FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF PRIVATIZATION IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

Keywords: privatization, higher education, shared governance

Rachel Boon

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Education, Leadership and Policy Studies,
Indiana University
June 2009

Accepted by the Graduate Faculty, Indiana University, in partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Doctoral Committee

Douglas M. Priest, Ed.D.

Donald Hossler, Ph.D.

Robert Toutkoushian, Ph.D.

Edwardo Rhodes, Ph.D.

Date:

Acknowledgements:

Doug Priest, Don Hossler, Rob Toutkoushian and Edwardo Rhodes: Your sage guidance made this project infinitely stronger. Much appreciation to you.

Doug Priest, Wanda Everage, and Sue Wright: You've provided me career and academic inspiration and helped shape my aspirations. I am indebted and thankful beyond measure.

John Moore, Karen Jackson and Joan Faber McAlister: The expertise and emotional support you provided were exceptional. You have my eternal gratefulness.

Adam and Addison Boon and Dan and Fran Dykstra: You've supported me, let me off the hook repeatedly, and never let me quit. I love you and dedicate this to you.

Rachel Boon

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF PRIVATIZATION IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

This study examined the knowledge and perceptions of faculty leaders at thirteen public universities in the United States to examine the degree to which they were aware of and involved in decisions to undertake privatization-related activities at their institution. In general, the importance of faculty in maintaining the institutional mission and supporting the public interest as reflected in their teaching, research, and service role necessitates understanding how faculty perceive these activities and their impacts. As a model of collaboration on decision-making, shared governance has historically provided a clear mode for faculty involvement with administrators and is supported by the American Association of University Professors. Faculty leaders were administered a survey based on their participation in a faculty senate or council at their respective institutions. Public universities with both high and low levels of state appropriations were included in the study for comparative purposes. Results of t-tests and logistic regression models indicated that many privatization activities are prevalent at both high and low state appropriation institutions, but that faculty leaders were more likely involved in budget and privatization discussions at the low appropriation (i.e. more privatized) institutions. Open-ended questions regarding the impact of these changes indicated concerns with faculty morale and retention.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1-Introduction

In higher education the rate of change is often only half-jokingly noted for is snail-like pace. From campus architecture to faculty teaching styles to student behavior and activities, university campuses look and act remarkably similar to those of many decades ago (Thelin, 2004). Areas in which the pace of change has seen somewhat more rapid transformation in the past fifteen years in particular are the funding sources and the administrative processes of public institutions (Birnbaum, 2000; Hearn, 2006). No doubt, variations in the scale of change across this sector are present, but the commonality of a shift in primary funding from public tax dollars to greater emphasis on tuition revenue and alternative sources of funding at nearly all public institutions provides the backdrop for other meaningful changes. Research is emerging about how this is altering the campus culture for faculty, but an unanswered question about these changes is the degree to which they are also occurring as part of university shared governance processes (Levin, 2006; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004).

State governments have a history of being a major funding source for public institutions, and in many respects, they still are. While there is no question that state funding has eroded, it is still the case that many public institutions receive a third or more of their revenue from state appropriations or grant sources (Palmer, 2006). This money and the history of state charters and public missions ensure that the state is still very relevant in university operations and decision-making. However, the question of influence wielded by other funding sources is also relevant. Does the use of increased corporate, foundation, or even federal grants and contracts for research impact the way in which it is carried out or how it contributes to its field (such as the recent UC Berkeley agreement signed with energy giant BP) (Vance, 2007)? Will the continued seeking of non-tuition revenue sources lead to non-mission-based commercial activity (see numerous university deals with soft drink companies) (Walter, 2006)? Will even the drive for additional tuition revenue lead to academic programming focused more on revenue than meeting academic competencies or community needs? These and similar questions are driving much of the media and scholarly attention on higher education right now (Blumenstyk, 2007; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004). At their core, they often relate back to the change in the funding levels from state sources and the policies instituted at institutional and state levels to address growing university budgets.

Faculty members are caught in the crossfire in many senses. As classroom instructors and researchers, they fulfill the core purpose of an institution and help meet major public objectives of the institution; however, the ability to fulfill the faculty role depends to an important degree on factors external to the classroom. Shifts in funding can have meaningful impacts on what and how many students fill the seats in the classroom and on the work expected of faculty members outside the classroom. Since direct budget and administrative duties are often the province of administrative and professional staff, faculty leaders are those with the most direct line to information and to participation in decision-making on the issues involved, a critical role that needs to be capitalized upon as budgets tend to reflect institutional planning and priorities. Reacting to state policy and funding shifts is often the province of administrators, but the way in which they react has critical implications for faculty making the involvement of faculty leaders a necessary link in the process.

Shared governance has traditionally provided this avenue to administrative participation. The body of faculty senates or academic councils "typically work on a representative basis, …[and] in a broad sense are mechanisms that allow for faculty input into decision-making [and] they offer a training ground for future college administration" (Pope and Miller, 2005, p. 748). Both well-informed decision-making and professional development are critical aspects of shared governance as the representative nature of these bodies contributes to their powerful ability to provide input in the process. As the individuals with classroom and other direct interactions with students, faculty can provide a perspective on policy impact that administrators can otherwise obtain only indirectly and unevenly. Indeed, this perspective is laced with faculty self-interest, but also with public interest as issues of access for students, educational quality, and academic freedom are important for state and taxpayer interests as well as those of the faculty. Privatization at public institutions of higher education is considered broadly as contingent on funding sources and related to a change in enrollment strategies. The creeping nature of privatization policies at public institutions (whether through state or institution level action) in some senses provides a perfect opportunity to receive real time feedback to assess policy impacts from faculty and staff across the institution.

Institutional Policies with Privatizing Effect

In response to funding difficulties, public universities are increasingly instituting policies and procedures that mirror those of private universities or corporations in the name of efficiency, cost reduction, or revenue production (Bok, 2003; Priest and St. John, 2006). At public institutions numerous areas are under great scrutiny given the public mission they must serve and to whom they are accountable, generally irrespective of the amount of public funding provided to an institution by the state. Given the challenge of proportional decreases in state funding, tuition strategies, budget systems, fundraising, and outsourcing are critical elements in the management of public institutions of higher education in the era of privatization.

A primary difference between a private and a public institution is the importance of tuition in the revenue scheme. Tuition strategies are often one of the first ways institutions make up for shortfalls in other revenue streams. Differentiated resident and non-resident tuition rates are explicit evidence that state subsidies are intended to focus on the resident students whose families have paid into the state coffers and for whom the institution is meant to serve. Non-resident students may frequently be highly subsidized as well through institutional grants and scholarships, but in a way akin to the "high tuition-high aid" model of private institutions (DesJardins, 2001; Stampen and Layzell, 1997). As public institution tuition increases for both residents and non-residents, however, the amount of aid to resident students is increased in ways that model the aid strategies for non-residents by raising tuition to take advantage of wealthy students' greater ability to pay. The increased revenue is then largely plugged in as aid for low-income and high-achieving students. In essence, the market for higher education becomes the driver of institutional revenue and planning instead of public policy or academic considerations driving planning and decision-making (Hossler, 2006; Paulsen, 1998). A recent difficulty for public institutions has been when state legislators try to impose laws to cap tuition increases that are part of these market machinations. This move acknowledges the importance of the public role institutions play in providing access to higher education, but these policies also distort the market in which institutions have been pushed to participate due to dwindling appropriations in recent years (Keller, 2007).

The budget system is another university function frequently selected to undergo revisions to more closely resemble private university or college behavior. Often the primary objective in transforming the budget system of an institution is to better equip it to employ incentives for efficiency, cost reduction, or revenue production activities. Since Harvard initiated responsibility center management (RCM) in the late 1970s, the movement of private institutions towards derivations of that model has been steady. Public institutions started to follow suit after Indiana University instituted RCM in the early 1990s with relative success (Whalen, 1991). This was a very deliberate act of mimicking private institution behavior. The nature of RCM, a core type of incentive-based budgeting, is to emphasize efficiency and provide incentives to create new modes of revenue production. Efficiency is not a characteristic foreign to the public sector (at least in theory), but explicitly examining options for revenue production in a public institution diverges from the roots of public charters and government entities in general.

Many not-for-profit institutions have a heightened emphasis on building an endowment for general revenue supplementation as well as targeted purposes. As a source of funding, endowments are coveted by institutions that recognize the limits of state funding and aim to prevent tuition from escalating to an untenable level. There were twenty public institutions with endowments over $1 billion dollars at the end of fiscal year 2006 (Chronicle, 2007), with many others launching aggressive campaigns to get to that level or far beyond. Conley and Tempel (2006) note that upon completion of a campaign that raised more than $1.37 billion over seven years, the very next year the president of Penn State University noted the importance of continued investment in fund raising for the institution. The cycle appears to have no end for most institutions at this point, and it appears there is enormous institutional emphasis placed on maximizing this source of income.

Streamlining or eliminating support unit costs as a cost reduction strategy has been heavily pursued by many universities (Bekurs, 2007; Gose, 2006). Residence halls, food service, physical plant, and building and grounds maintenance are among the services being outsourced by contract to private corporations in attempt to improve service and reduce costs to the institution (and potentially to students as well, though this is by no means a rule) (Palm, 2001). When the contracts for these services are well crafted, there can be an immediate change at an institution in quality of service, the revenue picture, and the management structure around that service. Long-term implications can be more varied and merit serious consideration prior to engaging in an outsourcing arrangement (Priest, Jacobs & Boon, 2006), but the intent of such arrangements varies little from one institution to the next. Typically they aim to generate greater efficiency with the potential for revenue, goals that can at times be upended years later by corporate mergers, company dissolutions, or factors not anticipated by a contract. Unsurprisingly, outsourcing has often been met with resistance across the public and private higher education communities.

State Policies with Privatizing Effect

State governments as well as the general public seem basically supportive of many of these cost reduction and revenue production activities described above, and, in fact, often encourage them (Heller, 2006). Several states have recently jolted the traditional approaches to state funding for higher education through new policy agreements, both with institutional support and without it. In 2005 the state of Virginia entered agreements with its three major public institutions (University of Virginia, College of William and Mary, and Virginia Tech) regarding predictable (and lower) levels of state appropriations in exchange for institutional freedom to set tuition and manage operations as it sees appropriate (Kaplan, 2006). The statement made by the institutions was, in essence, that if they were given permission to act more like a free market enterprise they could better serve the public objectives for their institutions. The agreements will be signed in three year cycles, initiated on July 1, 2006, that stipulate the state funding for that entire time period. As an experiment in cost saving to the state, it has a great likelihood of success. The ultimate impacts on the universities' ability to maintain tuition at levels historically expected from public institutions and maintain a commitment to the residents of Virginia, while also sustaining and advancing other institutionally held objectives is unknown. Like many elite public or private universities, however, the University of Virginia has typically seen little impact on enrollment demand at times of steep tuition increases (Turner, 2006). Less prestigious institutions seem likely to have a different experience with such a policy. With tuition dependency akin to private institutions, the variety of pressures to generate revenue will be critical at these Virginia institutions while they maintain their public charters.

The approach in Colorado has been quite different. In that case appropriations to institutions of higher education have been cut in the last few years and replaced with portable stipends for state residents to use at the school of their choice. Beginning in the fall of 2005, qualified resident students were provided $2,400 for use at an in-state, public higher education institution or $1,200 for participating private institutions. The major objectives stated by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education were to "dramatically expand college access for underserved students" and to "create a new type of competition for in-state Colorado students that did not exist in the past" (Colorado Department of Higher Education, 2005, p. 2). The state government of Colorado explicitly introduced market activities and incentives to public higher education funding in the state. This change has resulted in a decrease in state appropriations per full-time equivalent student from FY2001 to FY2006 of 37.9% in constant dollars. The accompanying tuition revenue increase was 15.0% per FTE, resulting in a net revenue loss per student of greater than 14% over that five year period at public institutions in Colorado (SHEEO, 2006). While Colorado institutions appear to have absorbed this loss so far, it seems from the outside to be a potentially unsustainable arrangement if tuition or other alternative sources of revenue cannot make up a greater portion of the past state appropriations losses. It remains to be seen, however, if the vouchers to students, now an indirect state appropriation in the form of tuition revenue, will maintain their purchasing power relative to the cost of educating students in the future to help Colorado institutions remain accessible.

Miami University of Ohio, a public institution, began charging all students, resident or nonresident, the same tuition rate in 2003. They simultaneously offer grants to all residents that vary based on need but meet a minimum level that nearly equals the increase to residents. The institution's website states that "with pricing flexibility similar to our private-school competitors, Miami can better meet strategic goals while better serving Ohio families" (Miami University, 2006). The desire to look and feel like a private institution made a high tuition-high aid model a seemingly natural choice for Miami. Though a variety of factors interplay with enrollment, the tuition rate structure at Miami of Ohio may be impacting the size of its undergraduate cohort. Since 2003, the first year of the new policy, there has been a 5.8% decline in undergraduate enrollment.

Each of these well chronicled examples is indicative of the trend towards privatization and market-based behavior at public universities. Smaller and smaller amounts of these institutions' revenue comes from the state, as is evidenced by the University of Virginia which in 2005 had only 6% of its total revenue from state appropriations. In the cases of the Virginia and Colorado institutions, as well as Miami of Ohio, they retain their public charter in spite of the fundamental changes in operations, and as that charter represents the interests of the public, it must continue to be honored and protected throughout these changes.

Faculty Impact

Some evidence suggests that faculty members at institutions engaging in these privatizing behaviors are experiencing a change in their work environment. Rhoades (2003) notes "surveys and interviews reveal that faculty are spending more time in class (generating student credit hours) but less in advising, and that as they ramp up their research and instructional productivity, they devote less time to service" (p. 3). Findings from a study of the change in faculty time allocation covering twenty years indicated that from the 1970s to the 1990s faculty at research universities actually increased the amount of time spent doing research but did not have a compensatory decrease in time spent teaching or preparing to teach (Milem, Berger & Dey, 2000). The time period covered by this study indicates the change in institutional function and faculty role has been a long-term evolution and is not purely a result of the current political climate. It clarifies, however, that, as was also noted by Rhoades (2003), faculty activity is changing, if not because of, then certainly simultaneous with the shift in institutional management and funding seen over that same timeline. Present interest in this area of higher education research and in public discourse may signal a breaking point that is resulting in a substantively different institutional character and aspects of the administrative function. The way in which faculty members allocate their time can directly impact the campus culture, the nature of a faculty appointment, and the education provided to students.

Faculty Governance

Historically, the faculty is included in a variety of administrative decisions at universities. A tradition of shared governance has long ensured a platform for faculty participation and sharing of expertise. Shared governance is largely exercised through faculty senates with members from across all major units of the institution. Organizations such as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) have public positions on the important role shared governance plays in university management (AAUP, 2006; AGB, 1996).

Faculty senates frequently have committees with names like "Academic Affairs" or "Budget and Finance" or "Faculty Affairs." It must be noted that the existence of a committee does not necessarily equate with influence accorded to it, but the structural presence does signal an at least historical understanding of the role of the faculty voice in administrative and curricular affairs. Flynn (2005) refers to this as "shared responsibility…for primary decisions about the general means of advancing the general educational policy" (p. 1). This statement is notable in part for use of the word 'responsibility' in describing the role of both faculty and administrators. This is different than just being an informed participant in the process. It also implies taking some of the heat when something goes awry. Flynn's statement is also interesting for its use of the word 'general' in reference to the means and the policies for which responsibility is shared. The minutiae of university operations are not intended to be debated between faculty senates and administrators unless they have bearing on the general direction of educational policy at the institution (AAUP, 2006).

AAUP explicitly addresses this idea in relation to budget issues in its *Redbook* stating "The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty" (p. 137). The description of the role of faculty that follows is focused on having "a voice" in the process, being party to analyses, reports, and projections of budget information, and understanding the function of each component in budgetary matters.

In spite of the clear structure to facilitate faculty involvement in budget and management decisions through shared governance, there is no direct evidence they have been systematically involved in crucial conversations about privatization. Neither is there evidence that faculty have been denied a substantive role in administrative decision-making regarding budget issues in the past. Duderstadt (2000) notes that "broad faculty participation through traditional governance bodies is all too often frustrated by inadequate information, the rapid pace of decisions required by contemporary issues, and the imbalance between responsibility and authority for most university leadership positions" (p. 54). As was detailed above, shared governance delineates the role faculty should play in review and providing a 'voice' in the process. With the changes occurring in university operations in recent years, now may be an important time for this role to be examined and to ensure it is actively employed in ways that do not leave faculty frustrated.

Statement of Problem

In higher education the literature regarding privatization and related concepts has slowly emerged over the past decade. The perspectives of administrators are well represented (Wiley, 2006; Dennison, 2003; Bok, 2003; Ehrenberg, 2000), and studies of the change in core faculty activity are prominent examples (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004; Rhoades, 2003; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). The changes in a variety of administrative areas are also well represented (Priest and St. John, 2006; Powers, 2006; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004; Wood, 2000). Inadequate attention is paid, however, to the role of the faculty on campuses in relation to decisions to pursue these activities or other activities that may not fit a traditional classification of 'privatization' or 'outsourcing.' In addition, the perspective of faculty members on the impact of these decisions is seemingly absent (Lerner, 2008). Faculty leaders at public institutions may perceive that the general direction of educational policy and institutional operations is changing and impacting their daily activities, and they might also perceive they are not playing a role in making decisions that directly or indirectly impact the campus culture or the faculty role. If they support the changes they are observing or experiencing and feel it is best for the institution, there should be little cause for concern. However, if the shifts of privatization are eroding the ability of faculty members to fully accomplish the institutional mission or feel comfortable with their role at the institution, then they need a platform to express their concerns.

Shared governance traditions at universities provide an avenue for faculty involvement, but it is not clear that faculty senates and similar bodies are actively engaged right now. Administrators and board members have assumed clearly defined roles in making decisions about privatizing university activities, but it is also necessary to determine if the faculty perspective is present in these discussions. The degree to which communication lines are open, consistent and structurally in place is important to assess and correct if they are found to be deficient. The basis lies in much more than respect for the history of shared governance, but also in the role of faculty as primary keepers of the public missions of teaching, research and service. This role has long been supported through shared governance mechanisms, and the documented impact various privatization-related activities could have on faculty and public roles for institutions merits the attention of faculty in decision-making.

There is much at stake in the privatization process for public institutions, some results of which can be predicted though others cannot. If larger class sizes or greater use of adjunct and part-time faculty results, research indicates there will be a loss in educational quality (Schuster, 2003; Benjamin, 2002). If support for research and creative activity is primarily from corporate or ideologically focused sources, some suggest that access to and credibility of research may dwindle (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004). Initiation of new academic programs, extensive time and resources devoted to fund-raising, and the institution of incentive-based operating principles need continued examination to understand long-term impacts. Given how little we know about the potential long-term impact of the changes involved in privatization at public institutions of higher education, it is necessary to have crucial stakeholders, weighing in on deliberations through the governance mechanisms that are already in place.

Purpose of this Study

This study will examine the knowledge about and perceived impact of privatization activities by faculty leaders at public universities. The focus will be on institutions with the lowest levels and the highest levels of state funding as a proportion of their total revenue. The spectrum of state financing is large but it has shifted over the years. Institutions currently receiving very low proportions of state funds have watched that erode from higher levels over the years moving the lower bound of the spectrum closer and closer to single digit percentages of total revenue (NCES, 2008). The comparison of institutions at the opposite ends of the spectrum is useful because they were not always as different on this measure as they are now. In addition, they are comparable in regards to their position as state institutions with the additional regulations that entails. Examining these institutions provides the greatest potential for finding significant differences in activities faculty leaders observe or expect.

Faculty leaders involved in the study are those who participate in institution-level shared governance through the faculty senate or similar body. Professors who are participants in faculty governance at the institution level are most likely to be involved in, or at least conscious of, discussions regarding privatizing activities. In addition, they are more likely to have had opportunities to observe institutional behaviors in administrative functional arenas often associated with privatization and feel qualified to state their perspective. Understanding how faculty are perceiving the privatization process is an important and missing element that can inform future policy-making, institution-level decision-making, and research on higher education management and privatization. In short, learning the perspective of these faculty leaders is necessary to round out what we know about how privatization is impacting public institutions.

Research Questions

Specifically, this study will seek to address the following questions:

- What activities do faculty leaders observe occurring at public universities that fit the category of privatization?
- Is there a pattern in the privatization-related activities faculty leaders most frequently observe or anticipate in the future?
- Is there a difference between institutions with proportionally very high state funding and very low state funding in terms of activities observed or expected?
- Do faculty leaders feel they are currently involved in the privatization decision-making process?
- Do faculty leaders have major concerns about the impact of privatization on their institutions? If yes, what are their concerns?

Conceptual Framework

Academic capitalism is a theoretical approach that addresses activities such as increasing research and patent-seeking emphases at institutions, copyrighting of instructional materials, and the use of other entrepreneurial activities to link the academic enterprise in the market place (Slaughter & Leslie 1997; Rhoades 2003; Slaughter & Rhoades 2004). This approach has explicitly been differentiated from privatization noting that "rather [academic capitalism] entails a redefinition of public space and of appropriate activity in that space" (Slaughter & Rhoades 2004, p. 306), though it can clearly be considered as inclusive of privatization activities. Academic capitalism is focused on how universities increasingly use state resources for market and "new economy" activities in ways that fundamentally alter the work of the academy. Faculty members are deemed complicit in the changes engendered by academic capitalism, as opposed to innocent by-standers to external market interests, through their active participation in seeking contracts and grants, in the drive to submit patents and generate business start-ups, and by copyrighting instructional materials they have developed. Absent from academic capitalism, however, is the role of faculty members in deliberate decision-making for other types of "redefinitions" of public space and appropriate activities that change from public or tuition-based funding to private outlets, or activities that involve a change in management style to mirror private institutions. These emerging practices in higher education can also have a major impact on an institution and its character.

Studies examining aspects of academic capitalism relating to faculty governance have been limited (Rhoades 2003). A detachment of the role of faculty from certain types of administrative decisions and activities is part of the system endorsed by the AAUP (2006), but it does not serve faculty well in the current system. It separates faculty from shifts in budgeting systems, outsourcing activities, and enrollment management initiatives that are also part of the privatization trend. The problem with this detachment is that it can ignore both the possible role of faculty in these decisions and the impact of these decisions on faculty. The role of faculty in these decisions is primarily through shared governance, and the impact is an emergent factor on which the faculty voice has not been a major factor.

The concept of privatization in higher education has adopted a somewhat broader position than academic capitalism by not assigning responsibility for changes exclusively to the external context or the internal practices of universities. The external context is indeed a factor of great importance as, for example, state funding changes certainly force the financial hand of administrators in short term decision-making (Heller 2006). Internally, the responsibility comes in part through deliberate decisions to manage enrollments in ways that maximize tuition income and prestige in the short- and long-terms (Hossler 2006). In relation to all of these trends St. John and Priest (2006) assert, "constructive steps can be taken to reclaim the common good in the midst of the transition to a privatized system of public higher education in the states" (p. 374). Implicit in this statement is an acknowledgment that a transition to privatized public higher education is well underway, and that it is acceptable if appropriately managed. The 'common good' is juxtaposed with privatization as an opposing idea; however, the authors argue for the ability of these concepts to co-exist within public higher education. Behaviors such as adjusting tuition strategies, instituting new budgetary management styles, or outsourcing are consistent with a transition to a privatized system of public higher education, but St. John and Priest believe that these tools can also be constructively used towards mission-directed behavior. Rather than focusing on how or why to stop activities consistent with privatization, the goal becomes to craft such activities in a way that the core of universities' social role and the core faculty values of academic freedom and shared governance are maintained.

In the field of public administration, privatization has been studied at length for many years, though primarily in regards to either public-private partnerships or outsourcing (Kettl, 2002; Savas, 2000; Kettl, 1993; Dimaggio & Powell, 1991). One useful approach is public institutionalism. Institutionalism is a facet of organizational theory that provides a framework and set of assumptions for considering the social and political roles of organizations and institutions (Frederickson & Smith, 2003). Institutionalism does not rely on market economics to explain institutional action, but instead addresses aspects such as the interaction of institutions with their context, the structure of the institution itself, and the rules and norms that help create and bound interactions within the institution as well as assess its performance (Frederickson & Smith 2003; DiMaggio & Powell, 1991). In the past institutionalism has been applied to the field of higher education (Brint & Karabel, 1991; Levin, 2006) to explain how a university not only functions as an institution within itself, but also as a larger community of higher education. The structural similarities across universities are indicative of the institutionalization of the field broadly speaking.

Academic capitalism is essentially an organizational theory in the vein of institutionalism in which the individual decisions of faculty members are addressed.

Slaughter and Rhoades' (2004) charge that faculty pursuit of grants or patents is complicit with administrative and political forces does not accept that decisions are made with other than self-interest on the part of faculty members. They charge that in many cases decisions to patent, for example, disregard the criterion of social utility (p. 332). In most organizations, however, individuals make choices that act as collective actions within an institution. In doing so at universities, individuals are responding to the context of higher education or their respective fields. They are simultaneously performing activities that are reinforcing both the context and the institution. If, as St. John and Priest contend, the institution is focused on assessing social utility broadly and seeking out the common good, then individual actions, including those of faculty members, in the organization will reinforce this context.

The "redefinition of public space" Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) note is related to this type of behavior in the framework of institutionalism as public universities become laden with private interests in ways not before seen, and do so with at least some amount of public funds. Academic capitalism presumes that the institution of higher education, as affected by its current political and economic context, is shaping the preferences of individual faculty members in ways that co-opt their traditional roles and may change the course of the academy entirely in the long run. Institutional theory supports this notion but would hold that the process is not necessarily co-optation but more the faculty reacting to the environment in ways that support the survival of the university and the importance of their positions within it.

An approach to privatization with its emphasis on the common good supports this notion of institutionalism. Here "institutional structures are organized according to socially constructed rules and practices that are formally assumed and supported" (Frederick & Smith, 2003, p. 72). The history of higher education has included the socially and politically constructed agreement that the roles of institutions include serving local needs, educating leaders and the general workforce, as well as advancing the knowledge base in relevant fields of expertise. These bases are supported by state charters and institutional mission statements of public universities. Institutions are not necessarily moving away from these foundations, but the societal expectations of them have expanded, as has their general pursuit of prestige within the higher education market. Institutional adherence to the common good has space for individual self-interest to guide decision-making if the institution has structures in place to match self-interests with socially relevant objectives.

Faculty participants in shared governance can provide important perspectives regarding the impact of privatization at public institutions, not only on the common good, but on the nature of their roles. If the shared governance is active and faculty are engaged in privatization conversations at the institutional level, then it is feasible that moves toward privatization at public institutions can meet institutional obligations to the common good as represented through faculty activities and interests. This study will blend aspects of academic capitalism and an expanded definition of privatization in higher education informed in public administration theory to better understand the perspective and role of the faculty member in privatization decision-making at public universities.

Definition of Terms

Privatization

For this study, privatization in higher education will be defined broadly in relation to funding sources. This definition considers it as a "process of transforming low-tuition institutions that are largely dependent on state funding to provide mass enrollment opportunities at low prices into institutions dependant on tuition revenues and other types of earned income as central sources of operating revenue" (Priest, St. John & Boon 2006). Privatization here is an active process, though it is not clear when an institution with a public charter meets the standard of being "private" or fully "privatized." In all likelihood, short of corporate buy-out most public institutions would not reach the extreme of this definition.

Shared Governance

The strong history of shared governance, or faculty governance, at universities is important and a unique factor among institutions of higher education (Flynn 2005; Ward 2003; Ehrenberg 2000). At most institutions, shared governance "suggests that the president and administration, the faculty, and students share responsibility for the management of the campus…[it] distributes power for university decision-making" (Ward 2003, p. 54).

Faculty Senate

A key aspect of the faculty portion of shared governance is in the representative body of a faculty senate. Sometimes also known as a 'faculty council' or 'academic senate,' this body is the “structure through which faculty exercise their role in college and university governance at the institutional level (American Association for Higher Education 1967)” (Birnbaum 1991).

Limitations of Study

Activities related to privatization are occurring at public institutions of all types and levels. Community colleges, master’s level universities, and research-intensive universities are all outsourcing, leveraging financial aid, and seeking new revenue sources (Hearn 2006; Hossler 2006; Wood 2000). This study was limited to four-year, baccalaureate-granting or greater institutions, and was dominated by high enrollment, doctoral-granting, high research institutions. While they represent those with the least proportion of state funding presently, they do not represent the full range of institutions experiencing privatization activities. Characteristics of institutions in the two groups in the study are presented in table 1.1. With the exception of the revenue variable, these characteristics were not selection criteria, but they did generally apply to most institutions in each group.

Table 1.1-Institutional Characteristics

Low State Funding	**High State Funding**
<34% revenue from state	>50% revenue from state
Enrollment > 15,000	Enrollment < 6,000
High research output	Low research output
Doctorate highest degree offered	Master’s higher degree offered

In addition, with thirteen institutions in the study, and with the focus on faculty participating in shared governance through faculty senates, the participant pool is not uniform. Institutions have the prerogative to select faculty senate members as they choose, and the actual structure of each senate or council can vary, particularly in size. Part of the objective of the study is to identify if institutions, regardless of the differences in these areas, are experiencing privatization trends in the same way.

Another limitation is the importance of different state level policies that might not be accounted for by level of appropriations. Higher education is a state function, and while there are some universal qualities in the movement toward privatization in higher education, there are variations by state, such as those in the examples for Colorado, Ohio, and Virginia, that can significantly impact day-to-day operations. An in-depth study of state policies other than those related to appropriations that may be impacting decisions towards privatization could be an important contribution to the literature.

Overview

It is not the supposition of this study that faculty should be the primary decision-makers in all institutional matters. However, in an environment in which faculty provide the instruction, research, and service on which universities base their mission and vision, and an environment in which shared governance is a tradition and part of the institutional fabric, the perspectives of faculty on the general policy of privatization is needed to protect their professional interests, the institutional mission, and the public interest.

A review of the literature in chapter two will provide a background on the concepts of privatization, academic capitalism, and shared governance. While the use of the term ‘privatization’ in relation to institutions of higher education is a relatively recent movement, ideas akin to it have been studied for many years already. Privatization also has a long history in other sectors as found in much public administration literature.

An understanding of privatization and faculty shared governance provides the base for the explanation of this study's methodology in chapter three. A description of the formation of the survey instrument, pilot study, population selection, survey administration, and the types of analysis applied to the resulting quantitative as well as supporting qualitative data are found here. In chapter four the findings reveal the activities perceived as already occurring by faculty, as well as what they expect in the future. An interesting aspect of the findings is in the projected impact such changes will have on faculty at an institution. Commonalities and differences across institutions emerge most clearly in this portion of the discussion. Finally, the conclusions drawn from these findings and the implications for further research, policy and administrative activity are described in chapter five.

Chapter 2-Literature Review

Privatization is a prominently discussed issue in public higher education right now. Nearly every treatment of the topic begins with macro-level observations of what public higher education has experienced in the recent past. Budget constraints have been affecting states for a decade, and federal funding directed to higher education (primarily through student grant programs and research funding) has done little to maintain itself, let alone be restored to levels of thirty years ago (Hauptman, 2001). State level reductions may have occurred as a slow erosion through the 1980s and 1990s (Heller, 2006), but in the past several years as many as half of the fifty states have made deliberate, large-scale appropriation reductions (Lyall and Sell, 2006a). In the past, the financial situation of institutions had been evolving based primarily on growing enrollments, but with these recent state funding changes, privatizing activities have accelerated.

Rather than just a response to possibly arbitrary or short-term changes in the budget picture, this acceleration of privatization activities is either simultaneous with or quickened by a shift in theoretical positions regarding the role of higher education and the appropriate use of public tax dollars over the past twenty to thirty years. The changes are often based on a theory of higher education as a private good as opposed to a public good (Stampen and Layzell, 1997). The public good argument is strong in part "because the [state] charter is the foundation of higher education institutions' missions and values and it affects choices made by all individual in the system of higher education from policymakers to parents to faculty to students" (Kezar, 2004, p. 430). The positive externalities created for society (i.e. reduced crime rates, higher production capacity, knowledge production) also support the public good.

At other times administrators or government officials assert the value of market competition in enhancing operational efficiency as justification for privatization-type changes (Ehrenberg, 2006). Philosophically, these views have altered the foundation from which administrative decisions are made at public universities, just as they impact legislators who appropriate funds to public institutions. A primary goal of efficiency in operations can elicit a different course of action than when the primary goal is to maximize the public good. A question some institutions are trying to answer is what is the most efficient way to maximize the public good?

Privatization in Context

Literature in the field of public administration has been addressing privatization of government owned entities for several decades (Donaldson, 1995; Savas, 2000; Steel & Heald, 1984). A variety of methods of privatization exist: contracting out, divestment, and public-private partnerships are the primary modes (Savas, 2000). Higher education is engaged in a great deal of contracting out. Individual institutions (both public and private) have outsourced activities as varied as food service, physical plant, laundry service, residence halls, and bookstore operations. At the state level there is de facto contracting out when private institutions are subsidized for providing specific high need programs for which in-state public institutions cannot meet workforce demands (such as nursing or teacher education). Divestment entails selling off pieces of, or even an entire government entity to private organizations for future operation. There are no universities which have made a full transition like this to date, and it seems unlikely as states would be extremely resistant to relinquishing control of the physical assets, and the price tag attached such a high volume of facilities, land and equipment is enormous.

The public-private partnership style of privatization most accurately describes higher education today. It is inclusive of outsourcing and divestment activities and is essentially a broad spectrum of arrangements (Savas, 2000). At public institutions the academic component of operations has been maintained by faculty on the state's payroll, making education still a government delivered service (though one could look to greater use of grant funds to cover faculty compensation as impacting this area). However, many of the supporting functions are privately delivered. It is a complicated arrangement in which government provides operating appropriations, additional grants to the institution and vouchers to individuals, and retains ownership of the facilities; however, institutions are expected to generate alternate self-supporting revenue streams without detracting from a public mission under a state charter, long the historical guide for institutional decision-making (Kezar, 2003). Many other public-private partnerships exist in the U.S. (i.e. water service, telephone service, K-12 education), but none have quite so many complexities as higher education, due in part to its broad array of functions.

The Role of Financial Aid Policy in Privatization

Financial aid practices at public universities are a good example of how this philosophical change plays out and result in a fundamentally different outcome. The philosophical change in funding sources and allocation has been felt by institutions, but it has also touched students directly through financial aid policy. Federal aid has shifted in this regard with Pell Grants, the most traditional type of the need-based aid, losing purchasing power to cover tuition costs while subsidized loans, tax credits, and new merit-based programs are instituted (St. John, 2003). Heller (2006) points out that at the state and institutional level merit aid has also gained political power over need-based aid:

> Throughout most of the nation's history financial aid was awarded to students based on their financial need in order to promote access to college for poor students, but recently both states and higher education institutions have been turning more to merit aid, which is disproportionately awarded to students from higher-income families (p. 12).

State programs were introduced in 1990s that focused exclusively on merit in making awards to students. Georgia has one of the most prominent examples with the HOPE program in 1993. In 1992, prior to the HOPE program in Georgia, 9 percent of state funds for undergraduate financial aid was awarded irrespective of financial need but by 2002 that had increased to 23 percent (Heller, 2006). The HOPE program has shown some success in persistence and graduation of "borderline" scholarship recipients, though most HOPE merit aid recipients lost their scholarships at some point after enrolling in college and the advantage is lost in these cases (Henry, et al, 2004). The last five years have seen a small migration back toward recognition of need, mostly in combination with merit, as states institute programs that make post-secondary scholarship commitments to low-income, high achieving 8th grade students (Indiana's 21st Century Scholars program is a good example of a program that identifies eligible students early on, sets the standards for maintaining eligibility, and provides postsecondary support. See www.edroundtable.state.in.us for more on program specifics.).

Institutionally based financial aid has also responded to the broader federal and state philosophical change in aid policy during this time. Unlike federal and state policies institutional aid policy is generally set at the discretion of a university's own board or leaders. The importance of this aspect in privatization is in how financial aid is leveraged to generate greater tuition revenue while also bringing students to campus that will increase institutional prestige (Hossler, 2006; Brewer, Gates and Goldman, 2002). It is a practice that defines how many private institutions of higher education have been operating for decades.

For public university administrators there is neither a pure focus on external goals such as access, nor on internal goals such as revenue maximization driving financial aid policy. Instead most are seeking a balance of these sometimes competing interests. The competitive nature of both public and private institutions' efforts to enroll students to bolster institutional prestige impacts aid policy as well. At most universities today at least some institutional merit scholarships go to individuals without financial need but who possess academic, creative or athletic skills associated with greater prestige. Table 2.1, adapted from Heller (2006) shows changes in institutionally based aid per student through just a short period in the 1990s.

Table 2.1-Institutional Grants to Dependent Students in Public Institutions

Avg. per student	**1992-1993**	**1999-2000**	**% Change**
Need-based	$1,336	$1,515	+13
Merit-based	$2.024	$2,618	+29
Total	$1,773	$2,189	+23

(From Heller 2006. Author's calculations using NCES 2004 data.)

Financial aid policy is a good example of how actual reductions in public funding and philosophical shifts in the public view of higher education can lead to substantive changes in institutional behavior. As state revenue decreases, there may be less perceived obligation to state objectives at public institutions. It is, however, only one area in which this type of substantive change has been realized. From initiating new internal university budget systems and altering modes of service delivery, to entire states restructuring their higher education funding and management mechanisms, U.S. higher education as a whole is experiencing fundamental change and has sought new ways to examine the impact changes may mean in the long run.

Incentive-Based Budgeting: A Privatized Management Style

University management systems regularly come under scrutiny by legislators and others calling for increased efficiency (Morphew, 2008; Supiano, 2008). One way in which more and more public institutions are responding is through adopting incentive-based budgeting systems in the model of some of their private university and corporate peers. As initiated by some early adopters (ex. Indiana University, University of Michigan, the University of Toronto), incentive-based budgeting takes many different forms, yet does not always meet with immediate success by the initiating institution (Priest, Becker, Hossler and St. John, 2002). At Michigan adjustments to the incentive-based system they instituted (called Value Centered Management or VCM) began almost simultaneous with implementation as administrators and faculty alike were skeptical of the process and seemed to desire more budgetary control to remain in the central administrative ranks (Courant and Knepp, 2002).

The University of Toronto, and early adopter since the 1980s, has found that even with high levels of government support (as much as 45% of revenue is from the federal government), a decentralized, incentive-based budgeting system has merit (Lang, 2002). In particular, institutions pursuing some form of incentive-based budgeting have utilized the core principles of this approach to getting the budget to support strategic planning and goals. Incentives for desired behavior encouraged disparate units to find ways to support institution-wide goals much as private corporations do to support profit-making objectives. To encourage efficiency in operations, the University of Toronto designed a system of assessments against various sources of income and expense categories, a strategy now employed at most institutions budgeting in this manner. The approach has led to unit and level specific approaches and a system that is well accepted and successful overall (Priest and Boon, 2006). Modeling on private institutions and corporate approaches as these institutions have is clearly changing processes of operation and is potentially changing objectives of operation in public institutions of higher education.

Copyright- and Patent-seeking: Revenue Potential

Research and development are important, mission-centric parts of many institutions of higher education. For decades many faculty and researchers have spent large portions of their time doing work that lead to new products or processes (Milem, Berger & Dey, 2000; Powers, 2006), often referred to intellectual property. Since the early 19th century states and the federal government have been supporting these activities through policies, including the foundational federal Bayh-Dole Act of 1980, aimed at economic development through knowledge production (Slaughter and Rhoades, 1993; Etzkowitz, 1997; Remington, 2005).

Many universities are increasing the programs and offices linking them to private industries for the purposes of funding such research and licensing copyrights or patents that may be produced (Bradshaw, et al, 2003). Berkeley provided a prominent example in its $25 million, five-year deal inked with Novartis in 1998 for plant genomics research (Renault, Cope, Dix and Hersey, 2008). The agreement sparked much controversy in the media as well as some internal parts of the institution, but an external review released in 2004 found that faculty in the college most impacted were almost unanimously supportive and felt their research had benefited a great deal from the financial and other resource access provided by Novartis, while the company refrained from directing any research projects (Busch, et al, 2004). A desired outcome of generating patents and copyrights that might provide some long-term funding sources, however, was not realized for either Novartis or Berkeley.

Increasingly, some are arguing that intellectual property agreements and economic development should be structured to favor local, regional and state interests (Renault, Cope, Dix and Hersey, 2008). The degree to which this approach is easier and more effective for proximity and public relations reasons would not necessarily make it more likely as the emphasis, and possibly even the need, for using intellectual property as a source of revenue could be diminished. Current modes of measuring university productivity in the area of technology transfer, collected and reported by the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM), include basic metrics of the number of patents and copyrights produced and the revenue generated from patents and copyrights in a given year. The focus on revenue production in reports is argued to overly emphasize pursuit of this to institutions (Renault, Cope, Dix and Hersey, 2008), though the realization of this revenue is much more difficult to come by than a story about the invention of Gatorade and its resulting $80 million in revenue for the University of Florida may imply (Powers, 2006).

Fundraising as a Central Revenue Source

Major giving campaigns and ongoing fundraising efforts at institutions of higher education are not just commonplace, but are considered necessary aspects of university operations in the current climate of reduced state appropriations and a market-based approach to enrollment and other operational approaches. Public university presidents spend remarkably high proportions of their time on efforts related to fundraising. An American Council on Education report on college presidents in 2007 cited that fundraising was the number one activity in which presidents engaged, taking 37.7% of their time (Hassan, 2007). In the report, presidents also frequently cited the reduction of state appropriations as a primary change in the past several years on the job, seeming to demand much more of their time to finding alternative funding sources. Research indicates a relationship between decreased state appropriations and increased fundraising revenue, though the relationship only holds at the aggregate level of institutional types (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). Institutions at different levels of Carnegie classification or US News ranking do not all have equal success. The reliance on fundraising for general operational funding is based on the returns from the endowment at most institutions, but the funding for capital projects is also critically based on fundraising efforts combined with bonds issued by state governments. Institutions and their facilities would be dramatically different in almost every state without an active fundraising agenda.

Outsourcing for Cost Reduction: Traditional Privatization at Work

The term 'privatization' most quickly elicits thoughts of outsourced activities, as the term is used in public administration literature (Savas, 2000; Palm, 2001; Kettl, 2002). The difference in talking about privatization in higher education versus the rest of the public sector, is in the scope of its meaning. Outsourcing in higher education is a key portion of the privatization landscape that, as previously noted, has generally focused on activities such as food service, physical plant, laundry services, enterprise data systems, and motor pools for university transportation (Priest, Jacobs & Boon, 2006). In other public sector areas, privatization has been a complete turning over of an activity to an outside provider. There is no mention of privatization of an entire local government that is outsourcing its trash collection and recycling service; yet in higher education, the tendency of late has been to look at this action in combination with many other actions of the institution and label the entire trend as privatization.

Cost reduction is the leading rationale for pursuing private providers, with potential for improved services and possibly even a profit-sharing arrangement in the contract bolstering support. These cost savings can be found through the careful crafting of contracts, but there is certainly a loss of control over the services provided to institutions' students which also requires screening of companies for non-expense related concerns (i.e. employment practices, sub-contracted companies) prior to entering a contract (Priest, Jacobs & Boon, 2006). The return to this careful attention can also be non-monetary as student satisfaction with service provision may improve, a factor good for recruitment, retention and general good practices.

Academic Capitalism and Commercialization in Higher Education

The theory of academic capitalism was introduced in the late 1990s to explain some of the changes in the activities of institutions of higher education in Westernized countries around the world (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). Academic capitalism is the phrase used to describe the "marketization" of the academy and a shift to research for commercial purposes or financial gain. Slaughter and Leslie (1997) note, "the central argument of our book is that the structure of academic work is changing in response to global markets" (p. 209). Fundamental changes in what it means to work in the academy, particularly research institutions, were the primary concern, but in Slaughter and Rhoades 2004 update to the original text, faculty are not victims to a changing global market but are viewed more as co-conspirators to the process of redefining the work of academia. Numerous examples are given of how faculty initiate and willingly participate in activities associated with academic capitalism, and the administrative and competitive pressures leading them to these activities are addressed.

Many have used other terms to describe the economic activities of modern universities. Commercialization is one term that refers to efforts to profit from teaching, research, and other campus activities (Bok, 2003). Bok's definition for commercialization fits with the ideas of academic capitalism; however, he varies importantly in his assertion that this behavior is not necessarily a new reaction to global markets, but that it is the size and scope of the present movements that makes it noteworthy. He notes that the search for revenue from new academic programs, aggressive fundraising, or business-type ventures dates back many decades before the rise of globalization in economics. Recently, however, it seems there is virtually no corner of many institutions where revenue-seeking and cost-reduction measures do not reach.

From Bok's perspective the changing make-up of governing boards from clergy and academics to lawyers and people from the business world is an overlooked factor in affecting a new academic environment. While these board members do not necessarily pursue privatization with the intent of changing the character of the academy or the work environment for academics, they seem to act with more of an eye toward revenue-production than previous generations may have done. Bok (2003) focuses on the clamor for money at universities, not just because some sources have been cut back, but also because "there is never enough money to satisfy [universities'] desires" (p. 9).

In another acknowledgment of the importance of board membership, cross-board membership between universities and corporations was examined by Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) for twenty of the top private and public institutions in the nation. They found tightly interlocked networks between major corporations and top universities, as well as between top universities. There is evidence suggesting that this interlocking has intensified in recent years, but they note that on university boards "corporate board members…have been the dominant occupational group since the 1890s (Veblen, 1918)" (p. 242). If boards of trustees are important in directing the character of institutional decision-making, in the current economic environment this cross-pollination of board members can impact privatizing activities as individuals may desire to protect corporate interests or possess greater influence in board activities.

For other scholars the external context is the primary interest, in particular, the effects of globalization (Marginson, 2000; Marginson and Considine, 2000) and the impact of falling government subsidy (Marginson, 2000; Heller, 2006; Olien, 2006). Pulling together the effects of all of these factors, both internal and external in nature, is the aim of academic capitalism. It is inclusive of entrepreneurial and commercial activities, and it also goes beyond to include the spirit of capitalism and competition. These have long been aspects of general U.S. culture and the expanding global marketplace, and now they are overt, pervasive currents in the function of higher education. The growing market of for-profit higher education is a simple example of how capitalism and competition are asserting themselves, but it is within the non-profit sector that the influence of these factors is most scrutinized.

Anticipatory Subordination: Building Good Will or Acting from Fear?

Also external to public institutions is the action of state governments. Reductions in appropriations as a source of revenue have been documented and these are important to operations (Heller, 2006; Lyall and Sell, 2006b). However, legislators often assert themselves in other ways that may not even end up in a codified form. One way in which this can take effect is in the institutional theory concept of anticipatory subordination (Brint and Karabel, 1991).

The central idea of anticipatory subordination is that an institution would act in a way that it perceives to be the desire of a more powerful institution (in this case, the state government). The degree to which such an approach to policy-making actually curries favor cannot be clear, but it indicates an acceptance of the structural power of one institution (here, the state) over another (its public universities) in a way in which the more powerful institution does not always actually impose its will. This concept was applied to the shift of community colleges to strong vocational education in the 1960s as an explanation for how administrators were responding to anticipated desires of the state government and business community (Brint and Karabel, 1991). Similar pressures from similar sources could indeed be seen as impacting the current privatization trend for four-year institutions, with a direct parallel in the case of new academic programs put in place to meet economic and market-based objectives.

Anticipatory subordination works because the power of the state takes two primary forms: money and regulations. When it comes to money, for those institutions with more than half of their revenue still coming from public monies, subordinating could signify their anticipation of losing that level of funding just as their more privatized counterparts have. Differentiation in institutional missions from the flagship public institutions that comprise the privatized group likely accounts for maintenance of more than half of the current revenue stream from state sources for highly state funded institutions; however, these same institutions have also experienced reductions from sixty percent or more of their revenue from the state in years past (NCES, 2008). Given the prominence of this fiscal shift in popular and trade media, administrators are undoubtedly conscious of this trend regardless of their institutional situation. In fact, there is even the potential of leveraging the anticipated cost savings of privatization activities into increased state funding in the future. This was the case for the University of Maryland system which eliminated $40 million dollars from its budget in 2003, a move the chancellor said "bought 'good will' with the governor and state legislature" and is credited with a $101 million increase in the system budget from the state in 2006 (Fain, 2006).

Similarly, the fear of additional regulations could also be a motivating factor to act in ways consistent with perceived state policymaker desires. In many states recent years have included on a spate of charges from many levels of too quickly increasing tuition, the need for an academic bill of rights to "protect" students from liberal professors, and a number of other state-specific areas of increasing regulation for universities. The power of this type of regulatory threat to entice universities to find other ways to placate lawmakers may push institutions which still receive a comfortable degree of funding from the state to mimic their privatized counterparts in administrative and fiscal practices. A future qualitative exploration of the degree to which this type of thinking may be pervasive at highly state-funded public institutions would be a useful addition to the literature.

In academic capitalism the point is simply that through actions internal and external to the academy, public space at universities is being redefined with these cultural shifts, and academic work is changing along with it (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004). The ideas of academic capitalism have been applied at major research institutions all the way to the community college level. Studies of faculty effort indicate that over time a higher proportion of time is being spent on research (Massy and Zemsky, 1994; Milem, Berger, and Dey, 2000). Milem, et al (2000) found, however, that the increased time spent on research did not result in less time spent teaching except at top research universities.

Evidence from this study suggests that for other doctoral, comprehensive, liberal arts and two-year institutions the increase in research and teaching time may be resulting in less time advising students and in service-related activities.

In reviewing the issue of faculty time allocation, Rhoades (2003) notes, “at a very personal level faculty and academic administrators internally conflate revenue production and productivity in a way that affects how people allocate the scarce resource of their time” (p. 13). There is no direct evidence of change in faculty time in governance activities, but a reduction there seems likely, too. The recent studies of faculty time do not empirically relate this change to specific university actions, but the impression of administrative pressure for specific teaching, research or administrative activities is widely held. Other institutional functions in which faculty do not play a direct role may also be impacting their roles.

Only one study to date has examined how faculty members perceive the broad impact of the changes in faculty work related to privatization. Using concepts of academic capitalism as the theoretical base, Levin (2006) examined a general sample faculty at community colleges in the American and Canadian West. Using interviews and focus groups he gathered information on their perspectives regarding changes in practices or management in recent years, the responsibility for decision-making at the institution, and the perceived level of reliance on public funding at the institution. Findings suggested that faculty at these community colleges perceive a shift in the general orientation of their institutions toward more business and market-oriented activities. They tended to indicate the changes were driven by the college’s administrators in ways that are redefining the purpose and mission of the institutions.

Institutional decision-making was viewed as "the purview of managers…[and] is placing the faculty in a subordinate institutional role, and the actions of the institution are seen as antithetical to faculty values" (p. 76). However, Levin (2006) also found virtually no evidence that the faculty were coalescing to combat the forces they were observing, except to a small degree via faculty union activities. However, faculty appeared to be more identified with their institution and its mission than with their occupational identity or unions. The author identifies this as a signifier of "corporate" allegiance above fidelity to academic field of study, a homogenizing factor within an institution (p. 81).

There are certainly important distinctions between community colleges and the major research universities that were the focus of prior texts on academic capitalism. Common ground is found, however, in the increasing importance of the business community to the institutions and the increasing demands on faculty members. While the idea that community colleges are becoming private or acting private is not mentioned by Levin (2006), the impact of academic capitalism and relationships with the business community on faculty was identified very clearly.

Refining the Concept of Privatization

Defining the term 'privatization' in higher education is important to understanding how it includes and excludes the ideas previously discussed in this chapter. Lyall and Sell (2006b) call privatization a "significant decline in the public investment in higher education institutions and educational opportunities, and the shrinkage of states as stakeholders in their own higher education assets" (p. 73). The first part of this definition is fairly straight forward in its attribution of privatization to a simple shift in revenue sources, and it includes funds to students to provide opportunity as relevant aspects. In the second part, the authors extend this definition regarding declining funds as a parallel for the role of states as stakeholders, essentially making the state's stake proportional with its funding level to the institution. This is somewhat akin to lore of a former university president's statement regarding his institution's move from being 'state funded, to state assisted, to state located.' However, in implying this relationship of state funds to the interest the state holds, Lyall and Sell contradict a fact they readily acknowledge throughout most of their book--states are likely to maintain an enormous stake in the results of higher education regardless of where the funds for the enterprise originate. This reflects the sentiment the Michigan president was actually bemoaning in his comment about reduced funding. At present, though difficult to quantify, the level of input from states does not seem to equate with the percent of institutional budget they provide. It is difficult to identify the appropriate balance, but the conversation regarding state involvement crystallizes around the idea of the institutional role in support of the public good and the degree to which the commitment to public good is related to the level of funding.

Another definition for privatization in higher education acknowledges aspects similar to the first half of Lyall and Sell's definition, but with greater specificity:

> [Privatization is] the process of transforming low-tuition institutions that are largely dependent on state funding to provide mass enrollment opportunities at low prices into institutions dependent on tuition revenues and other types of earned income as central sources of operating revenue (Priest, St. John and Boon, 2006, p. 2).

This definition recognizes the role of public institutions regarding mass enrollment and accepts that higher education is acting as a competitor in the economic marketplace for students, as well as other markets it chooses. This is somewhat opposed to its former role in the public sector where it was treated more as a service industry.

The idea of mass enrollment opportunities as a priority for institutions in the past parallels Lyall and Sell's acknowledgement of the decline of educational opportunities. Dependency on tuition and other earned revenue sources makes prioritizing enrollment opportunity an increasingly difficult task for institutions without the resources of a multi-billion dollar endowment such as Harvard's. A resource base of such enormity allows for aid programs blanketing all students below a certain income level, and very recently Harvard has expanded aid programs even further to touch more middle class students with family incomes up to $180,000 (Jaschik, 2007). At public universities, however, there is a great challenge to providing mass enrollment when state funds to the institution are reduced on a per FTE basis and state need-based aid to students is also reduced in the ways previously mentioned. All of this has occurred while the cost of educating students has increased at a rapid pace (Heller, 2006), complicating the objective of market competitiveness.

Attention to the changes in funding and financial aid and the changes in the faculty role has dominated the literature on privatization, but the relationship of all of this to the public interest receives less direct attention. As educators, scholars, and citizens of the state, faculty facilitate universities' direct link to the public interest. Faculty members are not necessarily seen directly as protectors of the public interest nor as consistently acting on behalf of this interest (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Rhoades, 2003), but they do seem to be positioned to do so if the appropriate mechanisms were in place to support such an outcome. Though the public interest is tied to the state, institutions themselves can initiate and support faculty activity that pursues such an end.

The charge of a state government is to consistently act in ways that protect the public interest, and presumably it will support such ends financially. Public higher education is a state entity and entrusted with this public interest objective in many areas, but institutions are being pushed to determine how they can do so with whatever resources they can secure exclusive of state coffers. This is the heart of private institutions' mode of operation, and the key factor initiating the privatization discussion in regard to public institutions. Whether through state or institutional policy and actions to secure adequate funding, St. John and Priest (2006) note that "constructive steps can be taken to reclaim the common good in the midst of the transition to a privatized system of public higher education in the states" (p. 374). It is in the "common good" that states will continue to share a stake in universities even as more and more funds are from non-public sources.

Attaining the common good through privatization will also include the use of many tools of market-driven, private entities, such as incentives and disincentives to encourage more efficient or mission-directed behaviors. While these behaviors are consistent with a transition to a privatized system of public higher education, Priest and St. John believe that these tools can also be consistent with mission-directed behavior. In stating the need to "reclaim the common good" the implication is that at present privatization is shifting the focus away from that ideal and it is time to return attention to it in earnest.

Faculty Governance in Decision-Making

At U.S. public universities shared governance between administrators, faculty, and the board of trustees has been part of the institutional fabric for over 150 years and has been maintained as a guiding principle by the American Association of University Professors (1966). The AAUP position is supported by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, though the AGB believes strong presidential leadership with an ability to make quick decisions without consultation is also an institutional imperative (AGB, 1996).

The distribution of power and management responsibilities embodied by shared governance has an historical basis in the professional authority of the faculty (Birnbaum, 2004). Tenets of shared governance generally acknowledge the difference between areas in which the faculty should govern and those in which they should have input. Flynn (2005) notes that in decisions about residence halls, salaries for secretaries, and tuition, for example, "it would be desirable to get faculty input in such cases, but these areas [sic] decisions belong primarily to the administrative powers" (p. 3). The basis of faculty involvement in decision-making has long been on expertise (Birnbaum, 2004; Rhoades, 2003), though Rhoades (2003) argues the need to move away from expertise as the primary criterion to "the principle of economic democracy, [and] the rights of employees to participate in decision making that affect their lives, the lives of their clients" (p. 32). Rhoades extends this not just to faculty but to staff, or 'managerial professionals' as he calls them. This is essentially a stakeholder theory in which all parties affected by operations have their interests taken into account. Stakeholder theory is similar to the AAUP basis for assigning authority based on each party's responsibility for a particular matter (Flynn, 2005), though Flynn's point regarding faculty input in areas where they are not experts is just exactly that it does affect their lives and those of their clients.

The difference between Rhoades' and Flynn's views here is important. Rhoades maintains the need for faculty to participate based on matters that affect their lives and those of their clients. Flynn would restrict faculty involvement a bit more to those matters in which faculty bear some level of responsibility and expertise (curricular matters and promotion and tenure, for example). In the latter view there is little space for faculty to give more than an opinion on issues such as outsourcing the bookstore or instituting a high tuition-high aid model for undergraduates. Faculty may bear no responsibility in these areas, but there can be significant impact on their lives, as accounted for in Rhoades' approach. A high tuition level for undergraduates may attract only a certain type of student to even apply to an institution, or the financial aid may be distributed in a way that changes the nature of the student body at the institution in social, economic, or academic dimensions. Faculty interested in matters that affect their lives or the lives of their "clients" can best become involved in them through channels of shared governance, but perhaps not as it is generally practiced now or as it is supported by current AAUP standards (2006).

Institutions and states often move towards what Lyall and Sell (2006b) call "de facto privatization" without the broad involvement of faculty governance units. As an explanation for this behavior they note, "higher education leaders are often seen as slow to react, hampered by shared governance and constrained by a competitive higher education market that requires them to act differently from the rest of state government" (p. 78). A public perception of a lethargic process may be widely held, but there has been little evidence of a negative impact of a somewhat slower decision-making process when faculty members are involved. In fact, it has been observed that the only examples of truly poor decisions or missed opportunities have come when administrators made unilateral, quick decisions outside of shared governance processes (Birnbaum, 2004; Bok, 2003).

Lyall and Sell's statement above also acknowledges that competition impacts the decision-making process by forcing public institutions to act differently from other public good entities due to market forces. The authors do not acknowledge the relationship of shared governance to protecting public interests in a competitive environment, but they assert "the historical connection of public universities to state needs will wane if the state money evaporates" (p. 81). The relationship to public needs and interests is, in their view, based solely on money, with the role of faculty governance seen as simply to slow down reaction time for the institution.

Governance issues in community colleges were focused on the role of provincial, district or state government in Levin's (2006) study of faculty at community colleges. The role of shared governance is mentioned only once, that instance being in a participant's comment that "there is an increasing effort to dismantle shared governance…This is a state trend" (p. 79). This sentiment seems to indicate unmistakably that shared governance is not viewed as a necessary or important characteristic of decision-making.

Over the last decade other evidence supporting the inclusion of faculty in budget committees and processes has emerged. Budget processes are not equivalent to privatization activities, however, privatization underlies these processes affecting their scope and providing the subtext for how the budget can be used to achieve institutional objectives, and area quite relevant to the faculty and public interest. Kissler (1997) found that faculty and administrators reported faculty councils to have at least some influence on budgetary processes. A recent examination of university governance structures found little evidence that shared governance impedes university management in substantive ways (Kaplan, 2004). However, Kaplan (2004) also found that more than 40 percent of faculty and administrators surveyed said faculty had little influence on budget-making decisions at the institutional level. Similarly, a case study of faculty governance found that while faculty were invited to participate in many aspects of the decision-making process, the participation was not seen as ultimately impacting the decision that was made (Minor and Tierney, 2005). Yet in this case the faculty was largely uncomplaining about this situation as trust for the president and administration was high.

A sense of increased effectiveness of institutional decision-making based on shared governance may be less about the perspectives forwarded through the process than the sense of social capital it builds. Birnbaum (2004) observes that the sense of influence created through governance activities is important. He also notes, “Social capital is important because it leads to trust and cooperation; a reduction of social capital not only weakens the influence of constituents within an organization, but also reduces the effective influence of their leaders” (p. 14). When dealing with academic capitalism and privatization, universities need the social capital of trust and cooperation between the faculty and the administration, something which can only be gained by involving both parties in the process. This corresponds well with Rhoades (2003) belief in the perspectives of the faculty as important in a democratic sense, though Birnbaum does not focus on democratic outcomes, but on the sense of trust in the process.

Conclusion

There seems to be consensus that privatization at public universities means more than just a change in funding sources. Administrators are experiencing the pressures of meeting operational needs through creative avenues. Students and families are watching the sticker price for a college education rise to an uncomfortable level that in many cases exceeds their resources. Faculties provide the core functions of institutions and deserve to have their perspectives included in the conversation. The literature indicates recognition of the importance of faculty in the privatization conversation, but it needs to move beyond talking about faculty members to listening to them and their individual and collective voices.

Understanding faculty time allocation, changing student financial aid policies, and the wide range of academic capitalist activities is critical to future research and policy-making in this area. Expanding on the literature with feedback and perspectives directly from faculty leaders on what they see happening in the management of their institutions, and, more importantly, how they experience or envision it impacting their role at the institution is also necessary. Administrators, legislators and others shepherding privatization into institutions need the presence of this voice to create a fuller understanding of how public universities can adapt without alienating the core purpose for their existence.

Chapter 3-Methods

This study's primary objectives are to learn more about the perceptions of faculty leaders in two basic areas: the implementation of privatization activities at their own institutions and the impact of these activities on their roles as faculty members. I make an intentional distinction here between privatization-related activities an institution is undertaking, and those activities that faculty leaders perceive to be occurring. A great deal of data on institutional operations can be obtained through official outside sources, but the activities that faculty *perceive* to be changing will indicate 1.) their level of awareness of and involvement in decision-making at their institution, 2.) activities that impact how they experience or conceive of their own role changing, and 3.) the gap between the official institutional position and actual implementation if one exists. It was first necessary to establish the current level at which faculty leaders are aware of or involved in privatization activities at different institutional types, and then to assess their perception of the impact of the changes brought on by activities identified with privatization.

Data on faculty perceptions in the area of privatization activities has been collected in just one published study to date, and it relied primarily on the qualitative methods of interviews, focus groups, and document analysis (Levin, 2006). This study was geographically focused on western portions of North America using a selection of faculty at community colleges in this region. Faculty members from a cross-section of departments and with varied employment status (full-time/part-time, tenured/tenure-track/non-tenure-track), race/ethnicities, and gender were included for a broad representation of perspectives. Participants responded to a series of questions about their perceptions of specific types of activities at their institutions. Certain aspects of participants' accounts were verified through the document analysis portion of the study. This fully qualitative approach allowed for an important degree of depth in the data collection, but it was limited in scope to one region and a single institutional type.

Methodologically the current study differs from Levin's (2006), though the two studies do have limited similarities in objectives and the theoretical base. The aim of adding the faculty voice on institutional administrative actions to the existing literature is a common objective. In particular, the perceived impact of privatizing activities on faculty was of interest in both studies, though it was a secondary concern to the present study. Theoretically, the similarities extend to the use of new institutionalism (in the sense of the importance of organizational structure and order in shared systems) in understanding organizational behavior, and the use of academic capitalism in describing privatization-related activities. Important differences between the studies are in the population selected (general faculty members versus faculty in leadership positions), the methods of data collection and analysis (interviews and document analysis versus a survey instrument), as well as the prior study's focus on the culture of community colleges and the centrality of managerialism (Levin, 2006).

The current study extends the literature on privatization and adds to the body of knowledge regarding faculty through use of a survey instrument distributed to a larger, yet more focused sample of faculty members. Shifting away from community colleges to public, four-year institutions also necessitates examination of additional types of privatizing activities which adds further to the knowledge base in this area. While privatization trends are at least indirectly impacting all institutional types, much of the literature has focused on activities of large, prominent institutions, a few of which are included in this study. Using a single study to compare and contrast different types of public, four-year institutions is a useful addition to the body of knowledge.

Method of Data Collection

Multiple sources of information were used in this study including direct institutional data from national databases and faculty data obtained directly from faculty members. A survey instrument developed for this study obtained information focused on the specific topics of interest. Survey research has long served as a viable method for obtaining direct and indirect information from populations of interest (Converse, 1987) and is now perceived by some as a dominant practice in social science research (Czaja and Blair, 2005). In recent years the Internet has emerged as a common vehicle for survey administration due to the efficiency with which large populations can be reached, the flexibility of including various types of media, and the dramatically reduced cost (Couper, 2000; Perkins, 2004). The result of these and other factors has been a proliferation of web-based surveys in recent years. Increasing concerns about loss of respondents due to technical problems and recipient skepticism over spam and unsolicited emails are leading to studies comparing the methods (Couper, 2000; Kaplowitz, Hadlock & Levine, 2004). Generally response rates are expected to be lower on web-based surveys than traditional mail-based (Couper, 2000; Czaja and Blair, 2005), and Kaplowitz, et al (2004) found some evidence of a response difference based on age with older subjects more responsive to the paper/mail-distribution method. Mixed-methods using mail and web contacts for a web survey have not shown beneficial increases in response rates (Porter and Whitcomb, 2007). Research has also indicated no significant impact on the substance of responses based on modality of the survey (Kypri, et al, 2004; Kaplowitz, et al, 2004).

Given the lack of variance in responses based on modality, the expected general age group of the population for the current study, and concerns regarding web survey fatigue, a paper survey administered by mail was utilized as the primary data collection mode for this study. The instrument consisted of fifty-six yes/no or multiple-choice questions, three open-ended questions, and six questions which gathered demographic information. The majority of questions were binary in nature, and the three open-ended questions allowed collection of a modest amount of qualitative data to further illuminate, explain or validate prior response choices.

A small pilot test to assess the instrument was conducted by mail in fall 2006 at one of the participant institutions. Feedback and results initiated several significant adjustments to the survey instrument to improve clarity, focus, and organization. In addition, professional staff at the Indiana University Center for Survey Research reviewed the instrument to ensure adherence with generally accepted survey practices. Consultation on the design and layout, question clarity, and timing of administration provided valuable input on the instrument and process. A complete copy of the final instrument is in Appendix A.

The literature review revealed that two general categories of institutional practice are utilized in instituting privatization strategies: cost reduction and revenue production (Bok, 2003; Levin, 2006; Priest and St. John, 2006). Question sets were designed in which respondents were asked yes-no questions regarding specific types of cost reduction strategies and revenue production strategies they may have observed at their institutions. The same set of options on cost reduction and revenue production was then used to ask which strategies they expect to occur at their institutions in the next few years. Open-ended questions followed each set of questions to ask the perceived implications of the changes identified by the respondent. The final set of questions on the survey addressed the communication and decision-making process at participant institutions with regards to openness, participation, and perceived ideal participants.

This survey instrument was administered from July to September 2007. Targeted participants were identified by virtue of being faculty leaders (defined as members of the campus-wide faculty governance body) at one of fourteen selected institutions from across the United States.[1] Institutions were selected using National Center for Education Statistics IPEDS Peer Analysis System, 2005-06. The variables noted in Table 3.1 were used to select institutions that either received a relatively low level of their funding from state sources or a particularly high level of funding from state sources in fiscal year 2006. Institutional funding from state sources ranged from 6% to 62% with most institutions falling between 38% and 45%. Selection criteria for study participation were set at 34% for the low end and 50% for the high end in effort to focus on the more extreme ends of the spectrum. A total of sixteen institutions were initially selected based on meeting either the low-end or the high-end of the set criteria. Ultimately, two institutions were eliminated from the study based on the inability to procure contact information for faculty leaders after multiple contacts to institutional administrators. Faculty leaders at the remaining fourteen institutions were identified based on their membership on the

[1] Institutions selected for the study were in the following states: Alaska, California, Idaho, Indiana, Michigan, New York, Texas, Virginia and Wisconsin.

faculty governance body of the institution. Lists of eligible participants and their contact information were publicly available and were collected via institutional websites.

Table 3.1-Selection Variables

Variable Name, 2005-06 IPEDS	**Parameter**
Sector	Public 4-year or above
Calculated Variable: *State Appropriations/Total Revenue*	<0.34
Caluclated Variable: *State Appropriations/Total Revenue*	>.50

Information regarding each institution collected from IPEDS was used in the analysis. Key variables used in analysis included the size of institutional enrollment, undergraduate resident tuition, undergraduate non-resident tuition, 2000 Carnegie classification, as well as the previously noted calculated variable regarding percent of revenue from state appropriations. An additional calculated variable included in the analysis was a ratio of resident to non-resident undergraduate tuition. Supplemental information on average faculty salaries during the 2004-05 and 2005-06 academic years available in annual the AAUP faculty salary survey also contributed to the analysis.

Response Rate

In the initial round of the survey administration, the instrument was sent to 836 individuals from the thirteen institutions identified for the study. Of this initial mailing 10.6% were returned undeliverable, most from a single, privatized institution. While attempts were made to correct this issue, ultimately the institution was dropped from the study leaving thirteen institutions with valid respondents. A reminder letter and survey were sent three weeks following the initial mailing. The final response rate for the survey was 37.0% (276/747), of which 275 responses were valid for use in analysis (see table

3.2). The response rate was calculated consistent with the definition for maximum response rate (RR6) by the American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR, 2006).

Table 3.2-Response Rate

	N	%
Total Population	836	100.0%
Undeliverable	89	10.6%
Respondents	276	37.0%

Methods of Analysis

Data analysis methods included general descriptive statistics, independent samples t-tests, and logistic regression analysis. A dummy variable represented the degree of institutional privatization based on its percentage of revenue in the form of state appropriations. Institutions with less than 34% of revenue from state appropriations received '1' indicating they were "privatized;" all other institutions received a '0' indicating higher state funding and thus "not privatized." The result was that four of the institutions in the study (30.8%) were coded '0' and nine institutions (69.2%) were coded '1.' It merits clarification that the use of the term "privatized" in reference to certain public institutions in this study from this point forward is for clarity of prose only and not to suggest that these institutions no longer fit in the category of 'public institution,' generally derived from an official state charter designating the institution as such. Among the four institutions meeting selection criteria for the study as 'not privatized' the revenue from state funding ranged from 51% to 62% of total revenue. 'Privatized' institutions included in the study have a percent of total revenue coming from state appropriations ranging from 6% to 33%. The use of institutions from extreme ends of the current spectrum was intentional to explore and emphasize differences between faculty leaders' perceptions at institutions with divergent revenue pictures.

These methods are appropriate for the research questions driving this study. Questions focus on determining what faculty leaders are actually observing at their institutions, thus using simple means and frequencies can provide interesting descriptive information. Because of the focus on institutions from both ends of the state-funding spectrum, it is simple and logical to divide the respondents into two groups. T-tests provide a useful way of initially comparing the groups. As will be described in more detail below, the logistic regression permitted a nuanced comparison of survey responses by controlling for contextual variables including the privatization characteristic and illuminating which of them most impacted the results.

T-Tests

The dummy variable for low versus high state funding was the grouping variable for the independent samples t-tests. T-tests are useful as indicators of difference in relationships with potential significance. The generally accepted formula for calculating t-tests is,

$$t = \frac{(M_1 - M_2) - \mu_{M1-M2}}{SE_D}$$

where M_1 is the mean responses from faculty leaders at privatized institutions and M_2 is the mean of faculty leaders non-privatized institutions on each question, respectively. The effectiveness of t-tests is reduced, however, when the groups are of unequal size or the groups are poorly constructed. For this study the grouping based on state funding level of the respondents' home institution was an appropriate construction, however, it resulted in a considerable difference in the size of the groups (n=246 in privatized group and n=29 in non-privatized group). The unequal size of the two groups of institutions necessitated accounting for unequal variances in the t-test. Because the results are largely based on unequal variances, it was not possible to calculate effect sizes to determine if the magnitude of difference was important (Sprinthall, 2003; Wright, 1986). The results can thus be utilized only as indicators of potentially meaningful differences that merit further examination.

Logistic Regression

The objective of regression analysis in this study is to provide a mode of ascertaining the significance of specific institutional characteristics in predicting responses to binary cost reduction and revenue production questions in the survey. The effect of various institutional characteristics on their privatization activities or the perception of them was important to assess. Regression analysis works best when none of the independent variables are collinear (Sprinthall, 2003), so correlation tests of variables on individual respondents indicated that variables on rank and years at university were collinear, thus years at university was dropped from the analysis. Institutional enrollment was included in all models to control for the effect of institutional size. Enrollment is a continuous variable ranging as high as 38,000 in this study. When used in a model with the dummy variable for privatization, the continuous tuition ratio variable ranging between 0 and 1, and the categorical respondent rank variable ranging from 1 to 5, the scale of the enrollment variable needed to be reduced to obtain results that could be interpreted more easily. A new enrollment variable created by dividing actual 2005 enrollment by 1000 adjusted for this difference. A test indicated enrollment was collinear with institutional Carnegie classification (an expected result since enrollment is one factor of the Carnegie ranking system), thus it is used to account for both in the analysis. Controlling for size and type in this manner should eliminate differences in the analysis that are based simply on these institutional aspects (Carini, et al, 2003).

When working with a dichotomous dependent variable, nonlinear methods of analysis allow greater sensitivity to marginal effects of independent variables (Long, 1997; Cabrera, 1994; Ronco and Cahill, 2006), so logistic regression was the primary method used in these analyses. Through transformation of the probability of Y (the binary dependent variable) into the log of the odds, it acts as a continuous variable permitting a logistic distribution of results. Another benefit of logistic regression is its ability to handle different types of independent variables such as categorical, continuous, or a combination of those types (Cabrera, 1994). In this study both categorical and continuous independent variables were present. The general formula for logistic regression can be expressed as follows:

$$P(Y) = \frac{\exp(B_0 + B_1 X_1)}{1 + \exp(B_0 + B_1 X_1)}$$

The Y being solved in this study is each of the activities noted in the cost reduction and revenue production sections of the instrument. Thus, separate models were run for each question in the both activities observed and expected. The population selection method included all institutions meeting the selected criteria, so there is no need to generalize results to other institutional types; however, the analysis is useful in explaining the significance of what the sample of faculty leaders perceive.

Independent variables included in the model were institutional enrollment, the privatization dummy variable, a resident to non-resident tuition ratio, and respondent rank. Each of these but the last is an institution level variable that is relevant to an institution's overall financial situation. Enrollment varies widely among public institutions, including among institutions in this study. Since it often corresponds closely with Carnegie classification, it can naturally control somewhat for variations in institutional mission. The tuition ratio reacts similarly, but was not found to be collinear with enrollment. The use of respondent rank was intended to capture the degree to which the individual might be knowledgeable about institutional operations due to the length of time available to him/her to build relationships and become involved in governance. Since rank was highly collinear with years at institution, rank was used to naturally limit the categories for time at institution.

The final logistic regression model was for involvement in decision-making. The dependent variable for the model was the binary of faculty participation in budget committees on campus. On the instrument this question included a response option of "I don't know" which was selected by approximately sixteen percent of respondents. These were excluded from the analysis. These respondents comprised 20% of all non-privatized respondents and 15% of all privatized respondents, so there was not significant difference in excluded cases on this factor.

For the communication model independent variables were entered in a single block. Included in the model are the transformed enrollment variable of the respondent's home institution, the dummy variable of privatized, the ratio of resident to nonresident tuition for the institution, and responses to the question regarding how the respondent would characterize communication on the campus (i.e. open, closed, consistent, inconsistent). Results of this final model will indicate whether or not faculty leaders are adequately aware of or involved in privatization decision-making, but also suggest whether privatization activities are more prominent at institutions with a lower proportion of state funding as a source of revenue.

Use of Qualitative Data

The survey instrument included three open-ended questions asking respondents to reflect on the implications or perceived impact, generically speaking, of cost-reduction and revenue production activities at the respondent's institution. In addition, it asked their perceived implications of involvement in decision-making regarding these types of activities. Many respondents of both institutional types gave lengthy responses to these open-ended queries, and the results were separately analyzed using qualitative methods of content analysis to identify themes of content or context (Ritchie, 2003; Berg, 1998). This was not the primary objective of the study initially, but since rich data seemed to emerge from this area it was given more emphasis. In large part these responses provided clarification and support for the results of statistical tests and were utilized in only this limited manner. This information was useful in supporting and expanding on results from other portions of the data.

Methodologically, the content was reviewed for both manifest (elements physically present in the words and phrases) and latent (interpretative of messages underlying the text as a whole or in part) themes (Ritchie, 2003; Berg, 1998). The comments were largely limited to either a few words or a series of no more than 3 sentences, yet many comments included information applicable to multiple emerging themes. In quantifying the results of the thematic analysis, the frequencies far outstrip the number of individuals who made comments, but the magnitude of the theme is maximized in this way (Berg, 1998). Additional value of the content analysis of this study was found by linking results to the dependent variable, namely, the privatized or non-privatized status of the institution at which the respondent was employed. In this way, the themes were given additional depth of meaning in looking for patterns of the perspectives, just as was done for the quantitative data.

Analytical Challenges

The survey instrument does not directly measure whether a response of 'no' to observation of a specific activity indicates lack of awareness or, in fact, that the activity has not been undertaken at the institution. An initial underlying assumption is that non-privatized institutions will not be engaged in activities associated with privatization. For many variables this information gap can be mitigated post-hoc through use of officially reported external data on the use of such methods at each institution.

Since there are clear categories of questions in the instrument, for the analysis I attempted to construct combined scores for each of the distinct categories of questions. This was ultimately abandoned because each activity represented in the categories of cost reduction and revenue production was distinct from others in the same group, so the importance of individual activities was not captured by creating combined scores for each individual respondent. More directly, an institution's decision to outsource an activity is completely independent of its decision to reduce funding for travel, though both potentially have the effect of reducing direct costs. Cost reduction and revenue production serve as useful categories for thinking about these activities, but were too broad to be useful as constructs in this analytic method. The descriptive statistics made clear that faculty at all institutions in the study perceived present and future engagement in several forms of cost reduction and revenue production. For these reasons it was most effective to use each question as a separate variable in the regression analysis and explore the relationship of state funding status to the results of that particular question.

Limitations

In using institutions from the opposite ends of the spectrum of state appropriations as a percent of all revenue, a variety of institutional differences were introduced between the two groups. Institutional enrollment was used to control for institutional differences that are related to size, but this variable has limitations. While enrollment was highly correlated with Carnegie classification, it may not capture all relevant differences. Institutions are placed into different Carnegie classes for more reasons than simple variations in size of enrollment, so the distinction carries greater implications regarding institutional mission that impact administrative decision-making and, potentially, the analysis of data in this study. The other primary variable used to control for institutional differences was the ratio of undergraduate resident tuition to non-resident tuition. In general, the tuition ratio could have similar implications of being directed not just by revenue needs but by mission objectives as well. With some of these broader contextual factors not directly controlled for in the data analysis, it is imperative that they be considered in interpretation of results.

The study was also limited by the large variation in size between the two groups of respondents. A more liberal definition for 'non-privatized' would have permitted additional institutions to be included expanding the size of that comparison group. Another alternative would have been to use institutions within a single Carnegie classification to further control for contextual variables related to size and mission of the institution. A negative impact of this would be the minimization of the difference between privatized and non-privatized in terms of level of state funding as the range within each Carnegie class may not be as great as the range between Carnegie classes in some instances. Since this study was targeted at understanding the difference between the perspectives and involvement of faculty leaders when funding was at the most extreme ends of the spectrum, a high degree of variance was deemed appropriate.

Finally, the study was designed to only minimally use the qualitative results; however, the limited amount of comments gathered provided an unexpectedly rich source of information in the study, thus prompting a more extensive use of qualitative analytical methods than was planned in the design phase of the study. Greater attention to this information in a more deliberate mixed methods study would enhance the understanding of quantitative results and perhaps further enhance the quality of qualitative data collected. As in Levin (2006), the depth provided by qualitative approaches greatly illuminates the issues and complements broader survey results such as those in this study.

Chapter 4—Results

The focus of this study was on the examining what types of privatization activities faculty leaders observe and if there was a difference between faculty leaders at different types of institutions in terms of activities observed and expected, an indicator of the degree to which the faculty is included in the decision process. As has been noted, observed results can indicate the degree to which faculty are aware of privatization activities, and expected results indicate perceptions of what is to come. Implications of these results for shared governance and the faculty role are important to consider. As has been discussed in prior sections of this study, the literature has emphasized the role of state appropriations in defining privatized and non-privatized institutions (Heller, 2006; Priest and St. John, 2006). Using that indicator as the primary mode of defining the two groups in this study permits examination of activities also associated with privatization and their relationship to state funding status. Additionally, the way in which faculty leaders characterize communication on these issues at their campus was of particular interest for its relevance to shared governance. Results are presented here for each mode of analysis discussed in the methodology section. Some supplemental information is included to contextualize the results. Most analysis and discussion will follow in the final section.

Descriptive statistics were useful in determining the demographic make up of both institutions in the study and respondents. The grouping of institutions provided a clear basis for independent samples t-tests to examine similarities and differences between privatized and non-privatized institutions. Unfortunately, group size differences (group 1 had 29 and group 2 had 246) somewhat limited the usefulness of these results. Logistic regression provided a means for examining the data to deal with dichotomous variables and to control for other characteristics potentially relevant to the outcomes. Results from each of these methods of analysis are below and are organized based on the research questions driving the study.

Demographics

Demographically the respondents to the survey were fairly homogenous in several respects. Of the 276 respondents, 70% were male, 89.5% were associate or full professors, and the average number of years at the institution was 17.2. Since the focus of the study was on faculty leaders, it is not unexpected to have primarily tenured faculty with substantial time at the institution dominate both the population pool and the respondents. The gender split is relatively in line with the overall gender distribution at public doctoral universities where there are four times more male full professors than female, and almost twice as many men as women at the associate level. At master's level institutions there are two and a half times more male full professors than female, and about 40% more male associate professors (Academe, 2007, p. 47). Gender did not emerge as important to the results of this survey, but there is much room for debate and future studies on the overall importance of gender in the form and function of faculty governance in the 21st century university context (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Since that was not the intent of this study, it will not be explored any further through these results or analysis.

Respondents employed at highly state-funded institutions comprised only 10.5% of all respondents. They represent a small proportion of respondents largely because they were only 9.7% of the population invited to participate. Each of the institutions in this group has a relatively small faculty senate (generally fewer than thirty) and enrollment of no more than 3,200 students on the campus. The average enrollment for the institutions with low state funding was nearly 27,000 students, with an average faculty senate size of eighty-five. These vast institutional differences are important to consider in analysis of the results below, as is the large difference in the size of the two groups.

Perceived Privatization-related Activities by Faculty Leaders

The research questions focus on determining which activities related to privatization faculty report observing on their campuses. Perceptions of the presence of these activities will drive faculty belief systems whether the perception is correct or not, so this was a first step in examining the data. While prior studies often focused on the activities in which faculty are directly involved (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Milem, Berger & Dey, 2000), the current study examined perceptions as well as faculty participation in budget issues.

The means on each variable in the survey instrument for the two groups of institutions provided the clearest way to determine the proportion of faculty leaders observing or expecting these activities, regardless of the group in which they were placed. For instance, on 'observe new academic programs' the mean for privatized institutions was 0.82 and for non-privatized institutions was 0.90 (see all means in tables 4.1 and 4.2). This is a non-significant difference statistically, but it is useful as an indicator of the seeming pervasiveness of this activity that more than 82% of respondents report observing this, regardless of institutional type. ‘Observe increased tuition for non-residents’ and ‘observe increased grant seeking’ were also reported by 80% to 90% of faculty at both institutional types. In fact, the observations of increased tuition are accurate, though not necessarily exclusive to non-residents. Average tuition increases at the privatized institutions from 2001-02 to 2005-06 were 36% for non-residents and 54% for residents. During the same time period at non-privatized institutions non-residents experienced an average 34% increase while residents experienced a 44% increase in tuition, though the actual dollar increase was generally smaller for residents (NCES, 2008). The faculty leaders’ observations were correct, and given that tuition for residents is often half to one-third of non-resident, the dollar increase for non-residents was substantial; however, the percent increase was higher for residents in all cases but one (a high-state-funding institution).

Over 80% of all respondents also noted they have observed or perceived minimal or no salary increases for faculty recently. This finding is not entirely substantiated by external data sources. Association of American University Professors (AAUP) salary data indicate that the average increase in salaries in 2006-07, the most recent year for survey respondents, for public doctoral universities was a 5.2%. There was a 4.8% increase for faculty at master’s institutions during that same time period (Academe, 2007, p. 35). The cause of this inconsistency between reports of little to no salary increases in spite of these national data is not known. It is possible that at each individual institution there truly was little to no increase. In addition, ‘minimal’ was not defined at a specific level in this instrument, so interpretations may have varied based on regional cost of living or inflationary effects.

For "expected" activities identified in the survey, nearly every non-significant variable met the standard of 80% or more faculty leaders anticipating these activities at their institutions. The two exceptions were 'expect reduced travel budgets' (0.63 and 0.61, for the respective groups) and 'expect reduced campus research support' (0.61 and 0.56, for the respective groups). In these areas faculty leaders are split in their confidence of maintaining campus-based support for pursuit of scholarship and related activities. Comments provided on open-ended questions in this section of the survey indicate, however, that these findings included the sentiment that travel and research reductions have already occurred and there is little left to be taken in these areas, thus, expectation of future reductions are reduced.

Institutional Differentiation

The examination of difference between faculty leader perceptions at privatized and non-privatized institutions occurred in two stages: t-tests and logistic regression. Results of independent samples t-tests (found in tables 4.1 and 4.2) indicate that faculty leaders at privatized institutions were more likely to have observed the revenue production methods of aggressive fund-raising, the use of incentives to departments to raise funds, and increased seeking of patents and copyrights. The use of financial aid to generate enrollment was more likely to be observed at the smaller, non-privatized institutions, possibly indicating increased prominence of this practice at these institutions if they are trying to increase enrollment. On several variables a statistically significant difference between institutions was found for activities "expected" at the university. At privatized institutions faculty leaders were more likely to expect the use of incentives by departments to raise funds and expect faculty to seek patents and copyrights, neither of which is unusual given the size of these institutions and the prominent place of research.

Table 4.1
Mean Differences-Privatized and Non-privatized Institutions-"observed" variables

		Mean	Std. Deviation	p-value
Observe reduced travel budget	Privatized	**0.55**	0.498	
	Not priv.	**0.57**	0.504	**0.868**
Observe reduced campus research support	Privatized	**0.59**	0.493	
	Not priv.	**0.56**	0.506	**0.745**
Observe minimal/no salary increase	Privatized	**0.85**	0.359	
	Not priv.	**0.79**	0.418	**0.447**
Observe support staff reductions	Privatized	**0.77**	0.420	
	Not priv.	**0.61**	0.497	**0.100**
Observe outsourcing	Privatized	**0.52**	0.501	
	Not priv.	**0.59**	0.501	**0.490**
Observe more non-tenure-track faculty	Privatized	**0.65**	0.478	
	Not priv.	**0.69**	0.471	**0.662**
Observe new acad. Programs	Privatized	**0.82**	0.384	
	Not priv.	**0.90**	0.310	**0.234**
Observe enrolling more non-resident ug	Privatized	**0.32**	0.466	
	Not priv.	**0.43**	0.504	**0.269**
Observe increased tuition for non-residents	Privatized	**0.91**	0.289	
	Not priv.	**0.83**	0.384	**0.282**
Observe engaging in aggressive fund-raising	Privatized	**0.93**	0.248	*
	Not priv.	**0.72**	0.455	**0.020**
Observe financial aid to generate enrollment	Privatized	**0.47**	0.500	*
	Not priv.	**0.75**	0.441	**0.004**
Observe financial aid to generate revenue	Privatized	**0.42**	0.494	
	Not priv.	**0.59**	0.501	**0.093**
Observe incentives to dept. to raise funds	Privatized	**0.56**	0.498	*
	Not priv.	**0.29**	0.460	**0.006**
Observe seeking patents and copyrights	Privatized	**0.76**	0.429	*
	Not priv.	**0.29**	0.460	**0.000**
Observe increased grant-seeking	Privatized	**0.91**	0.291	
	Not priv.	**0.86**	0.351	**0.511**

* = p<0.05, ** = p<0.005, *** = p<0.001

For non-privatized institutions faculty leaders were more likely to expect enrolling more non-resident undergraduates and expect the use of financial aid to generate enrollment and revenue. Significant variables from either of these models with negative values (i.e. those with greater prevalence at high-state-funding institutions) were those related to student enrollments or financial aid.

Table 4.2
Mean Differences-Privatized and Not Privatized Public Institutions-“expected” variables

		Mean	**Std. Deviation**	**p-value**
Expect reduced travel budget	Privatized	**0.63**	0.485	
	Not priv.	**0.61**	0.497	**0.858**
Expect reduced campus research support	Privatized	**0.61**	0.489	
	Not priv.	**0.56**	0.506	**0.615**
Expect minimal/no salary increase	Privatized	**0.75**	0.432	
	Not priv.	**0.79**	0.412	**0.627**
Expect support staff reductions	Privatized	**0.79**	0.411	
	Not priv.	**0.74**	0.447	**0.614**
Expect more non-tenure-track faculty	Privatized	**0.74**	0.439	
	Not priv.	**0.78**	0.424	**0.677**
Expect outsourcing	Privatized	**0.71**	0.457	
	Not priv.	**0.71**	0.460	**0.921**
Expect new acad. Programs	Privatized	**0.86**	0.346	
	Not priv.	**0.93**	0.258	**0.197**
Expect enrolling more non-resident undergrads	Privatized	**0.49**	0.501	*
	Not priv.	**0.75**	0.441	**0.007**
Expect increased tuition for non-residents	Privatized	**0.90**	0.301	
	Not priv.	**0.83**	0.384	**0.339**
Expect engaging in aggressive fund-raising	Privatized	**0.94**	0.246	
	Not priv.	**0.79**	0.412	**0.079**
Expect use of financial aid to generate enrollment	Privatized	**0.65**	0.477	*
	Not priv.	**0.86**	0.351	**0.006**
Expect use of financial aid to generate revenue	Privatized	**0.67**	0.471	*
	Not priv.	**0.83**	0.384	**0.051**
Expect use of incentives to dept. to raise funds	Privatized	**0.81**	0.394	*
	Not priv.	**0.61**	0.497	**0.047**
Expect seeking patents and copyrights	Privatized	**0.85**	0.358	*
	Not priv.	**0.44**	0.506	**0.000**
Expect increased grant-seeking	Privatized	**0.94**	0.231	
	Not priv.	**0.86**	0.351	**0.232**

* = p<0.05

As a group, the highly state funded institutions in this study have much lower enrollments, and a much greater proportion of residents than non-residents among the current student body. For these institutions, there is opportunity for revenue production in enrollment and financial aid use that has already been realized by most privatized institutions. Other significant items, observed or expected, at privatized institutions were activities that represent a broader array of cost reduction or revenue production activities.

Logistic regression models were run separately for each survey question to focus on contextual indicators relevant to each specific activity and faculty member, exclusive of other activities being undertaken. Since most of the activities mentioned in survey questions can occur independently of each other, this approach was deemed an appropriate way to independently analyze each activity. Results displayed in Table 4.3 indicate several areas in which responses to the survey vary in ways related to the home institutions' financial situation. Those questions for which an insignificant p-value was found for each factor were excluded from this table. Remaining questions include four (covering two topics) from the sections on cost reduction but twelve (covering seven topics) from the sections on revenue production activities. Observed reductions in campus research support had an inverse relationship to the resident-non-resident tuition ratio, indicating that where more reductions were observed there is a larger difference in tuition for these two groups of undergraduates, a characteristic of privatized institutions. For expected future reductions in research funding the relationship to being privatized was significant. Expecting reduced campus research funding indicated an inverse relationship, however, signifying that expecting these reductions was actually more likely at non-privatized institutions. Both the tuition ratio and enrollment were significant at $p<$

.05. Once again, the inverse nature of the tuition ratio to expecting reduced campus research shows that respondents from non-privatized institutions were more likely to expect future reductions.

Table 4.3-Logistic Regression question pairings with significant results

	Beta coefficients			
	Privatized	Tuition Ratio	Enrollment	Rank
Observe reduced campus research support	-1.116	-17.186	0.013	-0.150
P-value		*		
Expect reduced campus research support	-2.157	-22.677	0.049	0.167
P-value	*	*	*	
Observe outsourcing	0.983	8.806	-0.41	-0.264
P-value			*	
Expect outsourcing	0.986	9.912	-0.009	0.514
P-value				*
Observe engaging in aggressive fundraising	1.968	21.053	0.021	-0.141
P-value	*	*		
Expect engaging in aggressive fundraising	2.334	12.689	-0.006	0.497
P-value	*			
Observe enrolling more non-resident undergrads	-0.645	17.374	0.042	0.220
P-value		*	*	
Expect enrolling more non-resident undergrads	-1.829	3.415	0.039	0.232
P-value	*		*	
Expect increased tuition to non-resident undergrads	-0.023	-5.722	0.033	0.976
P-value				*
Observe use of financial aid to generate enrollment	-0.466	16.753	-0.005	0.030
P-value		*		
Expect use of financial aid to generate enrollment	-0.907	6.508	0.012	0.587
P-value				*
Expect use of financial aid to generate revenue	-1.425	-0.118	0.034	0.579
P-value			*	*
Observe use of incentives to dept to raise funds	2.038	9.810	-0.016	-0.074
P-value	*			

	Beta coefficients			
	Privatized	Tuition Ratio	Enrollment	Rank
Expect use of incentives to dept to raise funds	3.233	20.365	-0.038	0.358
P-value	*	*	*	
Observe seeking patents and copyrights	2.887	26.709	0.034	-0.146
	*	*	*	
Expect seeking patents and copyrights	2.693	15.863	0.014	0.377
P-value	*	*		

* p< .05

The other cost reduction area with meaningful results was outsourcing. Enrollment was significant to observing outsourcing at the institution, an expected outcome given the larger size of the privatized institutions in the study. The expectation for future outsourcing was related only to the rank of the respondent. Regression results for all cost reduction areas are consistent with the directionality observed in mean differences for each of these variables, but the t-tests of these differences did not indicate significance of difference. In this instance the sensitivity of the logistic analysis was useful in teasing out specific factors related to these differences.

Revenue production methods were much more highly represented in the results. Aggressive fundraising is an activity both observed and expected to a significant degree at privatized institutions in the study. Observing aggressive fundraising was also significant at $p < .05$ with institutions with a higher tuition ratio (i.e. predominantly high state funding institutions). A higher tuition ratio was significantly related to greater likelihood of respondents noting observation of more non-resident undergraduate enrollment. A higher tuition ratio was also related to observing use of financial aid to generate enrollment, observing and expecting use of incentives by departments, and observing and expecting seeking of patents and copyrights.

The distribution of tuition ratios by institutional privatization status is displayed in table 4.4 below. As tuition and state appropriations are the primary sources of revenue for public institutions, it is reasonable to anticipate that the tuition ratio might be positively correlated with lower appropriations. Results supported this idea as the correlation of these two variables for institutions in this study was 0.44, significant at $p<0.05$. Overall in the logistic regression analyses, nine of the sixteen cost reduction and revenue production variables with significant relationships on any other factor in this study were significant, all in positive direction, with the tuition ratio. In comparison, seven of sixteen were significant with privatization though with varying directionality.

Table 4.4—Tuition Ratio Distribution by Institution Privatization Status

Not Privatized	Privatized
27.6%	28.1%
31.4%	30.3%
36.2%	31.0%
41.0%	32.6%
	32.8%
	32.9%
	33.5%
	33.6%
	36.5%

In addition to the relationship between being privatized and aggressive fundraising, four other variables had a significant, positive relationship to privatization: observe use of incentives at department level, expect use of incentives at department level, observe seeking of patents and copyrights, and expect seeking of patents and copyrights. The difference in institutional size and mission could be reasonably expected to impact these four questions, but enrollment was included as a control in these models thus mitigating the size aspect to some degree. Only the expectation of greater enrollment of non-resident undergraduates was negatively related to privatization (i.e. more likely at highly state funded institutions).

There were just three revenue production variables on which respondent rank was related to a significant level ($p < .05$): expect increase in tuition for non-resident undergrads, expect use of financial aid to generate enrollment, and expect use of financial aid to generate revenue. These dependent variables were not highly significant with any of the financial indicators. Ultimately, there is little evidence to support that a differentiation based on rank indicates an important aspect of faculty involvement or awareness of these issues.

Perceived Involvement by Faculty Leaders

Communication and involvement in decision-making issues were addressed in the survey through questions about who is typically involved in budget committees or privatization-related decisions. A comparison of the two groups of institutions is displayed in table 4.5. Three areas had significant results in the t-tests: trustees typically involved in decisions, state legislature typically involved in decisions, and governor typically involved in decisions. Of these three both state legislature and governor involvement were negative, with non-privatized institutions indicating higher involvement than privatized institutions. This is not entirely surprising as these institutions are notable for their higher levels of state funding. A perception of greater involvement of trustees at privatized institutions merits further exploration. The role of trustees is varied based on state policy and structural issues that vary by state (Mingle and

Epper, 1996), so some degree of this variation may be more geographically based than related to the institutional type or financial situation.

Table 4.5
Mean Differences-Privatized and Non-privatized Institutions-Communication variables

		Mean	Std. Deviation	p-value
Faculty participate in budget committees	Privatized	**0.75**	0.436	
	Not priv.	**0.52**	0.511	**0.053**
Trustees typically involved in decisions	Privatized	**0.89**	0.313	*
	Not priv.	**0.68**	0.476	**0.040**
President/Chancellor typically involved in decisions	Privatized	**1.00**	0.065	
	Not priv.	**1.00**	0.000	**0.318**
Acad. Deans typically involved in decisions	Privatized	**0.96**	0.193	
	Not priv.	**0.83**	0.384	**0.075**
Faculty senate typically involved in decisions	Privatized	**0.47**	0.500	
	Not priv.	**0.33**	0.480	**0.162**
Student senate typically involved in decisions	Privatized	**0.11**	0.312	
	Not priv.	**0.26**	0.447	**0.099**
State legislature typically involved in decisions	Privatized	**0.75**	0.434	*
	Not priv.	**0.93**	0.267	**0.005**
Governor typically involved in decisions	Privatized	**0.72**	0.452	*
	Not priv.	**0.92**	0.272	**0.002**

* = p<0.05

Table 4.6-Communication model logistic regression results

	Beta	*P-value*	
Privatized	2.562	0.005	*
Tuition ratio	-9.956	0.176	
Rank	0.846	0.006	*
Enrollment	-0.049	0.014	*
Communication type	-0.688	0.000	*
Constant	3.586	0.198	

Dep. Variable: characterization of communication as 'open and consistent' 'open, but inconsistent' 'closed but consistent' or 'closed and inconsistent'

The final logistic regression model focused on factors related to communication. Results show that faculty who note the participation of faculty on budget committees at an institution is more likely to be at privatized institutions with lower enrollment. In addition, budget committee participation was more likely noted by faculty with higher rank. Least surprisingly, those observing faculty participation were more likely to characterize campus communication as ‘open and consistent’. (see table 4.6 above)

The relative influence accorded to faculty participants in budget decisions was not explored in this study, but a question regarding the degree to which communication was viewed as open or closed showed that more than 30 percent of respondents characterize campus communication as ‘closed’ at their institutions, more than half of which also indicated it was inconsistent (Table 4.7). The most notable difference between institutional types was that institutions with high state funding reported much more open and consistent communication than institutions with low state funding, an unexpected result given the previously noted finding that faculty at privatized institutions were more likely to note faculty involvement in budget committees.

Table 4.7-Communication types

How would you characterize campus communication?	High state funding (n=28)	Low state funding (n=239)	**All Institutions (n=267)**
Open and consistent	46.4%	25.5%	27.7%
Open, but inconsistent	21.4%	39.7%	37.8%
Consistent, but closed	14.3%	14.2%	14.2%
Inconsistent and closed	17.9%	18.0%	18.0%
None of the above	0.0%	2.5%	2.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Perceived Implications and Concerns

Several questions were designed to obtain additional comments and clarification throughout the survey instrument. With more than half of respondents providing open-ended comments, results from these questions proved useful in providing additional information to supplement the more direct responses of the specific, multiple-response and yes-no questions. As was previously noted, these responses were analyzed with generally accepted qualitative research methods of content analysis to identify themes and patterns in the very brief responses that were typically written (Ritchie, 2003; Berg, 1998). Though content analysis is limited by the extent to which the analysis "reif[ies] the taken-for-granted understandings persons bring to words, terms or experiences" (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000), it does provide a basis from which a baseline of evidence to use in combination with other empirical data. In general, the qualitative data in this study supported many of the quantitative results detailed throughout this section in regards to the prevalence of certain activities and the anticipation of more privatization-related activities in the future. The value of a mixed-methods approach to data gathering is supported by many researchers (Ritchie, 2003; Hammersley, 1996) is underscored by these outcomes in that quantitative data has pointed to faculty observing and expecting some particularly pertinent changes in the landscape of their home institutions, but the comments indicate some deep effects that may not be initially identified by when plans for cost reduction and revenue production activities are outlined.

Morale Considerations

The first such theme that was found in the qualitative data was one of declining morale among faculty. The frequency with which respondents made note of declining morale being related to increased use of the privatization practices listed was especially noteworthy as the concept of morale or job satisfaction was entirely absent from the instrument and materials that accompanied it. Fifty respondents, nearly twenty percent of all respondents and more than one-third of those who commented at all, specifically mentioned the idea of "decreased morale" or "demoralization" and seventeen others noted implications of these privatizing trends toward satisfaction, attitude, or increasing cynicism. Even though eighty percent of survey respondents made no mention of this, the absence of the term 'morale' from the instrument all related communications makes this finding meaningful. These comments came from faculty of both privatized and non-privatized institutions, though they were slightly more prominent and vehement at the privatized institutions. One strikingly negative comment from a faculty leader at a privatized institution noted,

> *"What can I say? Life sucks and then you die. Seriously, it is all bad. Research is harder to do and to communicate. The quality of education suffers. The quality of services decline. Faculty commitment and loyalty to the institution die a painful death. Collegiality evaporates. It has gotten very, very ugly."*

The tone of this comment is itself an indicator of the low morale of this particular faculty member. Coupled with the perspective openly indicated here, this comment is not necessarily characteristic of responses, many of which said only "lower morale," but this comment is interesting for the breadth of impacts noted. At many institutions it would go without saying that research, educational quality, and faculty loyalty are important to institutional vitality. These three factors are intertwined, so finding ways to adequately address research concerns and maintain educational quality seem like reasonable drivers to promoting high faculty morale.

Only four of these morale/attitudinal responses came from highly state funded institutions. The most specific of which stated the following two points of impact on faculty at his/her institution:

> *#1 is increased cynicism about our role and function as an institution of higher ed. #2 is increased anger and frustration at indirect efforts to make faculty focus and engage in/be held responsible for recruitment and retention.*

The sense of frustration is equally as palpable as the previous comment, though attributed to different issues. A similar sense of the changing nature of the institution as a whole is noteworthy also. Much more thorough qualitative investigation would be needed to explore the specific types of administrative actions and adjustments that are leading to this type of sentiment, but the relationship to privatization activities here seems unquestionable.

Recruitment and Retention of Faculty

An even more prominent sentiment across the open-ended questions related to problems with retention of faculty and/or recruiting of new faculty. In the question regarding cost reduction impact alone, loss of faculty or difficulty recruiting faculty was mentioned eighty-five times, the greatest appearance of any theme. More than one-third of the respondents from non-privatized institutions noted these concerns (37%), while just short of one-third (30.5%) of respondents at privatized institutions said the same. Typical comments on this issue were very direct about the issue as can be observed in these examples:

Our institution may become less competitive and perhaps influence faculty to look elsewhere for better support levels.

Incentives to seek outside offers.

Increased turn-over. Difficulty hiring.

University already facing faculty retention issues.

Not only do these four separate comments indicate anticipate these implications, they indicate it is already upon them in some cases. This could reasonably related to the decreased morale as in the prior comment from a faculty member at a non-privatized institution, but it is not clear what, if any, cause and effect relationship might be present. Decreased morale due to other issues could be poisoning recruitment and retention, but it is equally as plausible that difficulties with recruitment and retention of faculty are decreasing morale and the target for these frustrations becomes privatization-related activities. Future uses of this or similar data might examine the relationship of this sentiment to specific privatization factors or examine the relationship to this perception and actual faculty employment behavior and decision-making.

Changes in Research and Academic Work

Even with such vast differences in size and mission between the institutions in the privatized and non-privatized groups as has been noted, faculty members at the small and large state institutions consistently cited observing and expecting similar activities related to privatization. Of the thirty questions about cost reduction and revenue production activities, only five had means for either group that fell below fifty percent. Indeed, the comments regarding these areas were remarkably similar irrespective of institutional affiliation. A faculty leader from a large, privatized institution noted that the implications of expected future cost reduction strategies included,

> *"Needing to do more with less; impact on time available for students, balancing with research duties and continued emphasis on obtaining research funding."*

Comments on the same question regarding implications from two different faculty leaders at a small, non-privatized institution were in the same vein:

> *"Increased workload and stress, lower quality of classroom teaching."*

> *"In our case, reduced support for experimental stations, in particular staffing and equipment, has hindered research."*

Though the institutional frameworks and funding schema are quite different, these faculty members anticipate and are already experiencing remarkably similar impacts. This similarity seems to indicate that the changes associated with privatization are not just occurring when funding reaches some sort of tipping point, they are becoming the operational norm in public higher education, and faculty are feeling an impact.

Privatization as Positive

Some of the open-ended responses were noteworthy due to their positive or neutral nature. From the 276 respondents, twenty-four provided a comment that supported the changes engendered by privatization, or in some cases were at least accepting that this was a reasonable and appropriate response to the current context for public institutions of higher education. Though less than ten percent of respondents provided this type of feedback, it is important to note the presence of this sentiment among faculty leaders. One respondent reasoned about the revenue production and cost reductions that,

> *I believe that it has encouraged faculty to consider the financial implications of decisions. I see this as a good thing.*

Another positive perspective noted some broader implications, but indicated that financial implications were the least relevant aspect.

> *The implications are good for [my institution]. These strategies will enhance the quality of our student body which will improve my experience in the classroom. It will not, however, make a substantial dent in our deficits.*

This comment is supportive of the activities related to privatization, though the insistence that there will be little or no positive budgetary impact flies in the face of the intent of most of the cost reduction and revenue production activities' desired outcomes. Data to support claims of the impact of privatization activities should be a critical piece of conversations after the changes are made and can provide faculty with the evidence needed to understand this type of concrete outcome of privatization.

Summary

The comments collected in this study, whether positive, negative or neutral all ask faculty to simply speculate, the only concrete understanding that results is one of how faculty are perceiving privatization activities as a whole. There is no data in this study to support that faculty are thinking more deeply about financial implications of decisions or that the quality of education is declining. As a body of evidence themselves, however, the comments do indicate that faculty (and probably staff) morale considerations must be taken seriously in the process of instituting privatization activities at colleges and universities.

In sum, these results broaden the picture of what is known about faculty and faculty leaders' involvement in the privatization trend. The most surprising aspects may in fact be from reviewing the means of faculty reports of observing these activities. With so few of them below even fifty percent for either target group, there was an indicator of the pervasiveness of privatization activities in public higher education. This information also provides a sense that faculty leaders are not oblivious to the changes, though only one-third to less than half report faculty senates involved in these decisions. A greater proportion reported faculty on budget committees at their institutions, but the substance of that involvement is undefined. Comments about the impact of these changes indicate a strong sense of change in the general direction of educational policy, and that there is a day-to-day effect being observed. These and other results will be reviewed in greater depth in the following discussion.

Chapter 5-Discussion

Privatization in public higher education has been called a spectrum on which institutions are placed based on the share of their operations funded by public sources (Lyall and Sell, 2006b). The full picture of what is happening at various points on this spectrum has been slowly emerging as many institutions shift along it with decreasing proportions of revenue from public sources. With public institutions reaching levels as low as six percent of total revenue from the state (NCES, 2008), it is critical to assess the involvement of the faculty and the shared governance process in this transition. If, as some have suggested, reduced public funding encourages policies that increase faculty workload or shift institutional priorities (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004; Rhoades, 2003), the faculty of an institution is a critical stakeholder in describing what these fundamental policy changes mean in practice. As the core of an academic enterprise where shared governance is often the foundation for decision-making in a variety of areas, faculty leaders should be cognizant of the privatization trends at their institutions and be able to provide perspective on the implications toward the role of the faculty. The absence of this perspective from much of the literature on the topic is not difficult to correct. If, however, it is symptomatic of faculty absence from the institutional discussion, the problem is deeper.

As was suggested in previous chapters, ample evidence exists that privatization is occurring at institutions in myriad ways, not all of which might be obvious to the faculty. Outsourced dining operations, motor pools, laundry services, or even residence halls are unlikely to directly impact the faculty on a day-to-day basis, but the results are not irrelevant as, in the best case scenario, the entire institution benefits from streamlined operations or infusions to the budget. Conversely, the entire institution can suffer if students are poorly served or the academic side of the enterprise is compromised in some way through these contracts. There is sufficient potential for such outcomes to merit keeping the faculty at least informed regarding plans, implementation and results of such decision processes. The degree to which faculty leaders are aware of such changes and their actual participation in budget-related activities and decisions at an institution can begin to shed light on how institutions are handling these decisions that have such important implications.

Key Findings and Implications

The findings of this study present a view of the relationship between the faculties' awareness of specific operational activities and privatization in public higher education. Each activity included in the survey is one attributed to privatization in the literature, but of the fifteen cost reduction and revenue production activities potentially observed, only the revenue production methods of fundraising, generating patents and copyrights, and the use of incentives at the department level were more likely to be observed by faculty leaders at institutions that are more highly privatized. In some instances this lack of difference is because a specific activity was reported as highly observed (such as minimal/no salary increases) or least observed (as in enrolling more non-resident undergraduates) in equal measure at privatized and non-privatized institutions. A basic question of this study was whether or not faculty leaders are aware of the privatization activities being undertaken at their institutions, and these findings seem to indicate they do perceive the changes.

Manipulating enrollment and financial aid to increase tuition income were more likely observed by faculty leaders at the highly state-funded institutions. Enrollment and financial aid activities are part of the budgetary process at all institutions, but it is possible that at privatized institutions a shift to increase the role of manipulating these aspects to generate income occurred several years ago as part of the transition to their current funding status and are now routine practice not drawing particular attention from faculty members. This is also an area in which the current institutional status could impact results. Ratios of non-residents to residents at privatized institutions are already much higher than at highly state-funded institutions indicating much less room for increasing non-resident enrollment. For a highly state-funded institution, manipulating enrollments and financial aid in more visible ways may indicate the initiation of a greater privatization trend to seek the low-hanging fruit of additional tuition revenue, suggesting somewhat of a hierarchy of privatization activities.

Certain aspects of privatization do have a more immediate relationship to the faculty. Discussions of workload, salary competitiveness or class size are issues on which faculty have much more involvement on most campuses than was the case thirty years ago, though this involvement is not at the level of faculty determination but primarily as discussions and consultations (Kaplan, 2004). A faculty role in salary discussions could be conceived as the faculty participation in the promotion and tenure process, though it can also be on other levels. No direct questions regarding class size or workload were included in the survey for this study, but eighty percent of respondents noted both observing and expecting minimal or no salary increases. The regression results did not indicate any difference between privatized and non-privatized institutions on this factor, possibly a sign that either pessimism about salaries is a universal faculty characteristic or that salaries are always the first factor to be impacted by budget fluctuations. As was noted in chapter 4, AAUP data indicate salary increases within the Carnegie classifications of institutions in this study did increase, though for specific institutions this may not have been the case.

Responses to open-ended questions in this study did touch on all three areas of workload, salary, and class size and support the idea that these are highly salient issues for faculty members. Several responses indicated that trends being observed are most likely to result in a "voting with their feet" effect of individual faculty members choosing to leave the institution for better pay, increased support for research, or smaller class sizes at other universities or the private sector. Comments to this effect did not focus entirely on the loss of individual faculty members, however, but on broader impacts as well. Two examples below, both of which came from faculty leaders at major public institutions with low state funding, predict broader implications:

> *"Many of my colleagues will leave the university for other opportunities. I think the quality of our academic programs will suffer."*

> *"Decreased morale, brain drain to other states with adequate infrastructure so that their budget issues are not as widely felt."*

The first comment notes the impact on academic programs at the home institution, a factor of importance to institutions and states, not just from the position of prestige-seeking, but also in regards to the quality of the institution's graduates and the contributions of the institution to the state workforce and economy. Similarly, the second comment predicts a “brain drain” of faculty to other public, state systems even while acknowledging the breadth of state budget woes by saying issues in other places are “not *as widely* felt” (emphasis added). Essentially, faculty leaders realize the limitations of state budgets and are concerned about academic quality, but these are factors they must balance with individual career interests and prestige-seeking.

Institutional Similarities

The findings of this study also indicate that faculty leaders at privatized institutions seem largely cognizant of the variety of privatization activities at their campuses. Even at highly state funded institutions survey respondents noted observing a large number of cost reduction and revenue production activities associated with privatization, though these institutions may be least engaged in certain revenue production methods. A primary research question guiding this study was to determine if faculty leaders perceive factors related to privatization at institutions with proportionally very high state funding and very low state funding in terms of activities observed or expected. Results indicate an apparent lack of differentiation between the perceptions of faculty leaders at these two types of institutions in many areas. It seems in part that faculty are observing and anticipating the utilization of privatization activities almost universally within public higher education, irrespective of the state funding level. More differentiation was anticipated given the vast differences in funding sources, total revenue and institutional mission. Several possible explanations for this lack of differentiation will be delineated below. This study was not designed in such a way to determine which of these possibilities actually explains the institutional similarity on these factors, but a deeper case study approach may be able to do so in the future.

Anticipating the Future

Stability of financial status is critical to institutional planning and security. When viewing highly state-funded institutions in comparison to their low state funding peers, it was somewhat surprising to see the high degree to which faculty leaders at highly funded institutions anticipated additional privatization related activities in the future. It is conceivable that leaders and administrators at institutions currently receiving half or more of their revenue from state sources do not trust that this revenue can be counted on in the future. Guided by this belief and a desire to do what is necessary to maintain the highest possible level of funding, they act in a way consistent with the phenomenon identified in institutional theory as anticipatory subordination (Brint and Karabel, 1991). Pressure on institutions to meet state legislators' expectations may be self-inflicted to some degree, but it is nonetheless powerful. When institutions with more than fifty percent of revenue still coming from state appropriations seem to be undertaking certain privatizing activities at nearly the same pace as lower-funded institutions, a sense of anticipation appears to guide these behaviors. With no mandates in place to change particular activities, faculty members anticipate these changes on the horizon.

The qualitative data support this faculty anticipation as well. The comments were as often referring to the current state of affairs as to the anticipated future state of affairs for faculty. And the anticipation of the faculty in this study was, by and large, that the future would entail greater shifts towards private-style funding schema at both institutional types. That the faculty anticipates these changes is not in itself proof that anticipatory subordination is at work, but in many instances the comments from faculty regarding the decision-making process of the institution indicated a sense that the legislature and/or governor of the state are overly involved in driving the institutional decision-making process, and conversely, that the faculty senate body was not involved enough.

Management Fads

Regardless of the current funding balance between state appropriations, tuition, and other sources, the findings of this study speak to the prevalence of privatizing activities for all public institutions today. Perhaps influenced by a sense of anticipatory subordination, it could be that a general assimilation of institutional operations is taking place in the vein of management fads observed in the past, of which benchmarking is a prominent example (Birnbaum, 2000). Benchmarking may also contribute to the broad adaptation of privatization related practices. As universities follow the steps of comparing peers, identifying "best practices," and constructing benchmarks for their own performance, assimilation across the spectrum of institutions is a natural outcome. In examining peers and others, institutions with high state funding may very well be looking to privatized counterparts in seeking best business and administrative practices on which to model, a case of quite deliberate assimilation. The result of this practice will by default be the further privatization of these institutions.

A broad scale adaptation of a management style is not new to higher education, but use of the term 'fad' may mischaracterize what is currently happening by implying it is a short term change. Privatization as a form of management for public universities may seem to be a short-lived fad, but as Birnbaum (2000) notes “remnants of fads may become incorporated into institutional culture and become part of our collective thinking” (p. xiv). Institutions with low state funding must find methods of supporting their operations, and many of the activities associated with privatization are undertaken seemingly independent of any other activity, permitting a incremental approach to changing institutional operations. Privatization in public higher education is, in essence, a collection of activities, each of which might individually be considered a fad, but it seems clear that at least some of these activities are here to stay. When viewed collectively, this broad array of activities under the umbrella of privatization appears to be becoming part of the institutional culture and collective thinking in higher education.

Cost reduction activities, in particular, seem the most prevalent among institutions of all types as a starting place for adjusting management or operations. Survey results indicated these activities were consistently observed by faculty leaders and this is not a surprise. Cries for efficiency at institutions supported by taxpayer dollars are common and not entirely misplaced given the amount of money infused into higher education (Blumenstyk, 2008; Chronicle, 2007). At the institutional level, however, undertaking cost reduction should always be considered in the context of how an institution can best pursue its mission. If certain types of reductions are politically popular fads, there is risk in both adopting them and not adopting them. Compelling arguments might exist for the mission-centric nature of spending tens of thousands or millions on research, but to the taxpayer this can simply seem to be bloated budgeting to appease overpaid faculty members who should be in the classroom anyway. Almost irrespective of the sources of revenue for a university, these pressures can be felt and they may be more pertinent to administrative decision-making than the actual status of its revenue sources.

Some modes of revenue production have also been instituted almost universally at institutions in this study. The most obvious one measured was the use of incentives at the department level to raise funds. Generally this type of activity is part of an incentive-based budgeting system applied institution-wide. As a direct descendant from private institutions of higher education (which, in turn, adapted it from private industry), incentive-based budgeting results not just in an administrative structure that mimics a private institution, but also entails an underlying philosophical approach to institutional management that can either focus on the generation of revenue as a goal in itself or set boundaries for revenue-generating activities based on larger institutional objectives (Priest and St. John, 2006). The degree to which incentives for revenue generation and cost-savings are focused on institutional objectives is determined by those involved in decision-making and management of operations. If these individuals are held accountable to maintaining the focus on institutional objectives, this type of privatization behavior may resist falling into the traps identified as academic capitalism.

Respondents to this survey who are employed by privatized institutions were more likely to report observing incentives at the department level already or anticipating it in the future. Size is an important factor to consider in incentive-based budgeting in how it impacts the ability to smooth year-to-year revenue inconsistencies. For this reason the use of incentives may not be as attractive an option for smaller institutions, yet 61 percent of respondents from the smaller, non-privatized institutions reported expecting the use of incentives down to the department level in the future. Whether or not this actually happens, the expectation of it indicates the pervasiveness of this management fad in public university operations.

Another practice prevalent in privatization is outsourcing. More than half of all respondents surveyed have observed outsourcing on their campuses, and regression results indicated that as enrollment decreased a respondent was more likely to observe outsourcing. In actuality outsourcing is present almost universally at public institutions, including in instruction-related areas such as course-management systems (a market dominated by Blackboard) and electronic portfolio tools (Sakai, Blackboard, LiveText, etc.); however, it is an indicator of the ubiquity of these factors when faculty leaders may no longer perceive them as outsourcing. With only slightly more than half of respondents noting the observation of outsourcing in this study, and no single institution immune from it, it appears that not all faculty leaders have a sense of where this practice is being adopted.

Whether undertaken because of sense of pressure from government entities or simply responding to the higher education landscape as a whole, to refer to the adoption of these tools of instruction and other outsourced services as a 'fad' minimizes the degree to which they involve a long-term institutional commitment to a contract. Equally as important is the commitment of faculty, staff and students to adapting teaching, learning, living and operations on these particular services. It is the essence of what Birnbaum (2000) meant by saying "remnants of fads may become incorporated into our institutional culture and… collective thinking" (p. xiv). Faculty members are no more immune to these changes in culture and thinking than administrators, but it is the faculty which is most likely to immediately observe how the academic mission of the institution is affected by the changes.

Shared Governance in the Faculty and Public Interest

Based upon the AAUP position regarding the necessity of faculty participation on issues bearing on the general education policies of the institution (AAUP, 2006), it fits within the scope of accepted institutional practices to maintain some degree of faculty involvement even if the relation to general education is indirect. Enrollment decisions, outsourcing, initiation of new programs, and other privatization activities certainly fit this definition. Further, I have argued in this study that the role of the faculty supports the big picture of the academic mission and public interest. Though faculty participation in committees and governing bodies may appear focused on faculty interests, the core of each issue is often aligned with institutional and public goals.

This study focused on faculty participants on faculty senates or academic councils in order to include faculty members most likely to be involved in administrative collaborations and decision-making. It is reasonable to believe that other faculty members might also participate in various committees with oversight on specific issues at these institutions, but it was assumed that, for the most part, faculty senate/council members would be the most well informed of privatization-related activities. In large part this appeared to be the case as the respondents identified a great number of activities that are occurring on their campuses. Simply knowing that a specific activity has occurred or may in the future is not synonymous with participating in the consideration or adoption of that activity, but as has been observed, the relevance of many of these activities to the role of the faculty supports the need for faculty participation in the process.

Communication and Decision Participation

In order to determine the level at which faculty are represented in privatization discussions on campus, a portion of this study asked respondents questions regarding communication and faculty involvement in decision-making. Seventy-five percent of survey respondents at low state funding (privatized) institutions indicated faculty were involved in budget committees at their institutions, in contrast to only 52 percent of respondents noting budget committee participation at high state funding institutions.[2] This difference between the groups of institutions was not statistically significant due largely to the variance in group size (209 versus 22), but the relevance of institutional size or level of state appropriations in whether or not faculty will be asked to participate in budget committees may nonetheless be factors worthy of further exploration. Of course, involvement in a committee is not a sufficient condition to accord influence, but it is reasonable to consider it a necessary condition. If, as this study seems to indicate, faculty leaders are more likely to be involved in budget committees at institutions with lower state funding, this is a positive sign regarding the degree to which faculty members can provide input on the perceived impact of privatizing activities. Kaplan (2004) found that short-range budgetary planning is perceived to include a greater faculty role now

[2] Within institution consistency of these responses was very high for all but one privatized institution. At this institution 47% of respondents said faculty members are involved in budget committees while 53% said faculty members are not involved in budget committees. Whichever case is accurate a clear disconnect in communication exists at this institution.

than it did in the 1970s. High participation of faculty in institutional budget committees such as was found at privatized institutions in this study supports Kaplan's finding.

In light of the proportionally lower participation level on budget committees of faculty leaders at high state funding institutions, the higher perception of open-ness and consistency is interesting. With the privatized institutions being so much larger, this is complicated to fully tease out, but it implies that participation at these institutions may in some instances be perceived as only symbolic. A respondent from a large, privatized institution with faculty participants on budget committees commented that,

> *We have a long tradition of faculty governance at [our institution], but unfortunately this doesn't extend to campus- and school-wide budget issues.*

This respondent had also noted a lack of faculty senate involvement in privatization-related decision-making, so this specific instance supports the notion that symbolic faculty involvement has left at least some faculty leaders feeling substantively uninvolved.

For the total population surveyed a logical connection was found in this study between faculty participation on budget committees and characterization of campus communication as 'open and consistent.' Research has connected the open-ness of campus communication with job satisfaction for faculty (Daly and Dee, 2006), while another indicated that there is no connection between faculty job satisfaction and whether the campus had strong shared governance (Kissler, 1997). This study did not directly ask about job satisfaction, but even in instances where communication is open and trust for administration is high, close attention must be paid to how institutional structure encourages dialogue and debate. Minor and Tierney (2005) note "a culture of trust needs to be something more than everyone simply deferring to leaders. Governance needs to be linked to an increase in institutional quality rather than simply a series of harmonious structures" (p. 152). A dialogic process is more than open sharing of information back and forth; it is meaningfully engaging on issues to ensure characteristics of quality and equality are present in the outcome, with the additional benefit of impacting faculty job satisfaction. Committees and faculty councils are not necessary for this type of communication to take place, but they have long been identified as the primary vehicles for communication at universities.

The importance of strong communication with faculty is critical, not just to sustaining job satisfaction, but it is also important for maintaining institutional focus on mission and public objectives. If, as I contended at the outset of this study, faculty are the primary keepers of many aspects of the mission (via teaching, research, and service activities), then it follows that the administration, governing boards, and others in the policy realm have good reason to support a strong sense of open and consistent communication with faculty leaders. The expertise and shared responsibility faculty hold in regards to general policies impacting education at an institution make involvement a function that supports the faculty interest and the public interest.

Privatization's Impacts on Faculty

Whether or not faculty members are adequately informed of or participants in decision-making for privatization, they can have direct perceptions of impacts of these activities. The open-ended questions provided a space for describing these perceptions, and in some cases experiences. As was previously noted, these comments, a few of which have been included above, were not reviewed with a rigorous qualitative approach, but instead were scanned for key words and more detailed explanations of and support for quantitative findings. In general the comments were supportive of the quantitative findings and provided clarification of responses that improved the analysis of results. The comments serve a limited purpose of supporting other reported findings and providing indicators of future avenues to explore. Some specific avenues detailed more below include faculty morale, the institutional mission, and the sense of market-orientation in institutional direction.

Morale Issues

When deciding to include open-ended questions in the survey, the projection was that most respondents would use the space to identify which, if any, of the cited activities most impacted their role as teachers and researchers, positively or negatively. It was somewhat unexpected to find the most prevalent comment in two of the three open-ended questions was a much more general job satisfaction indicator. As was noted in chapter four, the issue of privatization activities impacting morale is fairly prevalent among faculty leaders in this study. Administrators need to understand and account for the impact on faculty morale in many decisions they make, but it may be that too little of that is being considered in current practices around privatization activities. It would be nearly impossible to start academic programs in a given department that might be revenue producers without consulting heavily with faculty in that department, but changing from a central budgeting model to responsibility center budgeting might entail much less of that consultation. Faculty members in this study are indicating that they are not immune to changes based on the broad array of privatization activities, and that the changes are important to how they perceive their job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction and retention are tightly intertwined. The cost of faculty turnover is high to institutions from a financial perspective, so supporting faculty retention can have positive budgetary results. In addition, consistency in the faculty ranks is likely to encourage active participation in governance activities that protect faculty interests. Evidence supports the importance of job and workplace satisfaction as well as the extent to which communication is viewed as open on intent to stay in a position (Daly and Dee, 2006). Other important factors in faculty turnover include workload and, for faculty in clusters of hard and applied fields, support for research (Xu, 2008). Interpreting morale to mean job satisfaction in these responses, it becomes clear that privatization activities are impacting the workplace in ways affecting faculty job satisfaction, though the relevance of these factors extends importantly into the ways in which faculty contribute to, and in fact, sustain the academic mission.

Mission-driven

While size of student enrollment was controlled for in the analysis, the mission of these institutions may be part of what differentiates the responses to the questions posed in this study. In large part, the privatized institutions had Carnegie classifications including high research activity and doctoral-granting status. The four non-privatized institutions generally had a master's as the highest degree granted, an indicator of lower research emphasis. These four institutions also had lower rates of undergraduate non-resident tuition relative to resident tuition (see table 5.2). Lower tuition rates for both residents and non-residents and a smaller differential between the two can reduce the need for financial aid, as well as leaving tuition increases as an easily accessible avenue to greater revenue.

Table 5.1-Resident Tuition as % of Non-resident Tuition
By Privatization Status

Privatized	Non-privatized
28%	34%
28%	36%
30%	36%
31%	41%
31%	
33%	
33%	
33%	
33%	
33%	

Carnegie classification is highly correlated to enrollment for institutions in this study and, in general, helps describe broad ways in which institutional missions and operations may differ across the categories. The enrollment variable accounted for much of the variance in each model. It is reasonable to assume that larger state institutions generate some economies of scale with their high enrollments, but the expanded research agendas at these institutions, as represented by their Carnegie classifications, likely pushes overall costs in a variety of ways that contribute to the lower appropriations to total revenue ratio. Regardless of what cost reduction or revenue production activities the smaller institutions are utilizing, it may be more interesting to examine in detail why they continue to receive such a substantially higher proportion of their budgets from state sources despite the trends of their larger, in-state counterparts.

Changing Work, Research Impacts

The results of this study included the observation that changes in faculty work, as noted in the comments faculty provided, are remarkably similar regardless of institutional funding schema. Individual comments from high and low-state funded institutions noted increased difficulty in finding time to conduct research, as well as increased pressure to find one's own funding to do the research. Examinations of faculty time allocation have shown more time spent on research in the last thirty years but equal time spent on teaching and other duties (Milem, Berger and Dey, 2000). Larger class sizes and advising loads, as well as other potential impacts of various privatization activities, are unlikely to provide any relief to a faculty member already feeling strapped for time to pursue a research agenda.

A cross-institutional change of this type supports the conception of academic capitalism that a change in the nature of academic work is occurring whether as a fad or long-term, fundamental shift at all institutional types. Academic capitalism has been primarily focused on a core shift of this type as something against which to wage battle and attempt to reverse with little sense of alternative funding structures for universities facing high expectations and fiscal shortfalls. Meanwhile most definitions of privatization are focused strictly on the funding aspect. It is an undercurrent of this study to explore the possibility that within the funding changes of privatization, the preservation of fundamental aspects of the academic enterprise at public institutions is a reasonable expectation, in part through faculty participation in the process. This study provides evidence that participation and awareness seem largely present, but the preponderance of comments indicating faculty discontent hint that faculty may not perceive they are engaged in meaningful dialogue with administrators on these issues even though they are present at the table. Institutions should support faculty participation in the process as a way to ensure the bases of their academic and public objectives are not impaired while the administrative structures shift with new fiscal realities. Faculty leaders appear to be thinking about impacts not just from self-interest but also for the relevance to the larger imperatives of the institution. Administrators, the public, and policymakers all benefit from this type of meaningful dialogue if it is permitted to take place in the changing economic and political climate.

Managerialism and the Market Approach

As has been emphasized thus far, academic capitalism and market-oriented practices at colleges and universities are frequently cited and studied for their impact on redefining institutions academic and public missions. Levin (2006) found that the market-orientation of the community colleges was leading to a dominance of managerialism in operations. He found that decisions were made that countered what faculty perceived as in their best interest by academic "managers" (i.e. non-faculty academic administrators) with a strong market-orientation. The nearly universal observation and expectation of new academic programs found in this study are also signals of the market-oriented approach used in public four-year institutions targeted here. More than 80 percent of faculty at all institutions in the study noted this trend and some comments indicated concern over this trend.

Faculty from two different privatized institutions noted observing,

> *"An increased shift in priorities away from liberal arts and fundamental science and toward …fund-raising rich professional programs."*

> *"New programs, more students, etc. without adequate investment-we're awash in mediocrity-staff, students and faculty!"*

These comments raise different faculty concerns about the initiation of new academic programs which need careful consideration by administrators. The latter comment indicates a concern about undertaking too many approaches to strengthening the financial picture at once and not doing any of it well. Implications abound in this sort of situation as the introduction of new academic programs can mean a redirection of funding from existing programs, faculty salaries or other existing initiatives. Some faculty will almost always support these initiatives as they generally include new faculty positions for related departments and perhaps a position of prominence as the institution touts its "progressive" new venture. Prominence can be short-lived, but the new faculty line has a much more long-term impact and resource demand, possibly, but not necessarily, matched by tuition revenue. None of this is to say that responding to the needs of the local economy is inherently inappropriate, but that it is only effective when addressed from numerous angles, including that of faculty stakeholders.

The comment regarding shifting priorities from traditional arts and sciences towards "fund-raising rich professional programs" observes a more fundamental shift that can result from privatization. It supports the core of the academic capitalism argument that universities are moving towards market and "new economy" activities in ways that fundamentally alter the work of the academy (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004). While these programs do often support the economic needs of the state, thus supporting the public interest, if the result is a loss of core academic programs or activities, one can reasonably question if the ultimate result truly supports the common good. Two other comments may have said it best:

> *Most of these approaches I believe substitute a free-market model of education for one in which education is seen as a PUBLIC good-and a PUBLIC responsibility. I've already seen this happen in medicine (previous career) with terrible consequences for the poor.*

> *It's becoming less of a state university, changing its purpose. That is bad for the citizens but not for the faculty.*

It is a question in which faculty should engage. Though adopting new economy-based academic programs is not a management fad (though it could reflect a disciplinary-based fad), it might be understood within the framework of anticipatory subordination. When leaders and policy-makers begin to focus attention on economic issues such as drawing emerging industries to the state, rather than potentially watch state funds be lost to industrial incentives, universities can create an argument for public financing of their support of these objectives if they commit to the preparation of the workforce in that particular field.

For example, one institution in this study that is located in a Midwestern state with a flagging, industrial-based economy over the last several years was able to capitalize on policy-makers' desire to entice "knowledge-based" firms to the state. University administrators dedicated significant attention to increasing the number of faculty in bio-technology and interdisciplinary life sciences and then lobbied successfully for a state commitment of nearly $100 million dollars over several years to enhance facilities, personnel and research in these fields. The attention of the institution to economic issues important to policy-makers was soundly rewarded, though the degree to which it compromised other institutional priorities or core academic functions cannot be accurately assessed. Certainly faculty in disciplines related to these emerging fields benefit from the updated labs and research collaborations that may result, but even in these areas, the incursion of industry into the agenda of the institution could be viewed as a threat to research and advancing state economic goals over generally accepted academic objectives.

Policy and Practice Implications

The role of faculty leaders in decision-making for privatization activities is important for administrators and faculty to understand. Beyond being important stakeholders in the success and vitality of the university, faculty members bring particular viewpoints and expertise that can contribute to the process. Garnering faculty buy-in would support the historical tenets of shared governance as an important university structure, as well as support morale, job satisfaction, and perceived communication openness, factors directly impacting faculty turnover. The financial implications of this are enormous, and particularly important as large portions of the faculty retire in the coming years. Not only must younger faculty become involved in existing shared governance structures, they must be included in the critical conversations about budget-related activities relevant to the faculty role. This is, of course, a two-way street and requires a call to faculty members to step outside of the classrooms and labs they so comfortably inhabit and seek this role. Respondents to this survey had an average time at their current institution of 17.2 years, and some reported as much as forty years. Experienced faculty are likely the most well informed to participate in budget discussions, but young faculty must also become active in governance, learn about institutional processes, and consider their own ability to participate in these processes.

In addition, several comments given on the survey indicate perceived the impact this is having or will have directly on students, this is an issue that must be addressed by administrators informed by the faculty who are directly observing and experiencing this change. If good teaching and other ways in which faculty engage with students are lost to heavy workloads, over-sized classes, or contract faculty, student learning is sacrificed. The public good may be an inadequate motivator for some administrators, but the threat of potential impact on institutional prestige is also relevant as lower quality teaching cannot help but eventually impact frequently cited prestige-indicators such as the recruitment, retention and graduation rates. Adequate assessment strategies are likely to be the first areas in which an impact of this type is observed, but the attribution of it to the policy and administrative decisions of creeping privatization may not be the first instinct. A holistic picture must be inclusive of a variety of anticipated and unanticipated outcomes. Administrators need to be open to review of these decisions that include information much broader than just financial variables. Faculty workload, student performance, and faculty and staff job turnover are all relevant details to the assessment of privatization-related activities.

Along with university administrators, policymakers need to pay heed to the perspective of faculty. Though the structures of shared governance do not necessarily extend into the realm of legislative activity, public higher education is dependent upon faculty to protect the public mission and public trust, whether or not this is the conscious goal of faculty members. Faculty may not consider the public interests of the institution as the drivers of day-to-day activities, but traditional faculty activities do indeed relate closely to this interest. Structures such as academic freedom and shared governance are themselves designed to protect not just faculty interests but to ensure public interests are protected through the faculty. As state legislators and governors propose funding changes such as tuition increase limitations or caps, specific performance metrics tied to funding, or reduced appropriations, they would be well served to ask faculty members the range of ways in which these might impact the faculty role. While salary is important to faculty and the public to whom they are accountable, the realities of larger class sizes, educational quality concerns, and reduced time for research provide a broader sense of what changes in funding can influence at an institution.

Recommendations for Future Research

Privatization in higher education is rife with opportunities for further study. Little is known about long term impacts of many of the activities noted in this study on the public good. While some perspectives on privatization in public higher education indicate it can coexist with the public good, the reality of how this is enacted must be examined closely. Qualitative explorations of connections between public interests in higher education and specific privatization activities would clarify aspects worthy of close surveillance by policymakers and administrators. It is also critical to continue the exploration not just of the externally perceived or measured impact on faculty activity, but also on the viewpoint and inclusion of faculty members in the process. Specifically, how do faculty perceptions of budget and other administrative processes differ from reality? What are the substantive contributions of faculty leaders who participate in budget and planning decision-making? Whether through shared governance or any other avenue, privatization-related issues need to be reviewed with the eye of people with greatest responsibility for carrying out the mission of the institution to further inform how the policies are crafted. Again, some in-depth qualitative studies would provide significant contributions in this direction regarding the disconnect between perceptions and reality, as well as the contributions made.

Other quantitative studies might utilize a larger sample of faculty with direct measures of decision-making involvement or changes in core time usage. A question worth exploring in the future is, are there specific privatization-related activities closely correlated with changes in faculty time allocation? Studies have captured information about time usage in the past (Kaplan, 2004; Milem, Berger & Dey, 2000), but continued monitoring of these activities and time allocation will enhance to body of knowledge, especially as it can be related to specific activities. In monitoring these factors and continuing to relate it back to institutional mission and public interests, a strong picture can be formed of privatization's true impact on the nature of public institutions.

Conclusion

The importance of faculty in the life of an institution of higher education is indisputable, so the importance to decision-making processes on issues potentially impacting the fundamental character of the institution seems almost equally as indisputable. This study indicated that faculty leaders are generally conscious of many privatization-related changes being undertaken at their institutions, and even have roles on budget committees where such issues are likely addressed or reviewed. The faculty role could be both active and passive in this realm; however, in the primary faculty deliberative and decision-making body the study indicates a deficit of involvement. This is problematic as, whether consciously or otherwise, faculty members can protect their own professional interests in ways that support the public good, and faculty governance bodies are the clearest avenue to doing so in higher education.

Institutions of higher education should not expect to remain unchanged over the decades. Over the years many shifts have been important and necessary responses to changing contexts and priorities. Present day financial realities necessitate some sort of action as state sources of funding make up less of the whole on an institutional basis and investment returns are unpredictable at best. A factor that has changed very little, however, is the relevance of faculty to institutional governance processes. The sometimes dramatic changes initiated in privatization processes require some degree of faculty review and response if these changes are to be properly assessed in view of the broad institutional objectives. The problem is that if the faculty is never asked, then the valuable perspectives are lost in the administrative hustle.

Appendix A

Survey of Faculty Leaders *Institutional IPEDS ID: XXXXXX*

Many public universities are contending with reduced levels of state appropriations and pressure to contain tuition growth. The various cost-cutting and revenue-generating activities used to address this may include faculty input and may ultimately impact the campus culture. This survey of faculty who are active in university governance will ask about your perspective on the activities your institution is undertaking to address these issues and your role as a faculty leader in the decision-making process.

For each question, check the yes or no box for each response. **Respond to short-answer questions in area provided. Continue on separate sheet if necessary.**

1. For each of the following modes of cost reduction, please note if *you have observed* it at your institution.

	Yes	No
Reduced travel budgets………………………………………………………	□	□
Reduced campus support for research ………………………………………	□	□
Minimal or no compensation increases for faculty and/or staff ……………..	□	□
Support staff workforce reductions…………………………………………...	□	□
More courses taught by non-tenure track faculty……………………………..	□	□
Outsourcing specific operations (ex. food service, motor pool, bookstores)….	□	□

2. For each of the following modes of cost reduction, please note *if you think* your institution is *likely* to use it in the next few years.

	Yes	No
Reduced travel budgets………………………………………………………	□	□
Reduced campus support for research ………………………………………	□	□
Minimal or no compensation increases for faculty and/or staff ……………..	□	□
Support staff workforce reductions…………………………………………...	□	□
More courses taught by non-tenure track faculty……………………………..	□	□
Outsourcing specific operations (ex. food service, motor pool, bookstores)….	□	□

3. Briefly describe what you believe to be the implications to faculty members at your institution of undertaking any or all of the methods you selected in question 2.

4. For each of the following efforts at revenue production, please note *if you have observed* it at your institution.

	Yes	No
Initiating new academic programs to generate enrollment (ex. Distance education, professional master's degrees, interdisciplinary degrees for local industry) ……………………………………………………………..…...	□	□
Enrolling a greater proportion of non-resident undergraduate students……..	□	□
Increasing undergraduate tuition for nonresidents…………………………...	□	□
Engaging in an aggressive fund-raising campaign…………………………...	□	□
Financial aid strategies for undergraduates to increase enrollment…………..	□	□
Financial aid strategies for undergraduates to generate more tuition revenue..	□	□
Incentives to schools and departments to generate additional revenue………	□	□
Seeking patents and copyright licenses………………………………………	□	□
Increased grant-seeking to generate indirect cost recovery funds……………	□	□

5. Do you think your institution *is likely* to implement the following efforts at revenue production in the next few years?

	Yes	No
Initiating new academic programs to generate enrollment (ex. Distance education, professional master's degrees, interdisciplinary degrees for local industry) ……………………………………………………………..…...	□	□
Enrolling a greater proportion of non-resident undergraduate students……..	□	□
Increasing undergraduate tuition for nonresidents…………………………...	□	□
Engaging in an aggressive fund-raising campaign…………………………...	□	□
Financial aid strategies for undergraduates to increase enrollment…………..	□	□
Financial aid strategies for undergraduates to generate more tuition revenue..	□	□
Incentives to schools and departments to generate additional revenue……….	□	□
Seeking patents and copyright licenses………………………………………	□	□
Increased grant-seeking to generate indirect cost recovery funds……………	□	□

6. Briefly describe what you believe to be the implications to faculty members at your institution of undertaking any or all of the methods you selected in question 5.

7. How would you characterize the communication between the administration at your institution and faculty leaders regarding budget issues (*circle the most appropriate answer*):

a. Open and consistent
b. Open, but inconsistent
c. Consistent, but closed
d. Inconsistent and closed
e. None of the above

8. Do faculty members participate on budget or budget oversight committees at your institution?

Yes…………………………….. □
No……………………………… □
I don't know…………………… □

9. Are the following parties *typically* involved in the decision for your institution to undertake varied types of approaches to cost reduction or revenue production?

	Yes	No
Board of Trustees (or like body) ……………………………………………	□	□
President/Chancellor………………………………………………………	□	□
Academic Deans…………………………………………………………..	□	□
Faculty senate ………………………………………………………….	□	□
Student senate…………………………………………………………..	□	□
State legislators…………………………………………………………	□	□
Governor………………………………………………………………..	□	□
Other: (specify)_______________ …………………………………………	□	□

10. *Should* the following parties be involved in the decision for your institution to undertake approaches to cost reduction or revenue production?

	Yes	No
Board of Trustees (or like body) ……………………………………………	□	□
President/Chancellor………………………………………………………	□	□
Academic Deans…………………………………………………………..	□	□
Faculty senate…………………………………………………………..	□	□
Student senate………………………………………………………….	□	□
State legislators…………………………………………………………	□	□
Governor………………………………………………………………..	□	□
Other: (specify)_______________ …………………………………………	□	□

11. Briefly describe your selections for participants in the decision-making process in question 10.

Demographic/Background Information

13. Mark your rank at your present institution:
    Full Professor……………………………. □
    Associate Professor……………………… □
    Assistant Professor………………………. □
    Lecturer………………………………….. □
    Instructor………………………………… □
    Other…………………………………….. □

14. How many years have you been working at your present institution (please write in)?

    ____________years

15. Which general field listed below best describes the department to which you are appointed?
    Mathematics……………………………… □
    Physical Sciences or Life Sciences………. □
    Social Sciences…………………………… □
    Humanities………………………………. □
    Fine Arts…………………………………. □
    Business…………………………………. □
    Education………………………………… □
    Law………………………………………. □
    Medicine or other medical field………….. □
    Other: (please specify)______________… □

16. What is the primary classification of the majority of the students you teach?
    Undergraduate…………………. □
    Graduate……………………….. □
    Evenly mixed grad/undergrad….. □

17. Gender:
    Male……………………………. □
    Female………………………….. □

18. Are you a U.S. citizen?
    Yes…………………………….... □
    No………………………………. □

Thank you for your time.

Reference List

Academe (March/April 2007). *The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 2006-07*. American Association of University Professors.

American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) (2006). *Standard definitions: Final dispositions for case codes and outcome rates for surveys.* Ann Arbor, MI: AAPOR.

American Association of University Professors (2006). *Policy documents and reports, tenth edition*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (1996). *Renewing the academic presidency: Stronger leadership for tougher times.* Report on the Academic Presidency. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards.

Bekurs, G. (2007). Outsourcing student housing in American community colleges: problems and prospects. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*. 31(8), 621-636.

Benjamin, E. (2002). How over-reliance on contingent appointments diminishes faculty involvement in student learning. *Peer Review*, 2002, 5(1), 4-10.

Berg, B.L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences, 3rd edition.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Birnbaum, R. (2004). The end of shared governance: Looking ahead or looking back. New Directions for Higher Education, 127, 5-22.

Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management fads in higher education: Where they come from, what they do, why they fail.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Blumenstyk, G. (June 13, 2008). *To cut costs, ought colleges look for for-profit models?* Chronicle of Higher Education. Vol. 54(40), A19.

Blumenstyk, G. (2007). *Berkeley's pact with BP*. Chronicle of Higher Education. November 16, 2007.

Bok, D.C. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: the commercialization of higher education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bradshaw, T.K., K.M. Kennedy, P.R. Davis, L.L. Lloyd, N. Gwebu, and J.A. Last (2003). Contributions of a university-industry toxic substances research and teaching program to economic development. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 74(3), May/June 2003, pp. 292-320.

Brint and Karabel (1991). Institutional origins and transformations: the case of American community colleges. In *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis.* Powell W.W. and P.J. DiMaggio (ed.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 337-360.

Brewer, D.J., S.M. Gates, and C.A. Goldman (2002). *In pursuit of prestige: strategy and competition in U.S. higher education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Busch, L. R. Allison, C. Harris, A. Ruddy, B.T. Shaw, T. Ten Eyck, D. Coppin, J. Konefal, C. Oliver and J. Fairweather (2004). *External review of the collaborative research agreement between Novartis Agricultural Discovery Institute, Inc. and the Regents of the University of California.* East Lansing, MI: Institute for Food and Agricultural Standards, Michigan State University.

Cabrera, A.F. (1994). Logistic regression analysis in higher education: An applied perspective. In J.C. Smart (ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. X*, 225-256. New York: Agathon Press.

Carini, R.M., J.C. Hayek, G.D. Kuh, J.M. Kennedy, & J.A. Ouimet (2003). College student responses to web and paper surveys: does mode matter? *Research in Higher Education,* 44(1), 1-19.

Chronicle of Higher Education (January 26, 2007). *In the news*. Vol. 53(21), A21.

Colorado Department of Higher Education (2005). *Higher education reform in Colorado: vouchers are only half the story.* Denver, CO: Colorado Commission on Higher Education, Summer 2005.

Conley, A. and E.R. Tempel (2006). Philanthropy. In Priest, D.M. and E.P. St. John (eds.) (2006) *Privatization and public universities.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 151-172.

Converse, J.M. (1987). *Survey research in the United States.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Couper, M.P. (2000). Web surveys: A review of issues and approaches. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64(4), 464-494.

Courant, P.N. and M. Knepp (2002). Activity-based budgeting at the University of Michigan. In Priest, D.M., W.E. Becker, D. Hossler and E.P. St. John (eds.) (2002). *Incentive-based budgeting in public universities.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Press.

Czaja, R. and J. Blair (2005). *Designing surveys: A guide to decisions and procedures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Daly, C.J. and J.R. Dee (2006). Greener pastures: Faculty turnover intent in urban public universities. *The Journal of Higher Education.* September/October 2006, 77(5), 776-803.

Dennison, G.M. (2003). Privatization: An unheralded trend in public higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, Fall 2003, 28(1), 7-20.

Denzin, N.K. and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.) (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research, 2nd edition.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

DesJardins, S.L. (2001). Assessing the effects of changing institutional aid policy. *Research in Higher Education.* 42(6), 653-678.

Dillman, D.A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: the tailored design method, 2nd ed.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

DiMaggio, P.J. and W.W. Powell (1991). Introduction. In Powell, W.W. and P.J. DiMaggio (eds.) (1991). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1-38.

Duderstadt, J.J. (2000). *A university for the 21st century.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Ehrenberg, R.G. The perfect storm and the privatization of public higher education. *Change.* January/February 2006, pp. 46-53.

Ehrenberg, R.G. (2000). *Tuition rising: why college costs so much.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fain, P. (April 28, 2006). *Big dreams in the bluegrass state.* Chronicle of Higher Education. Vol. 52(34), p. A29.

Flynn, J. (2005). The moral foundations of faculty governance in colleges and universities. Address delivered at Caldwell College, December 2005.

Frederickson, H.G. and K.B. Smith (2003). *The public administration theory primer.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Gose, B. (2006). Colleges rely on consortia, contractors, and ingenuity to cut costs. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* 52(21), B1-B5.

Hammersley, M. (1996). The relationship between qualitative and quantitative research—paradigm loyalty versus methodological selectivism. In J. Richardson (ed.). *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences.* Leicester: BPS Books.

Hassan, P.F. (2007). College presidents aging and holding jobs longer according to a new report on the college presidency from the American Council on Education. Accessed on January 19, 2009 at: http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=News_Room&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=20430
February 12, 2007.

Hauptman, A. (2001). Reforming the ways states finance higher education. In Heller, D.E. (ed.) *The states and higher education policy: affordability, access, and accountability.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hearn, J.C. (2006). Alternative revenue sources. In Priest, D.M. and E.P. St. John (eds.) (2006) *Privatization and public universities.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Heller, D.E. (2006). State support of higher education: past, present, and future. In Priest, D.M. and E.P. St. John (eds.) (2006) *Privatization and public universities.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Henry, G.T., R. Rubenstein, and D.T. Bugler (2004). *Is HOPE enough? Impacts of receiving and losing merit-based financial aid.* Educational Policy, 18(5), 686-709.

Hossler, D. (2006). Students and families as revenue: The impact on institutional behaviors. In Priest, D.M. and E.P. St. John (eds.) (2006) *Privatization and public universities.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 109-128.

Jaschik, S. (2007). Harvard's aid bonanza. *Inside Higher Ed.* www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/12/11/harvard. Accessed December 13, 2007.

Kaplan, G. (2006). *Governing the privatized public research university.* Paper presented at the conference on The Privatization of the Public Research University, University of Georgia, September 7-9, 2006.

Kaplan, G. (2004). How academic ships actually navigate. In Ehrenberg, R.G. (2004). *Governing academia.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kettl, D.F. (2002). *The transformation of governance: Public administration for twenty-first century America.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kettl, D.F. (1993). *Sharing power: Public governance and private markets.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Kezar, A. (2004). Obtaining integrity?: Reviewing and examining the charter between higher education and society. *Review of Higher Education.* 27(4), pp. 429-459.

Kezar, A. and P. D. Eckel (2004). Meeting today's governance challenge. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 75(4), pp. 371-399.

Kissler, G.R. (1997). Who decides which budgets to cut? *The Journal of Higher Education.* July-August 1997, 68(4), 427-459.

Keller, J. (2007). Moody's warns about state tuition caps. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* 53(31).

Kypri, K., S.J. Gallagher and M.L. Cashell-Smith (2004). An internet-based survey method for college student drinking research. *Drug & Alcohol Dependence,* 76(1), 45-53.

Lang, D.S. (2002). Responsibility center budgeting at the University of Toronto. In Priest, D.M., W.E. Becker, D. Hossler and E.P. St. John (eds.) (2002). *Incentive-based budgeting systems in public universities.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Press.

Lerner, G. (2008). Corporatizing higher education. *History Teacher.* 41(2), 219-227.

Levin, J.S. (2006). Faculty work: Tensions between educational and economic values. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 77(1), 62-88.

Long, J.S. (1997). *Regression models for categorical and limited dependent variables.* Advanced Quantitative Techniques in the Social Sciences Series, No. 7. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lyall, K.C. and K.R. Sell (2006a). The de facto privatization of American public higher education. *Change,* January/February 2006, pp. 6-13.

Lyall, K.C. and K.R. Sell (2006b). *The true genius of America at risk: Are we losing our public universities to de facto privatization?* American Council on Education series on higher education. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Marginson, S. (2000). *Rethinking academic work in a global era.* Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 22(1).

Marginson S. and M. Considine (2000). *The enterprise university: power, governance, and reinvention in Australia.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Massy, W.F. and R. Zemsky (1994). Faculty discretionary time: Departments and the academic ratchet. *The Journal of Higher Education.* 65(1), 1-22.
Miami University of Ohio (2006). *Miami's Ohio scholarship program.* Accessed at: http://www.miami.muohio.edu/ohioscholarships/specifics.cfm, October 3, 2006.

Milem, J.F., J.B. Berger, and E.L. Dey (2000). *Faculty time allocation: a study of change over twenty years.* The Journal of Higher Education, 71(4), Jul-Aug 2000, 454-475.

Mingle, J.R. and R.M. Epper (1996). State coordination and planning in an age of entrepreneurship. In Peterson, M,. D. Dill, L.A. Mets and Associates (eds.) (1996). *Planning and management for a changing environment.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.

Minor, J.T. and W.G. Tierney (2005). The danger of deference: A case of polite governance. Teachers College Record, 107(1), January 2005, pp. 137-156.

Morphew, C.C. (2008). *Policymakers must recognize higher education's 2-tiered system.* The Chronicle of Higher Education, 54(19), January 18, 2008, p. A34.

National Center for Education Statistics (2008). *Integrated Postsecondary Data System, Financial, 2001-2006.* Accessed on-line at http://nces.ed.gov/ipedspas.

Olien, D.W. (2006). Consequences of a legacy of state disinvestment: Plunging state support reduces access and threatens quality at University of Wisconsin system institutions. In Ehrenberg (ed.) *What's happening to public higher education?* American Council on Higher Education series on higher education. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Palm, R.L. (2001). Partnering through outsourcing. *New Directions in Student Services.* No. 91, Winter 2001, 5-11.

Palmer, J.C. (2006). Grapevine 50-State Summary Table. Center for the Study of Education Policy. Accessed at www.illstu.edu/fifty_state_summary.htm, August 5, 2007.

Paulsen, M.B. (1998). Recent research on the economics of attending college: returns on investment and responsiveness to price. *Research in Higher Education.* 39(4), 471-489.

Perkins, G.H. (2004). Will libraries' web-based survey methods replace existing non-electronic survey methods? *Information Technology & Libraries,* 23(3), 123-126.

Porter, S.R. and M.E. Whitcomb (2007). Mixed-mode contacts in web surveys: Paper is not necessarily better. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 71(4), 635-648.

Powell, W.W. and P.J. DiMaggio (eds.) (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Powers, J.B. (2006). Patents and royalties. In Priest, D.M. and E.P. St. John (eds.). *Privatization and public universities.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 129-150.

Priest, D.M., W.E. Becker, D. Hossler and E.P. St. John (2002). *Incentive-based budgeting systems in public universities.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Press.

Priest, D.M. and E.P. St. John (eds.) (2006). *Privatization and public universities.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Priest, D.M., B. Jacobs, and R.D. Boon (2006). Privatizing business and auxiliary services. In Priest, D.M. and E.P. St. John (eds.). *Privatization and public universities.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 189-202.

Remington, M.J. (2005). The Bayh-Dole Act at twenty-five years: looking back, taking stock, acting for the future. *Industry & Higher Education.* 19(6), pp. 408-415.

Renault, C.S., J. Cope, M. Dix, and K. Hersey (2008). A new technology transfer paradigm: how state universities can collaborate with industry in the USA. *Industry & Higher Education.* 22(2), pp. 99-104.

Rhoades, G. (2003). *Democracy and capitalism, academic style: Governance in contemporary higher education.* Paper prepared for Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis. ERIC document ED 482 063.

Ritchie, J. (2003). The applications of qualitative research methods to social research. In Ritchie, J. and J. Lewis (eds.). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ronco, S. and J. Cahill (2006). *Does is matter who's in the classroom? Effect of instructor type on student retention, achievement and satisfaction.* AIR Professional File. Tallahassee, FL: Association for Institutional Research, No. 100, Summer 2006.

Savas, E.S. (2000). *Privatization and public-private partnerships.* New York: Seven Bridges Press.

Schuster, J. (2003). The faculty makeover: What does it mean for students? *New Directions for Higher Education*, vol. 123, Fall 2003, 15-22.

SHEEO (2006). State higher education finance: FY2006. Boulder, CO: State Higher Education Executive Officers.

Slaughter, S. and G. Rhoades (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: markets, state, and higher education.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S. and G. Rhoades (1993). Changes in intellectual property statutes and policies at a public university: revising the terms of professional labor. *Higher Education*, 26(3), pp. 287-312.

Slaughter, S. and L. Leslie (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policy and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sprinthall, R.C. (2003). *Basic statistical analysis, 7th edition.* Pearson Education Group, Inc.

Stampen, J.O. and D.T. (1997). Tuition and student aid in public higher education: searching for an organizing principle. *New Direction for Institutional Research.* No. 95, Fall 1997, pp. 25-42.

St. John, E.P. (2003). *Refinancing the college dream: Access, equal opportunity, and justice for taxpayers.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Supiano, B. (2008). *Colleges seeking money from state are encouraged to bring cost-cutting ideas.* The Chronicle of Higher Education, 54(25), February 29, 2008, p. A19.
Thelin, J.R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Turner, S. (2006). Higher tuition, higher aid, and the quest to improve opportunities for low-income students: the case of Virginia. In Ehrenberg, R. (ed.). *What's happening to public higher education?* American Council on Education series on Higher Education. Westport, CT: Praeger, 251-274.

Vance, E. (2007). Energy company gives $500 million research grant to universities. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(24), A36.

Walters, A.K. (2006). Soft drinks, hard feelings. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. 52(32), A30.

Whalen, E. (1991). *Responsibility center budgeting: an approach to decentralized management for institutions of higher education.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Wiley, J.D. (2006). Why we won't see any public universities "going private." In Ehrenberg, R. (ed.). *What's happening to public higher education?* American Council on Education series on Higher Education. Westport, CT: Praeger, 327-335.

Wood, P.A. (2000). *Outsourcing in higher education.* Eric Digest. ED446726. Washington, D.C.: Eric Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Wright, S.E. (1986). *Social Science Statistics.* Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Xu, Y.J. (2008). Faculty turnover: Discipline-specific attention is warranted. *Research in Higher Education,* Vol. 49, 40-61.

Zhao, C.M., G.D. Kuh, and R.M. Carini (2005). A comparison of international student and American student engagement in effective educational practices. *The Journal of Higher Education.* 76(2), 209-231.

Rachel Dykstra Boon

Address: 5821 Windsor Drive, Des Moines, Iowa 50312 Home Phone: (515) 274-1913
Email Address: boonrachel@hotmail.com

EDUCATION

Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
Post-Master's Certificate in Institutional Research, August 2005
Candidate for Doctor of Philosophy
Major: Educational Policy, Higher Education concentration
Minor: Public Administration
Projected Completion Date: May 2009

Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa
Master of Science in Education Leadership, May 2002

Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa
Bachelor of Science in Education, May 1999
Certification Areas: English and Coaching, Grades 7-12

Central College, Pella, Iowa
Study Abroad-London, England (Spring 1998)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Director of Institutional Research and Academic Compliance
Drake University
(September 2008 to present)

- Responsible for review and approval of all external data reporting (IPEDS, state reports, NSF, assorted surveys, etc.)
- Chair campus-wide Institutional Research Council
- Ensure compliance with all federal, state and accreditation body regulations and reporting requirements
- Serve as Provost's liaison to Institutional Review Board and Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee ensuring compliance with university and federal regulations and ethical standards
- Provide guidance and assistance with all university-wide curricular assessment activities
- Campus administrator for web-based survey provider

Associate Director of Institutional Research, Drake University
(January 2007 to August 2008)

- Assist with review and approval of all external data reporting (IPEDS, state reports, NSF, assorted surveys, etc.)
- Chair campus-wide Institutional Research Council
- Complete analyses of retention and graduation
- Participate on Drake Curriculum Assessment and Planning committee and assist with assessment activities
- Participate on Institutional Review Board as Provost's liaison
- Served as Assistant Chair of Drake Self-Study
- Assist with faculty salary analyses for budgetary planning
- Compile Drake Data Book and post on-line
- Maintain Institutional Research website
- Coordinate and consult on internal survey administrations

Research Analyst, Office of Budgetary Administration and Planning
and Office of the Chancellor (June 2004-December 2006)

- Involved in campus financial planning via regular administrative meetings and duties related to assessing and projecting campus initiatives, budget, and enrollment
- Chair campus-wide Institutional Research Coordinating Group
- Represent Bloomington campus on University-wide Institutional Research Council
- Coordinate Budgetary Administration and Planning and Chancellor's Office involvement in re-accreditation self-study
- Respond to ad hoc data requests from Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Budgetary Administration and Planning
- Coordinate and write portions of campus mission statement and supporting documents
- Write Chancellor's Office external statements and internal memos on U.S. News ranks and other relevant national reports
- Coordinate campus involvement in external surveys/studies
- Assist with budget, enrollment, and annual reports for a graduate certificate program in institutional research

Project Associate, Center for Postsecondary Research
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana (July 2003-June 2004)

- Work on National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), survey of over 500,000 first-year and senior college students
- Handle client services issues for over 100 colleges and universities participating in NSSE
- Coordinate consortia of schools participating in NSSE
- Represent NSSE at regional and national conferences
- Collaborated on creation of NSSE accreditation tool-kit

Academic Assistance/CHAMPS Life Skills Coordinator
Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa (August 2001-June 2003)

- Report directly to Associate Provost for Academic Services, representing at campus meetings when necessary
- Coordinate activities for CHAMPS/Life Skills program
- Work directly with students on issues surrounding advising, motivation, coursework, and instructor interactions
- Co-teach fall and spring seminars for student-athletes new to the university covering variety of transitional issues
- Interact directly with various assistant and associate deans and faculty on issues important to their specific colleges or classes
- Work directly with athletic department personnel on all academic issues dealing with athletes
- Serve on university First Year Experience Study Group analyzing pertinent NSSE and YFCY survey information

Graduate Assistant for Personnel, Recreational Services
Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa (August 2000-July 2001)

- Managed over 120 student employees of multi-million dollar recreation and sports facility
- Completed all training, payroll, hiring, evaluating, scheduling, and employee communications

English Teacher, Assistant Speech Coach
Waukee High School, Waukee, Iowa (August 1999-June 2000)

- Taught English 2, Basic English, and Creative Writing

PUBLICATIONS

Priest, Douglas and Boon, R.D. (2006). *RCM and Privatization chapter*, in Privatization and Public Universities, Douglas Priest and Edward P. St. John (eds.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Priest, Douglas, Jacobs, B., and Boon, R.D. (2006). *Privatization and Outsourcing chapter*, in Privatization and Public Universities, Douglas Priest and Edward P. St. John (eds.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Priest, Douglas, St. John, E.P., and Boon, R.D. (2006). *Introduction chapter*, in Privatization and Public Universities, Douglas Priest and Edward P. St. John (eds.). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS

“We did it! Now what? Life After Accreditation.” Burney, John and Boon, R.D. Annual Meeting of the Higher Learning Commission, April 22, 2009.

“Using NSSE in Accreditation” Kinzie, Jillian, Burney, J. and Boon, R.D. American Association of Colleges and Universities, General Education Meeting, February 27, 2009.

“The HLC Assessment Academy Experience” Boon, Rachel Dykstra. Panel discussion at the Midwest Association of Institutional Research, October 13, 2008.

“Faculty Role and Perspective in Privatization” Boon, Rachel Dykstra. Roundtable to be presented at 33rd Annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, November 6, 2008.

“The Future of Iowa Higher Education Research” DeHart, Joe, Boon, Rachel Dykstra, and Moser, Kristin. Iowa Higher Education Research Conference, October 11, 2007.

“Future Budgeting in Higher Education” Priest, Doug and Boon, Rachel Dykstra. Society of College and University Planning, July 9, 2007.

“Choosing a Method (or 4!) for Calculating and Communicating a Tuition Discount Rate” Anderson, Douglas K., Lemming, Matthew, and Boon, Rachel Dykstra. 2006 Annual Forum of the Association of Institutional Research, May 16, 2006.

“Using Ratios for Internal Management” Boon, Rachel Dykstra and Santiague, Lilia. Presented at Indiana Association of Institutional Research annual meeting, March 2, 2006.

"Towards a Philosophy of IR" Boon, Rachel Dykstra and Rago, Melanie A. Roundtable presented at the 2005 Annual Forum of the Association of Institutional Research, June 1, 2005.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS (CONT.)

"Race and Student Major: Understanding Differences in Environments" Umbach,Paul D., Boon, Rachel Dykstra, Kuh, George D., and Buckley, Jennifer. Presented at the 29th Annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, November 5, 2004.

"Using NSSE Data for Accreditation" Hayek, John and Boon, Rachel Dykstra. Higher Learning Commission Annual Meeting, March 2004.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

Association of Institutional Research, 2004-present
Association for the Study of Higher Education, 2004-present
American Association of University Professors, Associate, 2008-present
Society for College and University Planning, 2005-2007
National Association of College and University Business Officers, 2005-2007