MATTHEW M. McDANIEL

INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE AND FACULTY GOVERNANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A SHIFT FROM CAPITALIST TO SHARED GOVERNANCE MODELS

ABSTRACT: Campus and institutional climate is a key measure of success for academic institutions. Higher education leaders serve in their positions, on average, less than 6 years, with a steady decline in this tenure over the past 20 years. This study aims to focus on the relationships and institutional climate between university faculty and university administrators as they apply to faculty governance. This study uses a qualitative case study method, in which 6 faculty members within the College of Engineering at a Northwestern United States university (referred to by the pseudonym State University) are interviewed to gain perspectives on their perceptions of these relationships. The guiding question for this case study is: What are the things that build trust between faculty and administrators that create a healthy collegial academic environment? The goal of this study is to gain a better understanding of specific themes that are shown to promote a healthy and positive institutional climate at the faculty and administrative levels which contribute to a healthy shared faculty governance structure as an alternative to the current capitalist governance model. An exploration of faculty governance is a key theme to this research.

*Keywords***:** Faculty climate, campus climate, higher education, university, faculty relationships, trust, shared governance

Introduction

More than 70% of the workforce in American higher educational institutions is comprised of non-tenure-track positions (Maxey & Kezar, 2015). This shift away from traditional, tenure-track offerings (among many other institutional climate conditions) has created a chasm between faculty and administration and their governance models. A key characteristic that has been compromised as a result of this widening gap is trust, or a governance gap. According to Hoy, Gage, and Tarter (2006), trust is a multi-faceted concept, with five key components appearing most frequently in the literature: openness, honesty, competence, predictability, and benevolence. Trust becomes the foundation for a successful institutional climate. For the purposes of this research, "successful" will be defined as a general level of satisfaction with the institutional climate among the majority of participants.

A proposed method of lessening this faculty-administration gap in trust and association in the establishment of a higher education institutional governance model that includes meaningful stakeholder inclusion in all committee and governing body compositions. This, in essence, spreads authority over a broader spectrum of stakeholders instead of isolating it within the traditional contexts of university department chairs, deans of colleges, and other university level administrators. "Faculty participation in the governance process has been viewed as essential to effective administration, dependent upon several factors, including the administrative leadership styles of those who have the ability to involve faculty, the culture of the institution which may or may not solicit or encourage faculty participation, and the beliefs and values of trustees and those serving on governing boards which relate to the sharing

of authority by administrators…" (Miller, McCormack, & Pope, 2000, p. 2). Beyond the necessary idea of closing the trust and governance gaps between faculty and administration, sharing authority in higher education takes a governance model that is potentially opaque and allows it to become more transparent.

This research study was initiated with the goal of specifically understanding the perceptions and opinions of faculty at State University (a pseudonym for a mid to large sized Northwestern United States university) as they relate to institutional climate and faculty governance. An emphasis was placed on trust within a university faculty governance structure, with further development centered on faculty retention, and idealized institutional fit. This work is a micro-study that specifically targeted the College of Engineering within the context of a broader inquiry across all colleges at State University. The results of this study include the qualitative data collected from respondents within the College of Engineering. Further comparison and holistic analysis can be made by examining the results of similar studies conducted by other doctoral students in the same course who have been assigned to study the other colleges within State University.

Purpose, Questions, and Significance

The purpose of this research study was to gain a better understanding of the specific elements that are shown to promote a healthy and positive institutional climate at the faculty and administrative levels which contribute to the development of faculty governance. Data was collected from faculty members in the College of Engineering at State University during the 2015-2016 academic year. The guiding question for this case study was: What are the things that build trust between faculty and administrators that create a healthy collegial academic environment? To further develop understanding of this guiding question, several other questions were developed to lead the study in the right direction. Is trust an important aspect in the relationship between faculty and administration? Why (or why not)? What are things that can build trust between faculty and administrators? What are the things that help retain faculty outside of salaries? What does an ideal higher education workplace and institutional fit look like? Each of these questions were asked of each study participant, leading to the possibility of other, more in-depth, lines of questioning that revolved around the central topic of institutional climate and faculty governance. These questions allowed for more clarity on how faculty at State University feel they fit in with the current governance model. The perspectives of the faculty members is the focus of this case study inquiry.

This study is significant because it provides a lens through which university governance can be viewed objectively. It presents the ideas, opinions, and perceptions of faculty and administrators alike and how each of these individuals views the current institutional climate regarding faculty governance at State University. This presentation of perceptions will allow both faculty and administrators to identify gaps in the governance process, provide more transparency throughout the ranks, and provide meaningful feedback on the state of the current faculty governance structure. This study examines several concepts that surround faculty governance, including trust, retention, and institutional fit. It also highlights the potential for development of a new governance model based on increased faculty involvement, or shared governance (American Federation of Teachers-Higher Education, n.d.; Bahls, 2014; Olson, 2009; Miller et al., 2000).

This study may call attention to a more diverse understanding of governance structures than a black-or-white perception. Though a limited understanding of the true effects of tenure status and individual faculty longevity on the outcomes of this research is available, these factors do play a role in how governance is perceived. It is important to compare the basic demographic data of participants and their responses as potential identifying markers of a developing notion of governance. It is assumed (and hoped) that governance is an evolutionary process that shifts over time to reflect best practices, and which can be treated as fluid in order to continually improve the model.

Literature Review

There is a significant body of literature related to the ideas of faculty governance, shared governance, and higher-education institutional climate. Much of the literature surrounding these topics frequently returns to the central concept of trust. The literature all supports the basic idea (which seems both intuitive and natural) that trust is an important aspect in advancing governance models in higher education. Seminal literature in the area of faculty governance dates back to the 1970s when McConnell and Mortimer (1971) published their book, *The Faculty in University Governance*. An initial review indicates that the concerns surrounding faculty involvement in university governance is not a topic that is novel or unique to the twenty-first century. To be sure, this is an idea that has long concerned those involved in academia. To get a firm understanding of the basic concept of shared governance, Olson

(2009) explains that there exists a number of misinformed definitions of the term that must be weeded out to get to the heart of the concept. Shared governance is explained to be something more complex than just a committee of faculty meeting to agree on how a department should move forward. Instead, "it is a delicate balance between faculty and staff participation in planning and decision-making [processes], on the one hand, and administrative accountability on the other" (Olson, 2009, para. 6). Communication is the key theme in finding success with shared governance (Olson, 2009).

As the literature developed through the latter part of the twentieth century, Moran and Volkwein (1988) established an understanding that administrators' perceptions of institutional climate are generally more positive than those of the faculty sampled across nine institutions. This interesting concept set the stage for further development of the concept of faculty governance and how the perceptions of faculty members varied from those of administrators. Setting goals and performance standards are cited as factors that contribute to the creation and maintenance of a positive institutional climate (Moran & Volkwein, 1988). This can be achieved through greater communication and understanding of the rank and file of a particular institution and organization.

Miller et al. (2000) conducted a qualitative research study by surveying the faculty of three community colleges, two comprehensive universities, and three research-oriented universities. Among these three groups, 713 full-time tenure-track or tenure-earning faculty responded. Faculty responded that their "role in the governance process was to insist on rights and responsibilities in appropriate governance roles, such as curriculum requirements, [and] graduation requirements (Miller et al., 2000, p. 8)" and that this role should be played out and sought out by "using the faculty senate as a conduit for soliciting faculty participation" (Miller et al., 2000, p. 9). To be sure, Miller et al. (2000) agree that the roles of faculty are diverse and broad, but that they may be better unified through a shared governance model. They argue that most faculty want to work harder and want to be involved in the decision making processes of their institutions (Miller et al., 2000).

In a statement released by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) – Higher Education (n.d.), shared governance is explained to be a system under attack. It is being challenged by a corporate style business model that is more interested in fiscal outcomes rather than academic pursuits and their independent merits.Other issues , include concerns among faculty and staff with the outsourcing of instruction jobs, the influx of adjunct faculty (or other low paying, low job security style positions) taking on jobs and teaching positions previously set aside for tenured faculty, shying away from traditionally academic courses in lieu of more 'real-world' style coursework, and increased workloads for tenured professionals (American Federation of Teachers-Higher Education, n.d.). It is argued that for the success of a valid shared governance model, faculty and staff must be able to represent themselves by their own choosing (not in some semi-transparent selection process deemed correct by the institution that predetermines 'qualified' candidates) and that they should be able to participate in the decision making process "at all levels of decision-making" (American Federation of Teachers-Higher Education, n.d.).

Hoy, Gage III, and Tarter (2006) entered the trust conversation by placing this idea in the context of school mindfulness. Though their survey was conducted with middle school teachers (which presents a difference between the aim of this proposal towards higher education), the concept of mindfulness as an important aspect of the faculty-administration trust complex becomes apparent. To function in a mindless fashion shows dedication to the maintenance of the status quo simply because it is convenient, common, and routine. To be mindful in developing faculty-administration trust is to provide "continuous scrutiny and refinement of expectation based on new experiences, appreciation of the subtleties of context, and identification of novel aspects of context that can improve foresight and functioning" (Hoy et al., 2006). This support the concept of a progressive governance model associated with the shared governance concept previously addressed.

As the AFT (n.d.) identified in its statement, university faculty have shared concerns regarding the tendency of some institutions to experience poor working conditions and a lack of support for faculty members which leads to negative effects on student learning. This concept is supported by the work of Maxey and Kezar (2015) as they studied the institutional climate conditions that proved to be problematic among non-tenure-track university faculty. In alignment with the findings of Hoy et al. (2006), Maxey and Kezar (2015) found that longstanding practices were one of the most significant obstacles to developing meaningful change within an institutional organization. The non-tenure-track faculty were found to be excluded from participation in many campus organizations and administrative processes due to the nature of their generally teaching-only positions (Maxy & Kezar, 2015). This further complicated their ability to be heard in governance structures.

In a previous study by Kezar and Sam (2014), the idea of governance as a catalyst for policy change was explored. The governance literature review of this article exhibits a powerful exploration of the most contemporary literature

surrounding the topic. The article uses a case study approach to organizing data collected from 30 previous case studies conducted by the authors (Kezar & Sam, 2014). The primary questions of this research were: "(1) What is the role of governance in creating institutional change for nontenure track faculty, and (2) What policies and practices can maximize and facilitate their role in changing the institution through governance?" (Kezar & Sam, 2014, p. 428). Findings showed that many faculty think governance is a luxury, but that participants in the study disagreed with this notion. Further, a significant answer to the second primary question was that the development of union contracts and/or faculty handbooks to include verbiage protecting and advancing faculty governance, especially supporting nontenure track faculty, is an important step in advancing the overall progress of faculty governance (Kezar & Sam, 2014).

On a worldview level, research has also been done regarding the higher education's institutional organizational climate. This shows that the idea of institutional climate is on the minds of researchers across the globe. Yang (2015) explored the effects of institutional climate on performance satisfaction at a university in Taiwan. Gender differences in institutional climate were a significant concern in Yang's work (2015). Beyond this, however, policy implementation from a governmental level to address the issues presented was suggested. A strong foundation in the provision of resources and funding was a strengthening bond in faculty-administration relationships and overall trust within the institution (Yang, 2015). Though not directly related to the faculty climate concerns that this proposal addresses, this piece of literature sheds light on the global nature of the concern for advancing faculty-administration relations through governance.

Gaps in the literature may include areas that are more specific to unique university settings. Much of the existing literature caters to a broad view of faculty governance. Applying this methodology to a specific department, college, or university may be an area of potential study. Beyond this, finding geographic markers or inter-collegiate opportunities to expand inquiry within the realm of existing literature may be an appropriate avenue for study.

Theoretical Framework

Rhoades (2005) proposes a shared governance model at the university level that focuses on democratic accountability. While universities are recognized as having a variety of functions, among them are the ideas of "generating revenue for academic institutions and producing knowledge and wealth to boost the global competitiveness of corporations" (Rhoades, 2005, p. 38). The trajectory that many universities use to meet the needs of these essential functions has become increasingly capitalist in nature, especially with the push of these institutions to expect that faculty assume responsibility for the generation of external monies through grant writing and other revenue streams (Rhoades, 2005). This capitalist trend as a means to an end has created a rift among faculty and its leadership, creating unequal decision-making processes (Rhoades, 2005) and has complicated the essence and spirit of true shared governance. As a result of this identification of the capitalist trend of higher-education institutions, Rhoades argues that a corporate model prevails, and which, unfortunately, leaves unfulfilled many of the essential functions that higher education institutions are expected to perform and also rejects the basic tenets of shared governance (Rhoades, 2005). Further, as a corporate structure prevails, employers, boards, and individuals with higher, managerial-type positions gain more influence solely for economic reasons (Rhoades, 2005).

Instead of this trend towards a corporate governance style, Rhoades (2005) argues that the pendulum must swing back towards democratic accountability. He outlines the keys to a democratic accountability model to include an increase in accountability for external and internal constituencies, a public-interest-oriented professionalism, and "a bottom line not of revenue generation, but of societal enhancement" (Rhoades, 2005, p. 41). A governance model developed and supported by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is established by Rhoades (2005) as a foundational model supporting his theory which "bases the faculty's claims to academic freedom and a voice in governance on the scholarly expertise of faculty members, which had to be protected against external pressure from capitalists who would try to influence and compromise the independent judgements, teachings, and research findings of faculty" (Rhoades, 2013, p. 41). In the AAUP's model, a firm stance that "colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage calling for appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the components of the academic institution" (AAUP, n.d., para. 1) is established. This model sets forth the need for various stake-holding groups to produce a joint effort in solving educational problems (AAUP, n.d.). Joint efforts are called upon within the academic institution in the areas of (a) communication among the governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others; (b) general educational policy; (c) internal operations of the institution; and (d) external relations of the institution (AAUP, n.d.). Beyond this, the AAUP governance model outlines expectations for the governing board, the president of the institution, the faculty, and students on their roles

in the shared governance process. Key themes from the model include consistent and constant communication among all of these key groups to maintain a high standard of transparency, due process in decision making determinations, the involvement of all key groups in policy creation, procedure setting, and financial decision-making, and a healthy interdependence among key groups to foster a positive symbiotic relationship that promotes the mission and vision of the institution.

Applying Rhoades' democratic accountability model (2005) and the AAUP's (n.d.) model of shared governance as means of avoiding the corporate-style capitalist trend of higher education institutions frames this study. An understanding of faculty views on how questions of shared governance and the level of a corporate, capitalist trends affect institutional climate is explored and developed.

Research Design and Methods

This study uses a qualitative case study research approach. A limited case study theoretical perspective will be considered, as the research will involve "the study of a case within a real-life, contemporary context or setting" (Creswell, 2013). The study is a limited case study, as further inquiry and investigation would be necessary to fulfill the needs of providing multiple sources of information (Creswell, 2013). The epistemological interpretive framework is social constructionism. According to Egbert and Sanden (2014), constructionism results in the rejection of the notion of objective Truth, but instead provides a foundation for the establishment of a new reality that lies somewhere between subjectivity and objectivity. Crotty (1998) further indicates that through constructionism, meaning is not discovered but constructed. This framework will allows the research to take an organic path to supporting a faculty governance model that includes all of the ideas unearthed through analysis and coding of the collected data. The data in this study consist only of interview transcripts. Future development of this study could include the review of historical documents directly related to faculty governance at State University, observations and field notes of faculty-administration interaction, and a cross-college analysis of data.

The target population of this study was full-time faculty in the College of Engineering at State University. This included, but was not limited to assistant professors, associate professors, department chairs, and deans. A convenience sample of six ($n = 6$) faculty members from the College of Engineering was obtained by sending out an initial email inquiry (Appendix A) to all faculty in the college. Table 1 presents a demographic summary of the study participants.

Table 1. Study Participant Demographic Summary

NAME (Pseudonym)	GENDER (M/F)	DISCIPLINE	ADACEMIC RANK	SERVED AT THE INSTITUTION FOR 4 YEARS OR MORE?
Dr. Mark Cooper	M	Engineering Technology	Associate Professor and Department Chair	Y
Dr. Randy Diaz	M	Engineering Technology	Associate Professor and Department Chair	Y
Dr. Adam Griffin	M	Engineering Technology	Assistant Professor	N
Dr. Ryan Patterson	M	Engineering Technology	Assistant Professor	N
Dr. Joe Phillips	M	Engineering Technology	Assistant Professor	Y
Dr. Gary Washington	M	Engineering Technology	Associate Professor	Y

The email inquiry included a request to participate in a short (10-15 minute) phone interview answering open-ended questions regarding individual experiences as a faculty member. No compensation was offered to participants. All participants were asked to complete an informed consent form before taking part in the interview. Part of the introductory script read to all interviewees included information regarding confidentiality and anonymity of responses and respondents, as well as permission to record the interview. The text of the IRB approved introductory script, as well as the foundational interview questions are found in Appendix B.

The study was conducted during the 2015-2016 academic year, with data collection occurring during the spring semester of 2016. The primary data collection method was an interview. Due to proximity constraints between the researcher and the subjects, interviews were conducted via appointment based recorded phone calls. Five key questions were asked of each subject, with the potential for clarification questions if the opportunity presented itself to gather more detailed information. While the interviews for this study were conducted within the College of Engineering at State University, colleagues collected and reported data from other colleges at State University. Their data are not reported in this article, though articles similar in scope and nature may be found and analyzed for comparative purposes.

There are a number of notable limitations to this study. First, the proposed sample size is small ($n = 6$). If the data collected from the College of Engineering were to be combined with the data collected from all other colleges, the sample size would be much more significant and likely would be able to present more accurate results. Beyond this, a general lack of depth in qualitative data also limits the study. The absence of data beyond interviews (observations, interviews, audiovisual materials, historical documents, reports, etc.) means that the study leaves open the possibility to generate more research based on the basic findings from a superficial initial inquiry. And there was a lack of both participant gender and ethnic diversity.

Data coding was based on major categories of conceptual ideas. To complete the initial coding process, all six transcripts were read in their entirety to identify themes (Appendix C). Open coding was used to "conceptualize the data line by line" (Savin-Baden & Howell Major, 2013, p. 422). During the coding process, a positive or negative connotation was associated with each code for each participant. The purpose of this association was to get a better understanding not just of the frequency of a code, but to better understand the implications of the code as it related directly to the concept of faculty governance and faculty involvement within its college. Some codes, while having a high frequency, were found to have equal numbers of positive and negative association, while others, though perhaps less frequently recurring, had overwhelmingly positive or negative associations from multiple study participants.

A priori codes established as a result of the literature review and the theoretical framework of Rhoades (2005) and the AAUP (n.d.) included trust, faculty involvement, communication, morale, and the question of available resources, including budget, materials, work space, instrumentation, and working conditions, especially as they applied to the potential of a capitalist-style governance structure. Among these codes and themes, trust, morale, and the question of budget, materials, and other financial implications of governance were the most commented upon.

Findings

Trust

When asked about trust, the majority of respondents had a generally favorable view of trust as an important aspect in the relationship between faculty and administration. One long-time faculty member stated that "trust is very important, and if you don't trust the people above you, you probably are not going to suggest ideas, promote things to better things". Another respondent affirmed several times his feeling that trust within the college is strong by saying that "I do feel that [administrators] are trustworthy". One other respondent indicated that he felt much more confidence and trust among administrators that had "gone through the regular faculty ranks", citing an "inferred trust" among these individuals because they have a better understanding of the plight of the faculty. Though one respondent felt that trust is essential, he went on to add that, with regards to faculty-administration relations, "they say they listen, but they don't really listen, or they don't want to hear and they don't provide resources necessary to do things." This speaks to a possible negative perception of trust between faculty and administration and also introduces the theme of lack of resources among faculty in the College of Engineering. One other professor indicated that there has been "such an erosion of trust between faculty and administration that there is no benefit of the doubt…which I think is a key part in any relationship". Though a few negative undertones of trust were identified, the general sense from respondents was that trust is both necessary and improving within the college.

Morale

Morale was an area that many respondents identified as an important and contributing factor to faculty-administration relationships and shared governance. Two different professors felt that morale was low due to heavy faculty burdens. "The workload goes up, the resources aren't there to do what needs to be done and that has a big effect on morale". Two other respondents, however, painted morale in a positive light. One stated that after having

worked briefly at two other institutions, that he felt he had a good handle on what types of red flags to look for, and that he "was pretty aware of how things were working at other universities and what the climate was and they had a lot of things…mentioned that were big red flags and weren't working, and actually I haven't seen that here, so I am very pleased thus far." It is noteworthy that those respondents with more negative views towards morale had significantly longer tenures at the university then those who responded with more positive views.

Financial Support

Perhaps the most significant a priori code within the context of the theoretical framework established by Rhoades (2005) and the AAUP (n.d.) is the theme of financial support. This encompasses several different themes, including salaries, budgets, resources, instrumentation, working conditions, and work spaces. Rhoades (2005) argued that the capitalist trend of universities widens the trust and governance gap between faculty and administration, and that "traditional academic structures are restraints on [financial] responsiveness" (p. 39). All of the respondents in this study shared negative perceptions and views on the financial support they receive. This overwhelming response strongly supports the theories of Rhoades (2005) and the AAUP (n.d.) in arguing that the heavy focus on all things 'financial' is detrimental to the goals and needs of academics. One respondent brought nearly every response back to the idea that lack of financial support and resources was the catalyst for governance disagreements. Resources such as "faculty time, laboratory facilities, equipment… [we] don't have the equipment and facilities and capabilities to do things [administrators] as [us] to do." Another professor cited "budget restraints", "dwindling resources", and "salary issues" as contributing factors to the "opaque" governance of the College of Engineering. Another professor responded that "the workload doesn't match the compensation…we keep doing more and more with basically our fixed compensations, whatever those are, whatever the benefits are, so it is the pull between the business productivity model and the idealistic academia model." This respondent clearly identifies the problem presented in the theoretical framework of the extremes of the governance continuum. While all respondents added a negative view of financial support, they all also discussed changes which could make major headway in solving this issue. Among these changes are centrally supported instrumentation, competitive salaries, more reasonable teaching loads (one respondent stated that he is teaching seven and eight courses each semester, along with recruitment responsibilities, advising responsibilities, and scholarly activities), time for professional development, and more inter-departmental collaboration. Faculty members argued that these changes could lessen the governance gap between faculty and administrators, which would create a path towards the AAUP's (n.d.) shared governance model and Rhoades' (2005) democratic accountability model.

Mutual Respect

Inductive codes, or those that have come directly from the data, included mutual respect, commitment, job satisfaction and institutional fit, and teamwork. Mutual respect was cited as a key factor in faculty governance by two respondents. Both had favorable, positive views on the importance and existence of mutual respect within their college. "I don't always agree with the ideas of my department chair and he doesn't always agree with my ideas, but he recognized the fact that my ideas are not meant to critique him, but to suggest something that might lead to the betterment [of the department]. There is a trust and respect and a very constructive discussion that comes out of [this] scenario that probably leads to something different than my idea, and [different than] his idea, and [out] comes a better idea." This suggests that collegiality and mutual respect between faculty and administration are contributing factors to the a priori code of trust that was found to be essential in closing the governance gap and moving towards a strong shared governance model.

Institutional Fit

Institutional fit was one of the few codes that garnered a unanimously positive response. Despite other negative implications and perceptions, all of the respondents that discussed institutional fit viewed their placement as generally positive. This is not to say that they found themselves in an ideal or utopian fit, but there was an overall satisfaction with their placement. One professor stated, "I like my current position a lot. You are not going to have everything, but I have a small research group…I enjoy teaching…I am quite happy…[and] this has been a good fit for me." The implication of this positive view of institutional fit paves the way for a shared governance model, as faculty feel that they enjoy their placements.

Several emergent codes, or those that might "possibly make new insights about the data" (Saldaña, 2013, p. 28), include faculty turnover rates, university-level stability, student involvement in the development of a department or college at a university, and honesty as a fundamental need for successful faculty governance. Honesty relates directly to the a priori code of trust. Honesty was listed as the most significant factor in building trust between faculty and administrators by one respondent. Even when the facts are not what everyone wants to hear, providing a firm foundation of agreed honesty will close the governance gap. Student involvement was perhaps the most interesting emergent code, as most of the respondents focused solely on faculty and administration when considering governance. The AAUP (n.d.) suggests that students are entitled to involvement in the affairs of their college or university. To be sure, the institution would not exist without their financial, physical, and educational contributions. One professor responded that "highly motivated students" significantly impact his work and contribute to the development of the College of Engineering. He also interestingly noted that "we have excellent undergrad students, but when it comes to grad students, oh my, I mean, we have to start to bring high quality students to [this state]." A push for student involvement, though likely cumbersome for faculty and administrators, is a key component to developing a shared governance model that is successful and meaningful (AAUP, n.d.).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of factors that contribute to the governance gap between collegiate faculty and administrators. Identifying key areas of concern and key strengths in the relationships between faculty and their superiors builds a case for the development of a functional faculty governance model, even a shared governance model as proposed by the AAUP. Though the response rate of faculty within the College of Engineering at State University was low, the finding of this study strongly support both Rhoades' (2005) model of democratic accountability in faculty governance and the AAUP's (n.d.) model of shared governance at the university level. When considering the capitalist trend in higher education governance models today, the faculty perception is strong that a shared governance model is preferable, and even potentially more profitable (though the latter claim would be grounds for further study).

The present study's most significant addition to the literature on faculty governance is the support for a shared governance model as opposed to the trending capitalist, revenue-centric models. The desire of faculty to have a voice in governance is clear. The data of this study make it clear that faculty feel devalued, overworked, and underpaid. Faculty feel that there is room for increased trust which can lead to higher morale and better faculty-administration communication, along with a more transparent governance structure. Capitalist governance models are increasing the governance gap between faculty and administrators. Faculty feel that their voices are not heard unless they are found to be strong financial contributors to their departments. Ironically, the same are not satisfied with the resources provided to them by their institutions. One study participant explained the three pronged expectations of his work at State University, which includes teaching, research, and outreach. He said that State University expects him to focus first on enrollment, or outreach, which is directly related to the fiscal stability of State University and the College of Engineering, but that evaluations and opportunities for advancement are based on scholarly activity. This example of disconnect between the expectations of faculty and desired program outcomes from administrators exemplifies the governance gap. Increased communication of expectations and desired program outcomes will lead towards a shared governance model and away from a capitalist governance structure.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Implications for policy and practice resulting from this study are intertwined. With regards to policy, it may be that a disconnect occurs between existing policy and practice. State University has an existing governance model that seems to lean closer to the shared governance model than the capitalist model on paper, however the data support the idea that many of the decision makers favor a capitalist approach (likely driven by perceived necessity) in practice. A review of the gap between theory and practice could alleviate this discrepancy. Besides a review of existing policy implementation, a consideration of the creation of new or stronger policy verbiage outlining the rights of stakeholders in the governance process would reinforce the rights of non-administrative participants in the faculty governance process. The data of this study indicate that faculty feel like they do not have a voice in the process even though they do by right and by policy. The unwritten rules of governance are seemingly more powerful than the policy. This leads to distrust, poor communication, unclear expectations, and a weary constituency.

In practice, data from this study support the idea that several key changes could make major headway closing the governance gap and favor a shared governance model. Among these changes are centrally supported instrumentation, competitive salaries, more reasonable teaching loads, time for professional development, and more faculty collaboration. These changes could lessen the governance gap between faculty and administrators creating a path towards the AAUP's (n.d.) shared governance model and Rhoades' (2005) democratic accountability model. They would also likely increase faculty morale, job satisfaction, university stability, and mutual respect, all of which contribute to the question of institutional climate. Ideally, these changes will also lead to better fulfillment of the mission and vision of the institution by all stakeholders.

Conclusion and Summary

The goal of this study was to understanding the perceptions and attitudes of faculty with regards to faculty-administration trust, shared governance, retention, and institutional climate within the College of Engineering at State University. The results of this study will be used to advance the concept of shared governance as a primary method of developing the university faculty governance structure to allow faculty to have a voice in the decision-making processes within their departments and to provide a progressive lens through which administrators may view their departments.

AFFILIATIONS

Matthew M. McDaniel is a doctoral student in the Leadership and Counseling Department in the College of Education, Health and Human Sciences at the University of Idaho.

REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors. (n.d.). Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities. Retrieved April 30, 2016, from http://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities

American Federation of Teachers-Higher Education. (n.d.). *Shared governance in higher education: A statement by the higher education program and policy council*. Washington, DC: Sandra Feldman.

Bahls, S. C. (2014, March). How to Make Shared Governance Work: Some Best Practices. *Trusteeship*.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage Publications.

Egbert, J., & Sanden, S. (2014). *Foundations of education research: Understanding theoretical components*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hoy, W. K., Gage, C. Q., III, & Tarter, C. J. (2006). School Mindfulness and Faculty Trust: Necessary Conditions for Each Other? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42*(2), 236-255.

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2012). Governance as a Catalyst for Policy Change: Creating a Contingent Faculty Friendly Academy. *Educational Policy, 28*(3), 425-462.

Maxey, D., & Kezar, A. (2015). Revealing Opportunities and Obstacles for Changing Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Practices: An Examination of Stakeholders' Awareness of Institutional Contradictions. *The Journal of Higher Education, 86*(4), 564-594.

McConnell, T. R., & Mortimer, K. P. (1971). *The faculty in university governance*. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California.

Miller, M., McCormack, T., & Pope, M. (2000). Sharing Authority in Higher Education: Faculty Involvement in Governance. San Jose State University, CA.

Moran, E. T., & Volkwein, J. F. (1988). Examining organizational climate in institutions of higher education. *Research in Higher Education, 28*(4), 367-383.

Olson, G. A. (2009, July 23). Exactly What Is 'Shared Governance'? Retrieved February 27, 2016, from http://chronicle.com/article/Exactly-What-Is-Shared/47065/

Rhoades, G. (2005). Capitalism, Academic Style, and Shared Governance. *Academe, 91*(3), 38. doi:10.2307/40252785

Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Savin-Baden, M., & Howell Major, C. (2013). *Qualitative research: The essential guide to theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

Yang, C. (2015). The Effects of Higher Education's Institutional Organizational Climate on Performance Satisfaction: Perceptions of University Faculty in Taiwan. *IBR International Business Research, 8*(8).