The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM) has faced a number of challenges in recent years. An overarching theme is the clear, growing disconnect between faculty and administration and a lack of institutional commitment to shared governance in which the faculty are strongly involved in the decision-making process. For example, there is very little direct communication between faculty and the Board of Regents (BOR). It is therefore difficult for the BOR to appreciate the extent to which faculty input has been disregarded in most recent decisions by administration. This situation is epitomized by a major structural flaw: at no level of the administrative hierarchy are any executives accountable to faculty. For example, deans alone are consulted by upper administration on most matters involving faculty, yet deans do not report to the faculty! They report to administration and are in fact executives themselves. Thus, all their incentives in pursuing an issue favor the administrative viewpoint, with no incentive to fully consult or faithfully represent faculty. Decision making can therefore happen with very little faculty input but with the dean’s representation to administration, BOR, and legislature of unanimous support, as evidenced in several recent initiatives on campus.

Shared governance is critical for achieving excellence within a university. The rationale for a commitment to strong shared governance is that faculty are the most specialized, diverse workforce in the state. They offer a unique and direct perspective on the primary missions of the university: teaching and research. That is exactly what faculty are hired to provide. Indeed, faculty are the only employees competent to directly serve or guide these missions. Faculty hold sacred the role they play in helping students achieve their goals, and they value open intellectual discourse above all else. The current operative styles at UH Mānoa and UH System pay lip service to shared governance but lead to conflict and poor outcomes when faculty are incompletely consulted or, worse, completely left out of the process.

To find solutions to a lack of effective leadership at UH, the Mānoa Faculty Senate Executive Committee studied the University of California (UC) system, widely regarded as one of the nation’s premier public universities. The UC developed from humble beginnings and was not always the world-class institution that it is today. We therefore viewed the UC system as a potential model for developing functional shared governance at UH. Here we summarize the key decision points in UC’s history that effected this outcome and that we deem necessary for our university system to achieve greatness. These historical decisions were made because the University of California had clearly articulated a number of key areas of focus that reflected core values of the institution:

1. **A clear central mission** emphasizing academic excellence underlying all aspects of the university.
2. **Emphasis on research** A University of California system that includes only research universities (4yr, graduate, and professional schools) allowing a uniformity of academic mission.

3. **Faculty leadership, rather than exclusion, in decision making.** An early president (Benjamin Wheeler, 1899-1919), understood that achieving excellence across the many fields comprising the university cannot be achieved using a top-down management style. Faculty, similar to physicians in a hospital, have the best interests of their clients in mind at all times, and are best informed on how to steer the institution toward excellence. This is their passion and the reason they devote their lives to this profession, when they could attain higher compensation for other skilled work. The Mayo Clinic, as a shining example of a similar transformation, has embraced a physician-run model rather than an administrative model, where every action from top to bottom is focused on serving the patient. The same philosophy was put to work in the UC system to serve students. At UC, President Wheeler integrated greater faculty involvement in setting educational policy and the management and growth of the university, modeling the most prestigious universities of Europe.

4. **Budget transparency and equity** A system of state funding that is proportional to the service provided, with campuses and academic units receiving funding based on a budgetary formula with increasing differentials for lower division, upper division, masters, and PhD enrollment. Importantly, this formula also brought into alignment the teaching and research missions of the university.

5. **A governance structure that maintains campus autonomy and system coordination** via clear differentiation of missions, alignment of faculty senate structures, and strong collaboration between administration and faculty, and faculty with the BOR.

Each of these focus areas embodies critical decisions that fostered excellence within the UC system, and we should model this approach. Similar to Hawai‘i, UC is a public university with 42% of undergraduates being first-generation college attendees, and 42% are eligible for Pell Grants. While California is much larger than Hawaii, size alone cannot completely explain the difference in academic achievement between the two systems, as other large public universities exist but do not attain the level of excellence of UC. What sets UC apart is its visionary governance. The development of excellence at UC fostered major economic growth in the state of California: in the semiconductor, biotechnology, agriculture industries, to name a few. By making all decisions based on core values shared by all stakeholders, with a real commitment by the Board, faculty, and administration to execute actions based these values, the University of Hawai‘i has the potential to manage its finances and its personnel in an ethical, transparent manner that breeds the kind of excellence the State of Hawai‘i deserves from its flagship educational institution.

February 25, 2016
Dear Chair Moore and Regents,

The state of shared governance at the University of Hawai‘i and especially with regard to its flagship campus, Mānoa, is a matter of great concern to faculty. As Manoa provides many highly qualified faculty to the other campuses and workers across the state, the quality of UH Mānoa determines the quality of higher education in the state of Hawai‘i. The MFS SEC would like to present for your consideration a study of the University of California System, one of the most highly regarded public universities in the world.

Mahalo,
Marguerite Butler, Vice Chair of MFS SEC

Clarity of Mission at the University of California -- Valuing Excellence

“The University of California improves the lives of people in California and around the world through our world-class educational opportunities, groundbreaking research, top-rated health care and agricultural expertise. We are driven by values of public service in all we do.”

The University of California System

- 10 campuses (9 UG/GR, 1 Prof/GR)
- 5 medical centers
- 3 national laboratories
- 150 academic disciplines
- 600 graduate degree programs
- 238,700 students
- 198,300 employees
- 1.7 million living alumni
- 61 Nobel laureates
- 20,000 UC extension courses
- 430,000 jobs supported
- $46.3 billion contributed to California economy
- Secures $7 in federal and private dollars for every $1 in research funding provided by the state of California

Research at the University of California has been a major driver of California’s economy, laying the foundation for growth in biotechnology, computing, semiconductors, telecommunication, and agriculture sectors. UC research continues to fuel the next wave of economic growth in nanotechnology, clean energy, neuroscience, genomics, and medicine. But how did they achieve excellence?

History of Shared Governance

Shared governance at UC formally delegates authority to the Faculty Senate great responsibility for the operation and management of the university, while preserving the authority of the Board of Regents to ultimately set policy, supported by a historical influx of investment by tax dollars to produce “a university enterprise of international distinction and vital service to the people of California”
1850 - A state university is authorized by the first California constitution governed by a lay board (public authority) overseeing activities of faculty and students. (Berkeley)

1868 - Organic Act: Academic senate established by charter, consisting of all faculty and deans, presided over by the president for the purpose of “conducting the general administration of the University.” The organization and relationship to the University President and governing board is determined by the Regents.

1879 - UC is established as a “public trust” at California’s second constitutional convention supported by key Regents who served as delegates. The university “shall be entirely independent of political or sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its regents and in the administration of its affairs”

19th century - Faculty served as both teachers and administrators, but with Regents setting educational policy (e.g., admissions, curriculum). By 1890’s Berkeley campus was “a weak institution with plenty of land, a college of broken-down buildings, [and] beggarly endowments”

1899 - President Wheeler and the “Berkeley Revolution” - Expansion of funding, enrollment, and academic programs.
  ○ Wheeler agreed to Presidency provided with direct powers to manage University Affairs.
  ○ Negotiated expansion of state support based on ENROLLMENT WORKLOAD
  ○ Allowed dramatic expansion of enrollment (almost 4x), new faculty, and programs becoming largest public university by 1910
  ○ Elevated the role of research in the hiring, promotion, and dismissal of faculty
  ○ Integrated greater faculty involvement in management of university affairs (but not codified)
    “Wheeler convinced the Regents that faculty were not simply employees of the state, but members of an academic community engaged in a free-market of teaching and research. They should, he argued and recalling the role of faculty at the University of Heidelberg, be primarily responsible for setting educational policy. Wheeler called on faculty, now growing in numbers, to make major changes in the administrative structure of the university.

Working with faculty and with the general approval of the Regents, Wheeler created some twenty new departments, reorganized the university’s curriculum into lower and upper division courses, created matriculation agreements with the state’s normal schools and with the emerging (and pioneering) system of junior colleges, and adopted a system of peer review for hiring and promotion of faculty. Wheeler also created a faculty committee for the allocation of research funds, and a faculty editorial board to oversee the university press to elevate the quality and quantity of its publications.”

○ Formed a Tripartite system of public higher education, expanding educational opportunity and maintaining excellence: a system of Junior Colleges, the California State University system to support the regional college movement, expand higher education opportunities (and the
nation’s highest college-going rate), while diverting enrollment pressure from the University of California, to maintain a highly selective admissions policy. Model created the public research university.

- **1920 - Standing Orders of The Regents - Delegating powers to faculty** - formalized the role of the president and the relationship to the Regents and the faculty. Powers delegated to the Academic (Faculty) Senate (with approval of Regents):
  - Determine conditions of admissions, for certificates and degrees
  - Advise President on all “appointments, promotions, demotions, and dismissal” of professors, and on the appointment of deans
  - Advise President regarding “changes in the educational policy of the university”
  - Advise President regarding budget issues
  - And to, perhaps most importantly, choose its own committees and organization “in such a manner as it may determine.”

“The agreement was a watershed in the general development of American higher education, creating an organizational structure of governance that would serve as a model for other major public
and private universities. California, however, was not only the first to formalize this structure in the United States, one that had antecedents in British universities, but took it the farthest.\(^2\)

“The so-called “California Plan” created a “remarkable democratic system of academic government in which California faculty,” once explained historian Walton E. Bean, “acquired a greater influence in the educational aspects of university administration than any other faculty in the United States. Indeed, the faculty virtually became a part of the administration.”\(^3\)

“From the base of authority granted in 1920, the Regents and the president increasingly came to rely on the Academic Senate to build a university of international recognition. The Senate proved a critical component to maintaining quality academic programs as the university grew in enrollment and faculty, and in the number of campuses.”\(^4\)

- **Shared governance provides collaborative solutions through times of adversity** - During the great depression, faced with a 26% decrease in state funding, President Sproul called on the Academic Senate committees on budget, educational policy, and others to develop methods to cut costs, raise revenues, and contain the regional college movement.

- **Transition from Central to Local Authority:** 1958 - 1964 President Clark Kerr negotiated the “1960 Master Plan” which fostered a **reorganization of administrative structure and the Academic Senate** in order to clarify the roles of the multi-campus system versus campuses, create greater local authority, and provide equity in distribution of state funds to the campuses.

  - **Budget equity** -- Kerr and the Regents agreed to a budgetary formula that would provide a steady flow of funds to new campuses while maintaining excellence at flagships (UCLA and Berkeley): **Funding apportioned by enrollment, but differentiated by level of instruction with increasing allocations for lower division, upper division, masters’ student, and PhD students**, based on the rationale that costs increased with level of instruction. Furthermore, this model **tied core funding for research to the teaching mission of the university, and provided an incentive for newer campuses to develop into strong research universities**.

  - **Universitywide and Campus Administration** -- President transferred more direct authority to campus Chancellors. Responsibilities and staff needed for day-to-day operations now at campus chancellor’s offices, and president’s office staff cut by 26%. Campus business officers and deans now reported to Chancellor, Chancellor could also approve research grants, contracts, transfer of funds. Campuses now in control of graduate education, etc. President’s office now free to focus on major issues facing the University, and greater collaborative working relationships and proper consultative processes with campus administrators and the academic senate.
Divisional model for the academic senate -- A 1963 reorganization of the Academic Senate to better align with the greater administrative authority of campus chancellors, which remains to present day.

- **Divisions of the senate created for each campus**, each with its own network of committees. Chair for each campus selected from the faculty, providing clear autonomy from campus and university administration.

- **Universitywide Academic Assembly** newly established with proportional representation from each campus division. Authority to pass changes in bylaws, regulations of the senate, resolutions and memos to the President. Therefore advisory to the President, but also in “no way override the autonomy of the various campuses or override the authority of the chancellors”. Concerned with matters such as definition of tenure; university admissions, dismissal, transfer policies; membership and voting rights in the senate; and bringing into harmony various conflicting attitudes on different campuses in so far as they threaten the well-being of the statewide university (otherwise respect academic freedoms of campuses).

- **Universitywide committees** -- continued, but grew in number and with membership now determined by equal representation from each division (campus). These committees of the Academic Senate charged to advise on distinct areas of policy and to report annually to the Academic Assembly.

- **Academic Council** -- the executive body of the Universitywide senate, study problems of overall concern to the entire university, direct activities of the Assembly and committees. Members include chairs of the new divisions and chairs of the standing universitywide committees.

- **Formal inclusion onto the Board of Regents of all stakeholders**: 1974 -- Faculty and Student representation along with Staff advisors added to the Board of Regents to give “greater credibility with its constituency.”


The organizational structure of governance at the UC System supported unprecedented growth (for new campuses, not only flagship campuses), while maintaining quality.

“This organizational structure also retained one of the University’s greatest strengths: the two general and at times overlapping spheres of policymaking under the Regents, the Academic Senate and the universitywide and campus administrations. Through this structure, the President, and in turn the Universitywide administration, gained influence regarding the agenda for the Regents, and the process of setting universitywide policy by the Board.”\(^2\)
Despite his domineering management style, President Robert Gordon Sproul understood that shared governance was crucial in creating effective university leadership. “No function of the university president [or chancellor] is more important than maintaining close relations with the faculty,” he wrote in 1953. The Academic Senate, Sproul remarked, became more important as the university grew in size and in the complexity of its role in society. Without strong faculty input, opinions and advice, “the titular head of the organization often suffers from something like oxygen starvation, with such characteristic symptoms as failing vision, and gait slowed down to a shamble, and weaving from side to side with little forward motion.”

Apart from such direct effects, shared governance also can provide an additional important benefit: the maintenance of a high level of morale within the academic community. “The process of consultation,” wrote John J. Corson in 1941, “strengthens the allegiance to the institution and their individual zeal and satisfaction.”

The Composition of the UC Board of Regents (26 members):
http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/index.html
18 regents appointed by the Governor for 12 year terms
1 student regent appointed by the Regents for 1 year term
7 ex officio regents -- the Governor, Lt. Governor, Speaker of the Assembly (California Legislature), Superintendent of Public Instruction (DOE), UC president, president and vice president of the Alumni Associations of UC
2 faculty representatives to the BoR -- chair and vice chair of the Academic Council (non-voting)
2 staff advisors to the BoR who are appointed by the President in consultation with the BoR chairman

Committees and Meetings:
Meets 6 times per year, every other month in 2 day meetings.

The Missions of the “University” as distinct from the Mission of the President’s Offices:
Sometimes called the “Public Mission of the University”, the University’s fundamental missions are teaching, research, and public service.

"The distinctive mission of the University is to serve society as a center of higher learning, providing long-term societal benefits through transmitting advanced knowledge, discovering new knowledge, and functioning as an active working repository of organized knowledge. That obligation, more specifically, includes undergraduate education, graduate and professional education, research, and other kinds of public service, which are shaped and bounded by the central pervasive mission of discovering and advancing
The Office of the President, on the other hand, acts as the facilitator to the vision for the university that is arrived at via shared governance. The offices manage multibillion-dollar fiscal and business operations, establish policy frameworks to aid in carrying out the UC’s academic and research missions across the network of campuses and programs, ensure legal and ethical compliance, manage risk and workforce support, promote university’s interests to the state and national governments, and respond to requests by state policymakers by conducting research and analysis of policies with potential for statewide impact. They work behind the scenes to be more efficient, responsive, and transparent stewards of the public trust.

Shared governance is tripartite between the Regents - Administration - Faculty Senate with strong collaboration at each level of organization.

Academic Senate has 18 standing committees, organized around:

- senate rules and committee composition,
- university planning and resource allocation
Each Campus-level Senate parallels the structure of the Universitywide senate

The interface between the academic senate and administration is described in more detail in\(^7\,\!^8\). Please also see the concluding section: an assessment of shared governance.
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