Faculty Constitutions in the Ivory Tower

Matthew Woessner

Jessica Kehler

Appendix A: OVERVIEW OF THE NAAS SURVEY

The NAAS study, commissioned by Stanley Rothman, Everett Ladd, and Seymour Martin Lipset, was the first-of-its-kind examination of the competing views of the university's primary stakeholders, utilizing a large scale national representative sample of students, faculty and college administrators (Rothman, Woessner and Kelly-Woessner 2011). Conducted by the Angus Reid Group (now the Ipsos-Reid Group) between March 4 and May 3, 1999, the study originally included respondents from both American and Canadian institutions. For our purposes, the analysis is limited to American colleges and universities. The American universities were chosen by random sampling procedures. Individual faculty members were also chosen at random, based on lists of faculty at each institution, proportionate to the size of the institution. Faculty respondents included full time faculty who were teaching during the 1999 spring semester. Administrators were chosen at random from a list of college presidents, provosts, academic vice presidents, senior academic officers, and academic deans. The Angus Reid Group secured a 72 percent response rate for faculty and a 70 percent response rate for college administrators. The complete NAAS survey includes 1,645 faculty, and 807 administrators.

Appendix B: SENATES, ASSEMBLIES, AND HYBRIDS

Senate Governance Schemes

	Faculty Size				
	<500	**500-2000**	**>2000**	**Total**	**n**
Assembly	30%	3%	8%	13%	11
Hybrid	4%	13%	32%	16%	13
Senate	67%	84%	60%	71%	59
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	83
n	27	31	25	83	

Not surprisingly, faculty assemblies are most common at institutions with the fewest number of faculty (See Table B). Somewhat surprisingly, some select institutions have *both* a faculty assembly and faculty Senate. George Washington University and Boston University are two prominent examples. In these outlying institutions, the representative Senate does the bulk of the work concerning faculty affairs, curricular management and advisory reports. The assemblies of the faculty are still called upon to discuss and ratify the Senate proposal, thus giving the faculty a direct, if somewhat more limited, say in faculty governance. Believing that having some direct say in faculty affairs plays a critical role in enhancing faculty perceptions of their own power, we use the presence of an assembly as a measure of direct faculty influence, even when some of the democratic functions are handled by a Senate or council as occurs in a hybrid constitution.

Invoking the terminology of each respective institution can be quite confusing in that some schools utilize a nomenclature that conveys the opposite of what the term

means in common parlance. For example, the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) operates under a hybrid system with both an assembly and a senate. The UCLA handbook refers to the whole of the faculty (which we term an assembly) as a "Senate" while it refers to the elected representatives (which we term a senate) as an "elected assembly."

APPENDIX C: NOTES ON CODING

To cope with the varying schemes of democratic representation in faculty governance, we examined faculty constitutions on six dimensions of democratic representation. Although these six variables do not provide a comprehensive view of democratic rules and procedures, we believe it captures the most important variations in faculty systems of governance. This cursory examination of academic constitutions provides an excellent starting point for evaluating whether institutional structures influence perceptions of power within the university.

Coding for the faculty governance structure for each of the six variables was based on an analysis of faculty constitutions and handbooks obtained in the spring of 2014. The coding for each respondent's institutional characteristic was integrated into the NAAS dataset at the individual level, such that the dataset can account for whether a respondent (faculty or administrator) is employed by an institution that has a faculty assembly, or places term limits on the senate and assembly executive. Ideally, coding for the structure of faculty governance should be based on academic constitutions exactly as they functioned in the spring of 1999. However, records of faculty constitutions going back 15 years are inconsistent. In some cases, we obtained faculty constitutions from the colleges included a list of substantive amendments offered since the completion of the NAAS study. It would appear that the overall structure of faculty representative institutions is relatively stable. Most academic constitutions have not undergone fundamental change since the NAAS survey was conducted in 1999. In the few instances where colleges instituted major constitutional changes following the completion of the

NAAS (1999) survey, the errors would, in all probability, be random. These errors would

tend to weaken the statistical link between faculty constitutional characteristics and

respondent attitudes. While the 15-year gap between the NAAS survey and the

constitutional coding might obscure otherwise statistically significant relationships, it is

unlikely that recent changes will result in false positives.