Nathan Cheesman graduated from the Higher Education and Student Affairs program in 2008. He received a B.S in Integrated Mathematics Education and a B.A. in Mathematics & Statistics from Miami University in 2006. At IUB, Nathan served as Graduate Live-In Advisor for Lambda Chi Alpha Fraternity and was an intern for the Student Development and Compliance Office in the Intercollegiate Athletics Department.

Isaac Kinsey graduated from the Higher Education and Student Affairs master's program in 2008. He received a B.S. in Kinesiology from Indiana University in 2005. While at IUB, Isaac worked as a Graduate Assistant/Assistant Instructor of the R100 Leadership Development Series at the Center for Student Leadership Development and also as the Graduate Live-In Advisor for the Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity.

Israel Laguer is a 2007 graduate of Indiana University's Higher Education and Student Affairs Master's program. As a graduate of The Rowan University, Israel earned his B.A. in Sociology with a Concentration in Leadership Studies. At IUB, he worked with Residential Programs and Services and taught courses focused on the leadership development of students and the analysis of historically Black Greek Lettered Organizations.

Mahauganee Dawn Shaw is a doctoral student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program. She earned a M.A. in Educational Administration and a B.A. in Liberal Arts both from the University of Missouri-Kansas City. At IUB, Mahauganee currently serves as a Project Associate at the Center for Postsecondary Research.

Faculty Governance: Challenging the Myths

Kelly A. Kish, Lauren E. Morrill-Ragusea, and Robin L. Murphey

This study examined the role of faculty in university governance using archival records of the Bloomington Faculty Council at Indiana University Bloomington. The study employed archival analysis techniques to challenge one myth about faculty governance. As faculty members continually seek to carve out their roles in institutional decision making it is increasingly important to ground their arguments in historical evidence.

Overview

The study of institutional governance has gained increased momentum in recent years due in part to heightened external pressures influencing American colleges and universities (Tierney, 2004). As Burgan (2004) outlined, these outside pressures include declining support from state budgets, increased activism on the part of boards and alumni, new demands by non-traditional students, increased foci on the role of institutions in the economic development of surrounding regions, and competition from for-profit higher education—all of which have challenged the structure and participants in university governance and decision making (Burgan). These discussions raised an underlying, and unanswered, question about the role of faculty in university governance in the 21st century. This study examined the role of faculty in university governance by examining myths about faculty governance that are referenced in higher education scholarship and commonly heard in administrative offices and trustees' meetings around the country. Using the lens of one faculty senate organization we challenged the myth that faculty senates are given menial tasks by the administration and have no influence over significant decisions.

Faculty in Institutional Governance

Over recent decades, competing and conflicting definitions have emerged over the appropriate role for faculty in governance. In an era of higher education shifting toward market models of organization and governing boards applying bureaucratic decision making models to areas that used to be within the domain of the faculty, the 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities issued by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has lost its meaning in (AAUP, 1966; Helms and Price, 2005). The Statement afforded faculty "primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of

instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process" (np). Faculties across the country have tried various methods to work through contentious times. Burgan (2004) encouraged balancing between unionization and shared governance (Burgan, 2004), while Tierney and Minor (2003) called for communication, increased trust, and delineating responsibilities and meanings of shared governance. Each of these approaches work best when the role of the faculty in institutional governance is agreed upon by other governing groups.

Kadish (1972) claimed that this definitional predicament is caused, in part, by the inherent conflict in faculty's dual role—as employee and as educator—because they conceive, plan, govern, perform research, and deliver education, in addition to being employees. The lack of clarity and shared belief about the role of faculty in institutional governance imperils the premise of shared governance and faculty authority, encourages polarization over issues, and exaggerates the adversarial concerns over common interests (Eckel, 2000; Helms and Price, 2005; Hollinger, 2001; Leatherman, 1998; Kezar and Eckel, 2004; Minor, 2004; Scott, 1996; Tierney and Minor, 2003; Williams, Gore, Broches, and Lostoski, 1987). Against this backdrop, scholars have recently begun developing an arsenal of empirical evidence about the characteristics, strengths, and advantages of faculty governance and the faculty's involvement in shared governance (Kezar and Eckel; Minor; Tierney and Minor). This study attempted to add to this arsenal by focusing on an archival content analysis of one faculty governance body's activities over the last half-century.

History and Myths of Faculty Governance

Rosser (2003) traced the origins of faculty governance to fundamental questions over "who shall teach and what shall be taught" (pg. 5). Drawing on the experiences of the great European colleges, the colonial colleges in the fledgling United States mirrored their structure with three exceptions:

> (1) the influence of church and the mission of the college were intertwined (private denominational sponsorship); (2) the autonomy of the faculty was not immediately established, because the American colleges started with a president, and the president initially taught; and (3) the establishment of a layboard [sic] or governing board that was not part of the institution, or did not include part of the faculty (or president), but an external overseeing body that did not exist in the European model (p. 6-7).

Lucas (1994) commented that by the late-1800s a "compromised" approach to governance had been reached at a number of institutions; the faculty were allowed to make decisions about student admissions, academic standards, curriculum, while other matters were left to the board and president.

The growth of the American research universities between 1890 and 1920 provided the setting for a renaissance for faculty governance in the United States. But, the 20th century was a contentious one for faculty governance and professional representation around the country. On the one hand, the AAUP encouraged the recognition of faculty authority over traditional matters of educational importance through traditional faculty senates. On the other hand, the AAUP participated in intense debates over the right to collective bargaining which resulted in over 830 institutions in the United States covered by faculty collective bargaining agreements in 1984 and grew to 1,115 campuses in 1995 (Douglas, 1988; Rhoades, 1998).

Myths and anecdotes that undermine the effectiveness of shared governance developed during the 20th century. The myths discussed in this paper can be found in higher education literature and general opinion magazines and newspapers and can be overheard in person by faculty members themselves in addition to administrators and trustees. As Leatherman (1998) joked, "If you want to draw a crowd to a faculty senate meeting, talk about pay, parking, or ousting the president. Anything else plays to an empty house" (A8). Hollinger (2001) added that "Shared governance" can be a joke when administrators do the governing and chuckle privately at faculty senate leaders who can be kept earnestly busy worrying about parking policies. Many faculty governance organizations do very little governing, except in a crisis" (p. 30). The idea that faculty senates lose interest when taking on serious issues with the management of the institution was also raised by Association of Governing Boards President Tom Ingram, when he said that he believes most faculty senates are "dysfunctional" because they are slow to act, reluctant to make hard decisions, and eschewed by the top scholars on the campus (Leatherman). Tierney and Minor (2003) introduced the notion that faculty governance in general and faculty senates in particular inhibit responsive decision-making and critics "bemoan the lethargic pace of decision-making when faculty are involved and expect to reach consensus" (pg. 1). Engstrand (2005) from the University of Minnesota, wrote about the effectiveness of the Minnesota senate, and juxtaposed their reputation to "the reputation of these bodies at other institutions as debating societies that accomplish (and affect) little" (p. 25). Further, Scott (1996) suggested that while faculty members assume

> their departmental, college and university committees are providing meaningful 'input' on university policies, in fact senior administrators pursue other avenues of consultation, including hand-picked committees which can provide a more 'authentic' faculty voice…in this changed context, faculty governance through traditional, elected councils takes second place to a parallel track of 'task forces' and 'ad-hoc committees' as values

> are shifted from academic freedom and shared governance to cultivating academic 'consumers' and cost savings (p. 724).

This study examined one myth about faculty governance through the activities and evidence of the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) at Indiana University Bloomington (IUB). Specifically, this study asked: Is the faculty senate given menial or symbolic items to discuss by the administration so that faculty members have minimal influence over significant decisions?

The Bloomington Faculty Council

The Bloomington Faculty Council is a useful case study of how one institution's faculty has formed a governance system that has served them well through most of the institution's history. Archival records show that the Indiana University faculty, then numbering only five, began to meet and record meetings of faculty business in 1835 (Collection C236, Faculty Council, IU Archives). The roots of modern faculty governance activities are grounded in these sessions of the faculty where: misconduct decisions and punishments determined, examination day recitation orders developed, the schedule of classes and distribution of faculty effort agreed upon, and decisions about educational policy affirmed (Faculty Council Minutes July 22, 1841 and May 8, 1846). In 1929, the general faculty approved the formation of a "University Council" to consider questions of academic policy affecting the university as a whole. This original Council was given investigative, deliberative, and recommendatory powers only (Mares, 2004). The Council investigated questions presented to it by the administration, the faculty as a whole, or individual members of the faculty. In the 1930s, for example, the Council discussed the introduction of a new curriculum that provided for a broad introductory set of coursework in the first two years followed by elective coursework in the third and fourth years. The new curricular approach was emphasized further by the introduction of "majors" and new professional-oriented degrees. Later that decade, the group considered substantive issues about the university library—budgets for acquisitions, the process for book orders, the location of rare books on the campus, and other administrative matters pertaining to the library (See Collection C233, University Council, IU Archives). This group existed from 1929 to 1969 (Mares).

The current structure of the BFC has its roots in 1969. The university underwent significant administrative reorganization in 1969, initiated by IU President Elvis J. Stahr, resulting in an independent faculty governance body in Bloomington (separate from the seven other IU campuses). The Bloomington Faculty Council claimed authority over Bloomington-specific matters and has remained a constant presence in the governance of the campus.

While the BFC example might prove useful to other large, public, research universities, evidence exists to suggest that smaller and private institutions sometimes encounter very different experiences in their faculty senates.

The BFC Archives

This study utilized the records compiled by the Bloomington Faculty Council since its inception in 1969. The BFC archives are kept by the Indiana University Archives and are publicly accessible. The large record collection is comprised of meeting agendas, verbatim meeting transcripts, policy drafts, membership records, committee reports, voting and election materials, and other supporting materials. Researchers compiled a general subject history of BFC activities since 1969 that yielded a broad categorization of BFC discussions under the headings: administrative affairs, student affairs, and academic affairs. From that listing emerged evidence to challenge myths that exist in the general literature on faculty governance.

Subsequently, a more thorough content analysis methodology was utilized to systematically evaluate the subject matter, participation records, and other evidence of the BFC. Analyzing textual information in historical records involves discerning both literal and interpretive meanings. Careful cross-checking of sources and contextualizing of topics with transcript records and policy drafts was conducted by each author independently. Notes and categorizations were compared to ensure inter-coder reliability.

The Myth

Ample evidence could be cited illustrating the role of the faculty council in academic and faculty affairs matters. The tough questions about faculty input typically lie in more traditional areas of administrative and student affairs and examples of the BFC's role in these areas are included below.

Budgetary Affairs

In creating the predecessor to the Budgetary Affairs Committee (BAC), Frank Franz, President of the IU Bloomington AAUP Chapter in 1972 wrote:

> Among its duties and obligations, the Faculty has preeminent responsibility for the maintenance and development of the curriculum and academic stature of the University. The prerogatives of the Faculty in the discharge of this responsibility have long been recognized in matters such as promotion, tenure, degree status, and the determination of academic priorities. It has become increasingly clear that the realization of academic priorities is inextricably coupled to constraints placed upon them by budgetary limitations. Since resources made available for one endeavor often come at the expense of another, and since allocations of resources have become much a matter of administrative discretion, the actual determination of academic

> directions and priorities has moved further and further from direct Faculty control, and even, at times, from direct Faculty consultation…The Faculty must expect and demand a far more significant voice in decisions such as these, which can affect the very constitution of the University (Circular B8-1973).

During the February 6, 1973 BFC Meeting discussion of the proposal to create a standing committee on budgetary affairs, Chancellor Byrum Carter indicated that a new standing committee would complement his academic advisory committee and Vice Chancellor for Budget Turner said that "he welcomed a Budget committee since it might take a little heat off of him" (Faculty Council Minutes February 6, 1973). By their Year End Report of 1974-1975, the Budgetary Affairs Committee had established a strong working agenda including: regular meetings with state legislators and university and campus budgeting officers, participation in the school's preliminary budget conferences, recommendations for minimum salary standards for academic appointees, and articulation of budgeting priorities derived from an assessment of faculty opinion (Circular B25-1975). These activities laid the foundation for faculty input into budgetary decisions in future years.

Over a decade later, in presenting his annual budget report to the BFC, Chancellor Kenneth Gros Louis (who had been a faculty member serving on the BAC in 1975) articulated that the procedures for developing the budget were consistent with past years and that the Budgetary Affairs Committee played a significant role in the budgeting process. Gros Louis commented that "As in the past, significant agreement existed on priorities for 1986-87 among the deans, the Budgetary Affairs Committee, and the campus administration" (Faculty Council Minutes September 16, 1986). He went on to describe allocations for faculty salaries and faculty research support, student support, academic equipment purchases, library acquisitions, and enhancement of computing facilities—all of which appear on the "very high" or "high" priorities lists from the faculty's BAC that year (Faculty Council Minutes September 16, 1986).

The productive and collegial relationship between the BAC and the campus administration was no doubt helped by the transition of faculty members into the chancellorship and vice chancellorship for budgetary affairs. As the BAC committee chair stated in his 1988 report to the Faculty Council, "I also want to emphasize that we maintained good relationships with Ward Schaap and Ken Gros Louis…[they] were candid and compassionate and cooperative." He went on to report that "Most members of the Budgetary Affairs Committee feel at the end of the year (and they verbalized this to me) (and I emphasize "most") feel that we've had a significant impact in the directions that the dollars have flowed on this campus. For

that reason we felt that we received a return on our investment of time and energy" (Faculty Council Minutes September 20, 1988). These collegial and trusting relationships during good budgetary years led to successful working relationships during bad budgetary years. Again, Chancellor Gros Louis, in 1991:

> To put the budget situation as simply as possible: this is the worst budget year the Bloomington campus has had in my memory…The Budgetary Affairs Committee worked extraordinarily hard under adverse conditions to provide advice and guidance not only to the campus administration, but also to the entire campus. The meeting held in early March for all Bloomington campus faculty and staff was organized and directed by that committee…It was a remarkable meeting, as some of you here know, because faculty and staff did indeed come together to consider how the campus would respond to what at that time seemed to be a worse situation than was ultimately the case. I can't underline enough how valuable the Budgetary Affairs Committee and the individual advisory committees in the schools have been during this most difficult year" (Faculty Council Minutes September 17, 1991).

This positive working relationship still exists in Bloomington between the Budgetary Affairs Committee and the campus administration. This may be because the members of the BAC consider campus-level issues, rather than department or discipline-based issues; or, perhaps, because the individuals holding the positions of chancellor (now called a provost) and vice provost for budgetary administration are still former members of the faculty in Bloomington themselves.

Fundraising

Similarly, when the Bloomington campus embarks on fundraising ventures, the Faculty Council plays an important role. The IU Foundation, the fundraising arm of Indiana University, receives its official marching orders from the IU administrative leadership. However, over the past several decades of capital campaign planning, the faculty council has played its role in providing faculty input to the administration and foundation leadership on academic priorities. In a memo to the Bloomington Faculty Council in 1980, Acting Dean George Springer (who was asked by the chancellor to receive all suggestions for priorities and coordinate the feedback process) articulated the faculty's critical role in the fundraising process as:

> The process of determining priorities continues. The success of the future campaign lies not only with the Foundation but with the careful and thoughtful work of the faculty who must provide not only facts and figures but ideas sufficiently compelling to induce philanthropic gestures from all manner of people" (Circular B29-1981).

This sentiment was reinforced by his statement that almost all the priorities suggested by the faculty to date had been included within the five major categories for the campaign. The following year, BFC President Albert Ruesink outlined the importance of the faculty's role in the priority-setting process and the campaign more generally:

> There obviously needs to be a continuing process regarding the capital campaign and in seeking effective Faculty Council roles in that campaign—both in terms of helping to set priorities and in terms of helping to raise funds. Priority setting is only the first stage. As faculty we cannot turn the job over to the administration and the Foundation and expect them to carry the whole campaign from here. That is the way in ordinary times with ordinary needs. These are extraordinary times and require extraordinary efforts. As members of the Faculty Council representing all faculty, we need to ask when, where, and how we can help with a continuing campaign project (Faculty Council Minutes January 19, 1982).

Professor Roger Newton, who chaired an ad hoc committee of the faculty council to begin the prioritization effort, articulated the committees' perspective on priority-setting as:

> We looked at this long list of requests…we decided that it would make more sense and would have a large impact on Indiana University and its distinction if we selected a small number of items that would make a major difference… As you see from the list, we selected only those things that would not benefit only an individual department or school… we picked only items that would benefit the campus as a whole" (Faculty Council Minutes January 19, 1982).

The Council members, after hearing the presentation of their ad hoc committee, received a ballot where they were asked to assign a High, Medium, or Low priority ranking to 17 independent projects (Ballot February 10, 1982 and Draft Ballot and Memo February 2, 1982). The results of the Campaign Priorities Ballot were disseminated to the campus faculty and the resulting priorities were (in rank order): Endowment for faculty development and research, Endowments for student fellowships (graduate, minority, undergraduate, honors), Endowment for book acquisition and university libraries, Endowed chairs, Research and Instructional Equipment, Music School Library Building, Endowment for Postdoctoral research fellowships, Observatory in Morgan-Monroe State Forest, New Theater Building, Endowment for the operation of the campus museums, Recreational sports building with a 50-meter pool, Addition to the Lilly Library, Endowment for an Institute for Advanced Study, Renovation of the Auditorium, Continuing Education building, Center for the Advancement of Education, and the Neal-Marshall Black Culture Center. The significance of the faculty's prioritization exercise is evident when one looks at the actual publication materials of the Campaign which include requests for, among its Eight Goals, "endowed professorships and scholarships" and "acquisition of library books" (Circular B20-1982).

A similar exercise of ranking fundraising priorities occurred in 1993, prior to the Academic Endowment Campaign in Bloomington. Again, the faculty's recommendations through their prioritization ballot weighed heavily in setting the overall goals for the Campaign (Faculty Council Minutes April 20, 1993). The priorities of the Faculty Council members were very similar to the early 1980s exercise.

The values of an institution are often inferred from how the institution chooses to expend its resources. As Hollinger (2001) mentions in his article about the successful role of the UC Berkeley senate, when faculty have input into financial decisions and priority setting at the institution, shared governance tends to follow naturally. These examples of the BFCs role in planning and decision-making in budgeting and fundraising (how the institution chooses to expend its resources) provide clear evidence that in Bloomington, if Hollinger is correct, at least one condition for successful shared governance is present.

Student Affairs and Campus Life

Another area of campus administration that has benefited from the expertise and dedication of deans of men and women, and now deans of students, is the large area of student affairs and campus life. The faculty traditions of involvement in student life at IUB are enduring. From their earliest days of handling misconduct cases in the mid-1800s, the Bloomington faculty have retained their involvement in the out-of-classroom activities of the student body through claiming legislative authority over many student-related policies and consultative authority on other student life matters. The most direct evidence of this involvement is the faculty's ownership and authorship of the Student Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct (previously entitled IU Student Code of Conduct). Intense drafting sessions of this document, with sometimes heated discussions about academic dishonesty, student misbehavior, and speech codes, have occurred every three to four years of the Council and typically extend for several sessions at a time. Although most students (and many student affairs staff on the campus) do not recognize that the faculty still maintain authorship over the Student Code it is a lasting symbol of their influence in the out-of-class behaviors and activities of the student population.

Student activism in the 1960s afforded the BFC an additional opportunity to make a statement about out-of-class activities. A Fall 1969 meeting

agenda in the included discussions on the war in Vietnam and a discussion on fraternities and sororities on the campus. On the first topic, the Council endorsed a resolution on students' political activities against the war in Vietnam:

> The Faculty Council recognizes students' and faculty members' concern about the war in Vietnam. One evidence of the extent of this concern is the proposed nationwide moratorium on October 15. We support a citizen's right to participate in such a non-violent expression of opinion, and ask our colleagues that students who wish to support the moratorium in a lawful and non-disruptive manner, not be penalized" (Faculty Council Minutes October 7, 1969).

On the discussion of fraternities and sororities, the faculty council entertained several motions, each providing an indication of the level of involvement of the faculty in campus activities. First, the BFC members considered that "it be the stated policy of the Faculty Council and of the Board of Trustees at Indiana University that the unanimous vote for purposes of selection of members in fraternity and sorority houses at Indiana University be eliminated" (Faculty Council Minutes October 7, 1969). Second, they discussed the creation of a Standing Committee on Fraternities and Sororities that would provide "close liaison among fraternities and sororities, the Faculty Council, the Student Affairs Committee, and other appropriate bodies. It would follow up Faculty Council and other recommendations, and aid in the improvement and fulfillment of the educational goals of fraternities and sororities" (Faculty Council Minutes October 7, 1969). Third, Professor Hofstetter, presenting for the ad hoc committee assigned to investigate these matters, suggested that the "Faculty Council support the National Interfraternity Council in condemning the practice of harassment in any form" (Faculty Council Minutes October 7, 1969). And finally, a resolution was introduced that commended the efforts of the campus fraternity organizations for improving equal rights and opportunities and urged both the men's and women's organizations to "develop model plans for pledge education including increased attention to the intellectual and moral role of the university in our society and to the great issues now being debated on university campuses through the land" (Faculty Council Minutes October 7, 1969). Speaking on behalf of these recommendations, Professor Remak, representing the local AAUP Chapter, stated that

> the American university has a mission which goes beyond the classroom; the American ideal of higher education aims in some way at the total man. That is why we have a campus and campus activities; and that's why we have extra-curricular activities; and why we have music and art and lectures and even athletics, and other such things, in order to draw in the

> whole man and do something for the character and personality, not just for his memorizing to pass examinations (Faculty Council Minutes October 7, 1969).

The Faculty Council discussed issues of Greek life periodically in the agenda records, including an hour-long debate in 2002. While Greek housing was a main topic of that conversation, it was general student campus residence halls that dominated another conversation when the BFC resolved to require all first-year students to live in campus housing beginning in the Fall of 2003. Citing a Student Affairs Committee co-authored report, the resolution stated that "students who start living on campus realize greater benefits almost across the board, which advantage them in later years" (Faculty Council Minutes September 17, 2002). Although this housing requirement was implemented with the full support of the campus administration and Board of Trustees it is more difficult to judge the impact of the Greek Life resolutions. The faculty's influence in those cases appears to be more of expectation setting and persuasion rather than edict.

Another student activity that pervades the Bloomington Faculty Council records since 1969 is intercollegiate athletics. The Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty claimed legislative authority over intercollegiate athletics and the BFC has executed that authority many times over its history. Annually, the Athletics Committee (governed by a policy of the Faculty Council) reports on the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics personnel activities, expenditures and incomes, student-athlete admissions, academic support for athletics, and other topics. In the 1980s, the BFC entertained critical questions about the academic support services available to athletes and the establishment of an athlete's ombudsman to assist student-athletes in grievances against coaches, teammates, and the Athletic Department. Recognizing further problems athletes face when registering for classes around practice schedules, the BFC endorsed a priority registration strategy for student-athletes in 2005. The Bloomington Faculty Council has also served as a representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, a consortium of faculty governance bodies concerned with faculty governance of intercollegiate (most often, Division I) athletics, since 2004.

The final example of student life that the faculty have involved themselves in at various points in its history could best be described as creating academic enrichment programs for students. Most notably, the BFC spent a year debating the establishment of the Herman B Wells Program for Outstanding Young Scholars. The BFC created this program to attract the very best and brightest undergraduate students to the Bloomington campus. The scholarship for students covers tuition and fees, room and board, study abroad expenses, and a living stipend—a very attractive program that

resulted only after a year-long debate over the balance between recruitment of high-achieving students and open access admissions, commitments by the IU Foundation to raise all the funds necessary for the program from endowment funds and not general fund moneys, and sufficient support from the faculty at-large to proceed with the program implementation.

The second and third enrichment programs created by the BFC are related—a minority achievers program for undergraduates and one for graduate students. In 1987, the Affirmative Action Committee of the BFC brought to the Council a proposal for a merit program for minority achievers. Professor Carolyn Calloway-Thomas argued that the declining minority enrollments at higher education institutions were disappointing and that

> Clearly there is a compelling need to reverse this trend. The proposed Merit Program for Minority Achievers is the Affirmative Action Committee's attempt to break out of the present situation. Our proposal is a serious response to the drain of many capable minority student residing in Indiana who attend universities outside of the state. It is also a serious response to the number of lively minds lost to education (Faculty Council Minutes March 24, 1987).

When the BFC endorsed a proposal to create this Minority Achievers Program (later renamed the Hudson-Holland Scholars Program in honor of two devoted faculty members) in April 1987 it signaled to the campus administration its supportive opinion on the expenditure of campus resources toward the recruitment and retention of minority students. Similarly, in 1989, the BFC approved a version of this program for graduate students, adding that the support at the graduate level was even more critical because "this segment of the population suffers even greater under-representation than at the undergraduate level" (Circular B19-90).

These examples, and other archival evidence, suggested that the BFC has played an influential and meaningful role in the domain of student affairs, and in certain cases, was involved in significant decisions that affect the lives of Indiana University Bloomington students.

Meaningful Participation

Each year, when the Council reconvenes, the BFC President has the opportunity to outline his/her ideas about the coming year as well as offer a bit of an orientation to new faculty members who may never have served on the BFC before. In 1991, BFC President Norman Overly commented that:

> This is certainly a challenging time in the life of higher education. It is a time for all to be engaged in the determination of our future, not a time for faculty to sit on the sidelines, leaving decision making to others…Faculty and student governance structures should play a major part in decisions related to issues faculty the university."

It seems that the "challenging times," or as Tierney (1998) calls them times of "crisis," in American higher education are occurring more frequently, thus, the importance of institutional governance, and the faculty's role within it, gains renewed purpose.

Speaking under different circumstances a decade later, BFC President Robert Eno reflected on the passage of an important resolution and placed that action in the context of the broader purpose and meaning of faculty governance:

> It [the same-sex domestic partner benefits policy] was an example of something that the Council does that actually has a direct and important impact on the lives of people on our campus and in that case on all the campuses of Indiana University and there are a number of times that will happen each year when our group makes a decision, takes a move, prods the Trustees or acts on its own authority, of which we have considerable amount, to do something that really deeply affects the lives of all of us on the campus and that is principally why the Bloomington Faculty Council can be an important body" (Faculty Council Minutes September 10, 2002).

Strong evidence in the BFC records indicates that this faculty senate does entertain questions of particular significance to the institution and has demonstrated its ability to act independently of the administration and responsibly on important issues.

Conclusion

This study attempted to add to the growing scholarship on faculty governance by investigating one faculty senate's activities for evidence of the role of faculty in university governance. The previously cited example, and others within the BFC archives, suggest that, over time, the faculty have been heavily involved in significant decisions. As faculty members around the country look to define their roles within institutional decision-making it is helpful to look to successful examples of faculty governance for direction. Indiana University Bloomington is one of those successful examples. Hollinger (2001) draws insights from the two systems he has worked within to say that, "(a) senates with little power should not pretend to be more than holding operations, (b) senates that aspire to more than that must be given substantial authority over important decisions, and (c) the particular, historical circumstances of any given campus will foster or frustrate efforts to maintain or increase the faculty's role in campus governance" (pg. 30). As demonstrated with the materials reviewed in this paper, the BFC is a senate with power, they have authority over important decisions, and the historical circumstance, in particular the long-term tenure of campus administrators from among the faculty ranks, has increased the role of faculty in campus

governance.

This study utilized a relatively contemporary set of historical materials—faculty senate records from the 20th century. Institutional archives contain a wealth of informative materials documenting the history of individual institutions and many institutional histories rely heavily on university archives for documentary evidence. However, faculty senate records are an excellent resource and should be utilized more commonly to gain insight into the under-explored area of faulty members' campus service activities.

References

American Association of University Professors (1966). Statement on government of colleges and universities. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.

Burgan, M. (2004). Preface: Why governance? Why Now?. In W. Tierney (Ed.), Competing conceptions of academic governance: Negotiating the perfect storm. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Douglas, J. (1988). Professors on strike: An analysis of two decades of faculty work stoppages, 1966-1985. The Labor Lawyer 4.

Eckel, P. (2000). The role of shared governance in institutional hard decisions: Enabler or antagonist? The Review of Higher Education, 24(1).

Engstrand, G. (2005). A university senate for all. Academe 91.

Helms. R. & Price, T. (2005). Who needs a faculty senate?. Academe, 91.

Hollinger, D. (2001). Faculty governance, the University of California, and the future of academe. AAUP Bulletin 87(3).

Hutcheson, P. A. (2000). A professional professoriate: unionization, bureaucratization, and the AAUP. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Kadish, S. (1972). The theory of the profession and its predicament. AAUP Bulletin 58(2).

Kezar, A. & Eckel, P. (2004). Meeting today's governance challenges. The Journal of Higher Education 75(4).

Leatherman, C. (1998, January 30). Shared governance under siege: Is it time to revive it or get rid of it? The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Lucas, C. (1994). American higher education: A history. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Mares, N. (2004). Chronology of Governing Faculty Groups at Indiana University. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives.

Minor, J. (2004). Understanding faculty senates: Moving from mystery to models. The Review of Higher Education 27(3).

Rhoades, G. (1998). Managed professionals, unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Rosser, V. (2003). Historical overview of faculty governance in higher education. In M. T. Miller and J. Caplow (Eds.), Policy and University Faculty Governance. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing).

Scott, J. V. (1996). The strange death of faculty governance. PS: Political Science and Politics 29(4).

Tierney, W. (1998). The responsive university: Restructuring for high performance. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tierney, W. (Ed.) (2004). Competing conceptions of academic governance: Negotiating the perfect storm. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tierney, W. & Minor, J. (2003). Challenges for governance: A report by the Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Williams, D, Gore, W., Broches, C. & Lostoski, C. (1987). One faculty's perceptions of its governance role. The Journal of Higher Education 58(6).

Archival Sources from the IU Archives

Collection C236 Faculty Council Minutes of the General Faculty: 1836, 1837, 1839, 1841, 1846

Collection C233 University Council Minutes

Collection C179 Bloomington Faculty Council:

"Proposal of an Advisory Committee on Budgetary Affairs," Memo from Frank Franz, President IU Bloomington AAUP, to Leo Solt, Secretary, BFC, 23 October 1972, Circular #B8-73.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 6 February 1973.

"Budgetary Affairs Committee, Bloomington Faculty Council, Year End Report, April 22, 1975," Circular B25-75.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 16 September 1986.

"Annual Report of the Budgetary Affairs Committee," Circular B8-87.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 20 September 1988.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 17 September 1991.

Memo from George Springer to BFC reprinted in Circular B29-81.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 19 January 1982.

"BFC Capital Campaign Priorities Ballot," February 10, 1982.

"Memo from Agenda Committee to BFC on Motions Concerning Capital Campaign Priorities," February 2, 1982.

"Draft Ballot"

"The Eight Goals." Circular B20-82.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 20 April 1993.

"Agenda Committee Business" remarks by Professor Robert Eno, September 10, 2002, Minutes of the IU Bloomington Faculty Council.

For materials related to the 1986 salary discussions, consult the following: Memo from Donald Gray to Members of the Faculty of the Bloomington Campus, January 31, 1986.; Circular B29-86; Salary Ballot (February 24, 1986); Minutes of the General Meeting of the Bloomington Campus Faculty, February 6, 1986; Announcement of A Special Meeting of the Faculty of the Bloomington Campus; Circular B56-86. For materials related to the 2005 presidential discussions, consult the Supplemental Collection for 2005-2006 BFC Records.

Memo from Professor Milton Fisk to President John Ryan, 22 February 1973, American Federation of Teachers, 1972-1973.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 6 December 1977.

Minutes of the University Faculty Council, 14 October 1980.

"Informational Seminar on Collective Bargaining" Agenda and supplemental materials, 5 December 1980.

"AAUP-IUB Response to the Trustees' Decision on Collective Bargaining," 7 February 1981, Circular U10-81.

Collection C45 President John W. Ryan papers at the IU Archives:

Memo from D. C. Danielson to Professor Patrick M. Brantlinger, 1 May 1980, American Federation of Teachers, 1979-1980.

Resolution of the IU Northwest Faculty Organization, 8 May 1972, American Federation of Teachers Local 1955 (IUN) 1971-1972.

Memo from Professor Don Gray to Members of the Bloomington Chapter of the AAUP, and Other Members of the Bloomington Faculty and Administration, 30 March 1974, Collective Bargaining 1975-1976.

"Ballot on Collective Bargaining." Collective Bargaining 1979-1980.

"Second Guessing the Faculty's Position on Collective Bargaining," AFT-IUB Speaks Out Newsletter, November 18, 1980. Collective Bargaining 1980-1981.

Memo from D. C. Danielson to Professor Patrick Brantlinger, 1 May 1980, American Federation of Teachers, 1979-1980.

Memo from President John Ryan to The Faculty, 10 February 1981, Collective Bargaining 1980-1981.

Memo from Professor William E. Becker to Mr. Richard Stoner, 23 October 1981, Collective Bargaining, 1981-1982.

Kelly A. Kish is a doctoral candidate in Higher Education at Indiana University Bloomington. She received her B.A. in government and politics from the University of Maryland and her M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs Administration from Indiana University Bloomington. Kish has served as Chief of Staff to the Bloomington Faculty Council and currently serves as Research Specialist in the Office of the President. Correspondence regarding this article may be sent to the authors at kekish@indiana.edu.

Lauren E. Morrill-Ragusea graduated with a Master's in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University Bloomington in 2008. She received her B.A. in History from Indiana University Bloomington in 2005. While at IUB she served graduate supervisor for Residential Programs and Services in Wright Quadrangle and a practicum intern for the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Robin L. Murphey graduated from Indiana University Bloomington in 2008 with a M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs. She earned her B.S. in Computer Science and Mathematics from Georgetown College in 2000. While at IUB, Robin served as a Graduate Research Assistant for the Faculty Council Office and Graduate Leadership Development Coordinator in the Student Activities Office.

Predicting Collegiate Philanthropy: Student Engagement as a Correlate of Young Alumni Giving

John V. Moore III

Alumni giving is an important source of revenue for colleges and universities. This exploratory study is an attempt to find predictors of future alumni giving across multiple institutions using the National Survey of Student Engagement's benchmarks of educational effectiveness. Few effects were found, leading the researcher to speculate that the decision for alumni to donate to their schools may be a decision based more on institutional post-graduation efforts than college experiences.

Introduction

Financial gifts from alumni are an important source of income for American colleges and universities. Nationally, it has become one of the largest sources of revenue for institutions of higher education (Council for Aid to Education, 2003). Beyond the monetary benefits, alumni giving rates are used as a measure of institutional quality by external constituencies. In the highly influential US News and World Report's national rankings of colleges and universities, for example, alumni giving accounts for 5% of a school's overall score (US News and World Report, 2004). Grant-giving agencies and major corporate donors may also use alumni giving in their awards criteria (Winston, 2000).

Given the importance of alumni giving, it is no surprise that institutions invest time and resources in the cultivation of alumni donors. College Web sites indicate that this is done through the work of alumni offices, the hiring of fundraisers dedicated to fund solicitation from graduates, and annual fund drives. Another part of this effort includes statistically modeling student behaviors such as fraternity or sorority membership (O'Neill, 2005) and extracurricular involvement (Taylor & Martin, 1995) or demographic characteristics such as age (Olsen, Smith, & Wunnave, 1989), race (Clotfelter, 2001), and level of financial aid (Marr, Mullin, & Siegfried, 2005). Managers of giving campaigns are interested in factors that are shown to be predictors of alumni giving. This kind of marketing research assists institutions in deciding where it is best to commit resources in the solicitation of funds from alumni (Mosser, 1993; Pearson, 1999).

Because of the personal nature of the data and the way in which the results will be used, many of the studies of alumni giving have been local, in-house examinations of the phenomenon. Few have attempted to look nationally at characteristics associated with alumni giving at colleges (Sears, 1990/1922; Spaeth and Greenley, 1970). It is only recently that there have been attempts to examine a broader context have been published (Clotfelter,