on the responsibilities and the authority of faculty senates.

An item to identify whether an institution is public or private would be very useful in future studies. Although faculty senates at master’s and doctoral institutions nationwide were identified and invited to participate in the Faculty Senate Leader Survey, there was no indicator or survey item that identified institutions as public or private. In general, the governance systems of public and private institutions are very different. Faculty senate’s role in shared governance may be especially different at these institutions as the operations of the organizational systems of public and private universities have different governing bodies and models of university governance.

The researcher also recommends that faculty senates at baccalaureate institutions and community colleges be investigated. Past studies (Tierney & Minor, 2003) have collected information on faculty senates at baccalaureate institutions which provide that faculty senates are prevalent at baccalaureate institutions. According to Tierney & Minor (2003), out of the 311 baccalaureate institutions that were surveyed, 82% have faculty senates.

Little information has been collected on faculty senates at community colleges. The shared governance systems in 4-year institutions and 2-year institutions are very
different, and it would be interesting to understand faculty senate’s role in shared governance at 2-year institutions.

It is also recommended that researchers apply Minor’s typology when studying faculty senates. As mentioned in Chapter Two, James T. Minor (2003) developed theoretical models in which to study faculty senates and understand senate involvement in governance. Each model has criteria and characteristics that assist in identifying a faculty senate as a functional senate, influential senate, ceremonial senate, or subverted senate. These theoretical models have not been tested and supported; therefore, applied research in this area is crucial. The results of the study could possibly expand on the identifying factors in each senate model.

Faculty unions and collective bargaining units can influence the way faculty members participate in university governance. The presence of one of these organizations could inhibit or enhance the responsibilities of faculty senates. Responsibilities, duties, and charges that are traditionally held by faculty senates may be divided or shared with a faculty union or collective bargaining unit. A faculty union or collective bargaining unit could also diminish the effectiveness of a faculty senate and render it obsolete.

Conclusions of the Study

The findings of the study revealed that the demographics of faculty senate leaders have remained fairly consistent over the past 20 years. Mirroring the demographics of the American professoriate, the majority of senate leadership is composed of Caucasian males.
The findings of the study revealed there are some exploratory differences in faculty senates based on type of institution and type of senate. Faculty senates overall tend to be responsible for ensuring academic freedom, committee appointments, curriculum and academic programs, and faculty grievances. These are areas that faculty members as a whole tend to be responsible for throughout most college campuses. Areas that faculty senates appear to have no responsibility or only advisory influence are retirement plans, faculty compensation, and campus facilities. These are areas that are usually managed by administrators or at the state level.

There are differences in the number of senate members by type of institution and type of senate. Faculty senates at doctoral institutions are larger than those at master’s institutions. Doctoral institutions tend to be larger than master’s institutions. Doctoral institutions have more departments/programs, and hence more faculty members constituting more senate representation. Similarly, mixed senates have more members than pure senates. This may be due to the fact that mixed senates have constituencies other than faculty, and thus need more members to represent them.

The findings from this study are beneficial to governing boards, administrators, faculty, educational researchers, and policymakers. Governing boards are ultimately responsible for the direction of institutions and have full authority over institutional planning (AGB, 2010). Since governing boards have the authority to delegate responsibilities to members/bodies of the institution, governing boards should review the role faculty senate plays in institutional governance. Typically, governing boards delegate the responsibilities and authorities of faculty senates to the president of the institution.
Presidents of institutions should review what responsibilities and charges have been designated to the faculty senates on their campuses. Presidents should then assess what role faculty senates play in the shared governance at the institutional level.

Provosts/Vice-Presidents of Academic Affairs are in unique positions as it relates to faculty senates. Although it is an administrative position, this position works more closely with the faculty at-large than most senior level positions. The provost/vice-president of academic affairs is responsible for the formulation and administration of academic policy in consultation with the academic deans and the faculty senate (Miller, 1999). As indicated in this study, 94% of faculty senates have full responsibility or advisory capacity over curriculum and academic programs. Provosts/Vice-Presidents of Academic Affairs can use the findings of this study to encourage a conversation with faculty senate leaders regarding their current responsibility level over the curriculum and academic programs. Senates that have only advisory capacity authority in curriculum and academic programs could begin to have conversations about having more responsibility in this area.

Faculty can begin to ask questions of their senate leaders regarding the responsibilities of their faculty senate as well as the direction and goals of the senate. Review, assess, and question the processes of the senate such as elections, positions, authority, and rules and regulations.

National associations such as AAUP and AGB can use the findings of this study to recommend policies and strategies for their members’ institutions. AAUP, being a strong advocate of shared governance and faculty rights, could use the information in this
study for their professional development workshops for faculty leaders. AGB’s mission is to strengthen and protect institutional governance through research, service, and advocacy. Since this study explores the role of faculty senates in institutional governance, AGB can use this information to help determine its’ viewpoint on how faculty senates function in institutional governance.

Additionally, the information could be used to improve and strengthen shared governance in institutions across the nation by using the findings to initiate dialogue between all constituency groups. More importantly, this research study adds to the limited information on faculty senates by providing a better understanding of the responsibilities of faculty senates at colleges and universities.
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