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Chapter Six

The Intersecting Authority of Boards, Presidents, and Faculty

Toward Shared Leadership

Peter D. Eckel and Adrianna Kezar

Think of complex orchestral scores: each musician must play her or his respective part, but as a whole they must work together. Soloists become part of a collective driving toward a common mission and purpose. Similarly, effective leadership in colleges and universities requires orchestration among its key players—faculty, senior administrators, and trustees. Each group must lead independently in its primary spheres of work, but also lead collaboratively for the good of the institution. While each note on the score might seem easy to play, the collective execution of a complex passage can be difficult. Universities have different and competing sources of influence through which various stakeholders seek to exert leadership, unlike simpler organizational structures with clear lines of communication and sources of authority and control. Leadership through governance is nuanced and complex.

This chapter explores the leadership dynamics of universities through the lens of governance and the three groups of actors that play dominant roles—trustees, presidents, and faculty. While we recognize the important contributions of students or staff, this chapter focuses on the three groups most consistently influential and that are part of the formal governance structure. In addition to describing the leadership of boards, presidents, and faculty, it explores the organizational and environmental contexts of leading in the academy, select theories of leadership that pertain to higher education, and the intersection of faculty, trustee, and administrative influence.
Boards of Trustees

At the top of the formal university organizational hierarchy sits the board of trustees. Boards of trustees, sometimes called boards of governors, and infrequently called boards of visitors (for example in Virginia), boards of overseers (Harvard), or boards of curators (in Missouri) are the legal authority of the institution. Boards have the final jurisdiction on all matters related to the policies of the university. The boards, in turn, delegate the authority to manage the day-to-day operations of the university to the president. In some instances, in addition to governing boards universities may have other types of boards, often called boards of visitors (just to confuse things), that serve in advisory rather than governance roles. The distinction is that these do not have the fiduciary responsibilities of governing boards. According to the Association of Governing Boards, there are an estimated 50,000 trustees in the United States. The overwhelming majority of them are volunteers; only trustees of for-profit universities tend to be compensated, although trustees abroad may be compensated similar to corporate trustees.

A fiduciary is the steward of public trust and is responsible for ensuring that the assets (financial, reputational, and physical) of the organization are safeguarded and held for the benefit of another; in the case of universities this refers to the trustees. It is from this function that board leadership stems. The fiduciary role encompasses three duties:

- The duty of care requires that trustees carry out their responsibilities in good faith, in the best interest of the university. The expectation is that a board member is actively engaged in the work of the board and knowledgeable about the university, and that she or he acts reasonably, competently, and prudently when making decisions as a steward of the institution. The duty of care assumes a degree of diligence and attention to one’s work and the work of the board.

- The duty of loyalty requires board members to put the interests of the institution before all others and to act in ways consistent with the institution’s public purposes. It prohibits a board member from acting out of self-interest and directly or indirectly benefitting personally. For instance, the board’s conflict-of-interest policy provides guidance on how a conflicted board member can avoid putting personal interests first.

- The duty of obedience refers to the board member’s obligation to advance the mission of the college or university consistent with its stated
purpose and within the boundaries of the law. Failure to fulfill this duty can result in a loss of public confidence in the institution.

Boards exert their influence through tasks they carry out, which can be distilled into five broad categories:

1. Setting the organization's mission and overall strategy, and modifying either as necessary
2. Monitoring organizational performance and holding the administration accountable;
3. Selecting, evaluating, and supporting the president, and, if necessary, removing that individual from the position;
4. Developing and safeguarding the institution's financial and physical resources; and
5. Serving as a conduit between the institution and its environment, and advocating on its behalf.

The nature of college and university boards in the United States grew out of the historical tradition of lay or independent boards in which individuals who were not employees of the organization served as fiduciaries, a model first adopted in the colonies by Harvard University. Therefore, the board's leadership is different from that of administrators and faculty. It is more distant and episodic as the board members are not formally involved in the daily workings of the institution they govern. This concept can even be inferred from Thomas Jefferson's labeling of the University of Virginia's governance body as "the Board of Visitors." That is, the board members visit but do not inhabit the university. The benefits of lay boards are that they "can help to form a fresh vision for the institution; focus attention on the most critical challenges; critique the prevailing wisdom from the vantage point of knowledgeable outsiders; bring new perspective, often from the business world; and illuminate old problems." Board members provide an informed external view of the world and can add depth and perspective by tapping their outside expertise and experiences. Effective boards govern, but do not manage.

The goal of boards should be to add value. "A board can reach that destination only if it functions as a team," writes Nadler. The authority of boards lies in the collective, not with individual trustees. So boards should and need to act as a body. However, as Chait points out, some boards are often "orchestras of soloists," in which members try to exert their individual influence rather than
working through the board. An extreme example of this is the governance breakdown at the University of Virginia in 2012 that resulted in the termination and subsequent reinstatement of its president.\textsuperscript{14}

Boards face many uphill battles when it comes to exercising their influence and being effective leaders.\textsuperscript{15} Members must make their decisions collectively but they usually only come together periodically. They are volunteers who, while highly accomplished and influential individuals in their own professions, are not of the academy. They must forge and maintain a complex relationship with the president whom they both oversee and partner with strategically, and they have to address a long list of complex issues essential to the institution's well-being, typically without deep higher education backgrounds. Finally they need to keep their work at the policy level and not overreach into the tasks of management. “Effective governance entails influential participation in meaningful discussions about consequential matters that lead to significant outcomes” writes Chait.\textsuperscript{16} Board structure and composition make this calculus challenging as the discussions may not be salient, participation can be fluid, and many decisions put before boards by campus administrators or even board leadership may be of little consequence to the institution.

Chait, Ryan, and Taylor argue that even beyond these structural challenges, boards may underperform because the work often lacks purpose. “Many boards are ineffectual not because they are confused about their role but because they are dissatisfied with their role. They do not do their job well because their job does not strike them as worth doing well.”\textsuperscript{17} Trustees want to serve and give back to their institutions. For some there is tremendous prestige in the role. Thus they trudge on even when facing frustrations. That said, boards do develop processes, and, more importantly, cultures to be effectively influential.\textsuperscript{18}

To be most consequential and purposeful, Chait, Ryan, and Taylor\textsuperscript{19} argue, boards should focus their work in three distinct streams—fiduciary, strategic and generative, which combine like a triple helix to create governance as leadership. The first type of work, fiduciary, requires that boards live up to their stewardship role, are compliant with laws and regulations, work to advance the mission of the institution, and use resources appropriately. The strategic work focuses on advancing the institution’s mission and priorities, and aligning the institution’s strengths and weaknesses with threats and opportunities. This is not to say boards develop the strategic plan outside of the traditions of academic governance. As Chait writes elsewhere, “The board can and should test whether plans are consistent, tactics are plausible, risks are reasonable, milestones are
feasible, and metrics are sensible.\textsuperscript{20} The final type of work, which the authors call "generative," involves using trustee knowledge and wisdom to meet the challenges and opportunities facing the university as it develops strategies, plans, and policies. It is the "grapple factor." This final type of engagement occurs when the work is still ambiguous and open to interpretation. Effectiveness in this domain requires a strong and effective partnership between the board and the campus, a foundation of trust, and an understanding that challenges can be ambiguous.\textsuperscript{21} "Engaging the collective mind of everyone around the board table should lead to better deliberations and better decisions" argues Trower regarding generative governance.\textsuperscript{22}

Studies of boards tend to be narrow in scope, focusing on structure, composition, and roles. However, Kezar offers a multidimensional model of public board effectiveness with six elements.\textsuperscript{23} Based on interviews with over a hundred board members and staff, the model includes leadership/board agenda, culture, education, external relations, relationships, and structure. This model is important because most of the earlier work on boards has been conducted on private boards. Kezar's process-based model presumes and promotes interdependency among these characteristics, which often are considered individually or in isolation. Leadership is at the heart of public boards. The other elements (culture, education, external relations, relationships, and structure) help to support and advance leadership. The themes are prioritized in importance related to effectiveness. For example, after leadership, culture is the most often noted theme in the data, followed by education, external relations, relationships, and structure. Board leadership involves developing a common vision and purpose, creating a multiyear agenda, asking tough questions, and forging a strong relationship between the board chair, other members of the board, and the campus CEO. In terms of the culture, leaders build a professional and nonpartisan culture among the board. The tendency of boards to become mired in politics can be overcome through a careful attention to a professional culture. Effective boards have highly elaborated board orientations for new members, ongoing opportunities for education throughout the year, educational opportunities outside of board meetings, strong data from staff, and educational experiences that are based on a careful evaluation of the board's needs. In terms of external relations, effective boards coordinate with legislative and governor's strategic plans, have joint goal-setting meetings with external stakeholders, develop sophisticated communication vehicles across the various layers of governance, have access to the governor and other important state officials, and stick to their agenda even as governors
turn over. In terms of relationships, the CEO and board chair have ongoing communication, board members engage university constituents actively, and the board meetings include a social aspect to develop trust among the members. Lastly, in terms of structure, the board works to clarify its role, develops needed ad hoc committees, have a clear board chair role, and engage in ongoing evaluation of their work.

The impact of board work is transmitted from the board to the campus via the president. "The working relationship between the president and the board is the essential alliance in bringing about positive change." In a national survey of approximately 500 presidents, roughly 80 percent reported that their boards had had a positive impact, and a similar percentage were either satisfied or very satisfied overall with their boards. However, the flip side is that one in five presidents reported that their boards did not have a positive impact. This is a high percentage given the influence that boards can have, both positive and negative. Furthermore, almost a quarter of presidents in this study indicated that they were not confident in their board’s abilities to address future institutional changes. On this point, key differences existed between the boards of public and independent institutions, with 80 percent of presidents from private institutions being confident or very confident about their boards’ ability to govern into the future; only 60 percent of presidents from public universities felt this way. Together the data suggest that, although boards are highly influential, a sizable share of presidents are not confident that their boards can provide needed leadership over either the short or the long term.

In that same study, important differences emerged by presidential tenure and by type of institution. When long-term presidents (those serving ten or more years at a single or multiple institutions) were asked about the changing nature of governance, approximately two-thirds indicated that boards were more important today than when they first became presidents; one-third did not. A similar number reported that boards were more effective today than when they first took office. Only half of longstanding presidents from doctoral/research universities said boards were more essential today, and one in five reported boards being less effective today than when they began. Less than one fifth of new presidents (three years or less) strongly agreed that their boards made a positive impact. By contrast, more than half of presidents in office twelve years or longer reported the same feeling. Almost one-third of newly hired presidents reported being not very satisfied or even dissatisfied with the board. This rate is twice that of their longer-serving colleagues with eight to twelve years in their posts and three
times the rate of presidents who have served for more than twelve years. Furthermore, just over one in five newly hired presidents report not being on the same page as their boards regarding future institutional change and were unsure whether they and their boards were in sync about future challenges. One would expect the search process to clarify such goals, but clearly this did not happen, meaning new presidents were immediately in difficult positions with their boards regarding future institutional directions. New presidents may have different and possibly higher expectations for boards than longer-serving presidents or middle-term presidents. Regardless, boards matter and presidents believe their effects are more easily felt today than in the past.

The President

The individual most likely identified as the leader of a university or college is the president, who also may be called chancellor, rector, or vice chancellor, depending on the continent and the system. As the Task Force on the State of the Presidency in American Higher Education of the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities noted in its statement, “no leader comes to personify an institution in the way a president does. A president must provide leadership in maintaining the institution’s academic integrity and reputation. He or she must assimilate and tell the institution’s story to build pride internally and support externally. The president has the primary responsibility for increasing public understanding and support for the institution. . . . and must lead the institution as it confronts new external challenges.”

Boards charge presidents with leading the institution. Presidents are responsible for the wise use of scarce resources and are accountable for their institution’s effectiveness. They coordinate institutional strategic direction, develop and put into action both master and strategic plans, and are accountable for the institution’s future well-being. They support institutional work by making choices—for instance, regarding space and facilities, enrollments, and budgets. They liaise with critical external stakeholders, such as policy makers, alumni, and donors, and they hire and manage other key campus leaders. The attention they choose to give to certain activities, functions, and issues matters, both operationally and symbolically. Further evidence of their importance is the sizable financial investment made by trustees in identifying and retaining talented presidents, with the highest salaries and benefits over $1 million per year (but still lagging behind football and basketball coaches). Successful presidents are essential to dynamic, relevant, and robust colleges and universities. Seen from
the other direction, failed presidencies are costly in all-too-numerous ways. Regrettably, higher education is often reminded of these unfortunate costs.

Much of the president's time is spent away from the campus, with off-campus constituencies, and the external demands on the position are growing. In an ACE study of college presidents, 57 percent of long-serving presidents (those who have been in their positions for ten years or more) report that as new presidents, they spent the most time with constituents who were internal campus stakeholders. In contrast, only 14 percent report that, as experienced presidents, internal constituents still occupy the majority of their time. Instead, 39 percent spend more time with external constituents, and 47 percent spend time equally with external and internal constituents. While new presidents are likely to invest time on campus establishing themselves as the new leader, the sizable difference experienced presidents have reported in the amount of time previously and currently spent on campus suggests that the nature and demands of the job today are also different. Much of the on-campus leadership is now delegated to the chief academic officer (CAO) or provost, who tends to be the campus number-two leader (behind the president) and reports spending little to moderate time on off-campus activities.

The external work of campus leaders is tied to the growing importance of the need to secure more resources as expenses grow and public dollars do not keep pace, and institutions cannot raise tuition high enough to support their expenses. Presidents find themselves as the lead entrepreneur. Of the ten areas identified most frequently by long-serving presidents as taking more time today than these areas initially did during their tenure, half are directly related to securing or spending dollars (fund raising, capital improvement, budget and financial management, entrepreneurship, and operating costs) and three others are indirectly related to this (technology planning, strategic planning, and enrollment management). Furthermore, fund raising is the task all presidents, regardless of their time in office, most often identified as being the one they were underprepared to address when they began their position. Presidents meet with potential donors to the institution, such as alumni and corporate leaders, and they are the key lobbyists interacting with public officials in the statehouse as well as in Washington, DC. They drive entrepreneurial agendas by building relationships with corporate leaders and seeking technology transfer and licensing agreements; sponsoring new business incubators; and seeking to capitalize on patents and intellectual property rights; and they are ultimately responsible for traditional and innovative auxiliary services (such as hospitals, residence halls, and
athletics), investments, and endowment returns. These external demands tax
the effectiveness of the president on campus and the role in shared governance.
Presidents simply are absent from on-campus decision making.

Therefore, presidents influence campus through a variety of mechanisms,
such as leveraging strategic plans and budgets, managing and evaluating se-
nior staff, and promoting institutional goals. An essential mechanism is through
engaging stakeholders. Clark Kerr, former the chancellor of the University
of California system, described the difficulty presidents have with serving
so many different stakeholders, from traditional ones such as faculty,
students, and alumni to newer stakeholders such as business and industry, fed-
eral and state governments, local communities, and, over time, international
communities. 33

It is indirect not direct interactions through which presidents wield the most
influence on campus. They serve in what is a highly symbolic role as campus
heads and signal intent through the interpretations of their actions. 34 In his na-
tional study on presidential leadership, Birnbaum notes that “presidents, by vir-
tue of their hierarchical positions and legitimacy, are believed by others to have
a coherent sense of the institution and are therefore permitted, if not expected,
to articulate institutional purposes.” 35 From this perspective, “leadership influ-
ences people to focus their attention on specific stimuli and to interpret them in
the ways intended by the leader . . . Good leadership is not defined by an ability
to get subordinates to do something, but rather by a leader’s effectiveness in
making values and activities meaningful to others and developing a vocabulary
to be used in communicating that meaning throughout the institution.” 36 Shap-
ing interpretation and meaning allows presidents influence across numerous
stakeholders.

As part of his national study of presidents, Birnbaum grouped presidents into
three categories: exemplary, modal, and failed. Exemplary presidents developed
the skills and knowledge to “influence both the way their institutions are man-
aged and the interpretations that define the reality of other organizational par-
ticipants” and they “gave equal attention to tasks and relationships, and have a
collaborative relationship with the faculty.” 37 Modal presidents, he found, “man-
age institutional processes but have lost the ability to affect the interpretive life
of the campus.” 38 They no longer can affect relationships and meaning, and in-
stead focus on management tasks. The research reinforces the idea that manag-
ers do not make exemplary leaders. The final group, failed presidents, develop an
adversarial relationship with the faculty and lose the ability to shape meaning.
Birnbaum writes elsewhere about this phenomenon, paraphrasing an old song, "Old presidents never die; they just lose their faculties."39

The difficulty for many presidents is that the demands of the position, including off-campus and on-campus stakeholder expectations, require that they be able to effectively function equally well across a set of leadership contradictions. A roundtable focus group of contemporary presidents convened by ACE found that they need to simultaneously

- be visionary and pragmatic;
- have an on-campus presence and work externally off-campus;
- focus on immediate needs and keep an eye on the future;
- balance long-term patience with immediate intensity;
- appreciate and understand complexity of the job, the institution, and the environment and keep things simple; and
- exude confidence and have humility. 40

Finding a way to accomplish all this when some tasks do not align with an individual’s personal strengths is difficult. The complexities of the job and the real limits to leadership affect the extent to which presidents can be effective leaders regardless of how much people expect them to lead.

**Faculty Leaders**

Faculty have historically exerted leadership through shared governance structures. While other structures exist such as councils or university-wide bodies, the faculty senate is the most widely utilized formal structure for faculty leadership, with 90 percent of institutions having such a structure.41 Although there were senates created as early as 1890, most faculty senates emerged during and after World War II42 and were part of the university movement, which established faculty as major power brokers on campus. By the 1960s, faculty senates were normative on most campuses.43 Since World War II, faculty influence grew and faculty continued to professionalize, which resulted in more checks on governing boards and the administration than in any previous time period.44 The reason for the growth of senates was the prevailing view that faculty were professional and that professionals should have direct input into overall organizational decisions, particularly their own working conditions.45 However, it is also important to note that historically many senates emerged as a reaction to overreach by administrators in academic decision making, and an attempt by faculty to equalize influence.
Formal governance structures evolved as a means to create shared governance where it did not exist in spirit or action. However, this structure was not sufficient on many public campuses, and unionization efforts throughout the 1970s led to faculty being involved in campus leadership through collective bargaining rather than through shared governance.

The traditional view is that faculty inclusion in major university decision making is a way to protect faculty interest and ensure that institutions maintain fidelity to the academic mission. It is important to note that tensions between faculty and administrators are historic as much as contemporary, grounded in the differing perspective, focus, and priorities of administrators and faculty. Of the many criticisms of faculty senates and the ability of faculty to participate in shared governance, almost none are empirically based. These critiques suggest faculty are too deliberative and slow, are too inclined toward consensus, cannot make hard decisions, and are too self-interested. In one key study that examines this untested assumption, Eckel identified how faculty are willing and able to participate in a constructive way in institutional decision making, even in high-stakes decisions such as program closure, and that faculty are responsible agents in shared governance processes in ways that counter administrative common wisdom.

Most research on senates examines and describes their structure and authority. One key difference that has been identified is the distinction between elite and non-elite institutions and those more market sensitive. At research universities, faculty experience greater levels of freedom and autonomy, but at less selective institutions faculty may experience greater restraints and less involvement in governance. So context can impact the ability of faculty to have an authentic leadership role. Other studies look at the representativeness of the faculty, voting rights, subcommittee structures, and purpose. For example, having a sound executive committee or smaller committees has been identified with higher satisfaction among faculty involved. Senates can also have vastly different power, with some being mostly advisory and others having significant delegated authority. Faculty's leadership is more likely to be prominent in those institutions where they are delegated authority, which typically relates to academic issues, curriculum, and student-related matters. This grounding was codified in the 1966 joint statement on government by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), with signatories by the American Council on Education (ACE) representing presidents and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) speaking for trustees, and outlined the
responsibilities of senates. Faculty involvement in governance is a fundamental part of American higher education and embodies a central value on most campuses, although there is not universal agreement on the areas in which faculty should have authority or how widely construed their authority should be.

One important aspect of faculty governance is the way senates exert leadership potential. Three approaches are discussed: Birnbaum, Tierney and Minor. Birnbaum looked at the espoused and actual roles that senates play in university decision making. He uses four alternative organizational models—bureaucratic, collegial, political, and symbolic. Birnbaum documents that senates are more likely to be inefficient and slow, and not politically representative, and are more likely to expose latent conflict than to increase a sense of community. But he suggests efficiency should not be as important as effectiveness and describes an effective senate as one where senate leaders and administration leaders meet regularly (formally as members of committees and cabinets and informally), communicate, cooperate on goals, and recognize and respect each body’s scope of authority. Birnbaum takes a complex view of effectiveness by arguing that senates operate under different and sometimes multiple logic models—bureaucratic, political, and collegial.

Under Birnbaum’s bureaucratic model, a faculty senate would clarify institutional purposes, specify program objectives, reallocate income resources, develop new income sources, and be involved in issues such as the management of academic operations, degree requirements, academic behavior, and program evaluation. A senate, in the model, might be considered effective to the extent that it efficiently considered institutional problems and, through rational processes, developed rules, regulations, and procedures that resolved them.

In Birnbaum’s political model, the senate is a forum for the articulation of interests and as the setting in which decisions on institutional policies and goals are reached through compromise, negotiation, and forming coalitions. Senates provide a means for discussion and conflict resolution over the mission and operation of the institution. A senate, under the political system, might be considered effective to the extent that, perceived as fully representative of its constituencies, it formulates and clarifies goals and policies.

In Birnbaum’s collegial model, the senate is a forum for achieving dynamic of consensus. A senate, in the collegial model, might be considered effective to the extent that, through interaction across key constituent groups, it develops shared values leading to consensus.

In Birnbaum’s symbolic model, the senate is most important as a symbol about faculty voice, a reminder to the campus, including the board, that faculty
perspective is important in decision making processes. In the symbolic frame
the senate is effective if administrators and staff feel that decisions need to be
run through the senate for input. From this perspective, the outcomes of
decisions are less important than the search for consensus and the use of
democratically-oriented forms of decision making.

In addition to these manifest functions, Birnbaum notes that latent functions
of senates are also important and should be considered when thinking about
ways faculty can contribute to leadership and decision making. In terms of latent
functions, the senate can provide opportunities for socialization, congregation,
discussion, professional screening, and the like. Senates can contribute to insti-
tutional stability in the potentially divided and changing environment of higher
education. Thus leadership is exhibited in varying ways, and faculty who can
operate across bureaucratic, political, and collegial approaches will be more
effective.

Other organizing constructs exist to explain the work of senates. For ex-
ample, Tierney categorizes the functions of the senate as directional (where the
chair gives direction to the members, usually bounded by the senate doors),
news related (where the chair or president or another administrator shares of-
official campus news), ceremonial (emphasizing important events), confirmational
(wherein the senate confirms a decision), and decisional.57 The most important
is the decisional function, which is where the bulk of the senate's work takes
place. As important as the other functions may be, the main purpose or role of
the senate is making decisions that affect the university; this is the function that
should take up the most time and energy of the senate. Tierney suggests that suc-
cessful faculty leaders optimize the decision function and not allow other roles
to monopolize time.

Minor argues that there are four types of senates—functional, influential,
ceremonial, and subverted—and that they have very different consequences for
effective faculty leadership and decision making.58 Functional senates have clearly
designated authority, a traditional electoral, representative structure, and, like
the Birnbaum model, serve the bureaucratic functions of setting goals and mak-
ing decisions, mostly related to faculty-specific matters. Influential senates share
some characteristics with functional senates in that they make decisions related
to faculty specific issues, but in addition they create and frame their own agenda
to promote policy changes within the institution that aim to promote the gen-
eral welfare of the institution. Influential senates generally have collaborative,
instead of confrontational, relationships with the administration. Ceremonial
senates are fairly inactive, existing mainly in name only as symbolic artifacts that have little real interest in and influence on governance or institutional leadership. Subverted senates are ineffective because they have been subverted by other venues for faculty participation in governance such as an informal or ad hoc kitchen cabinet group of trusted faculty that the administration turns to for advice. Subverted senates may maintain authority in traditional areas of faculty concern such as curriculum, tenure, and instruction but usually clash with the administration.

Regardless of the typologies of senates, the focus on senate structures and roles is too narrow and does little to advance a deeper understanding. A broader view of shared governance may be more constructive, including factors such as the relationships between faculty and president, and between faculty, presidents, and boards; how senates learn and change; and how senates fit into the larger governance ecology. For instance, a senate may be labeled as ceremonial because the institutional environment will not permit it any other role. However, the issue may change when a different lens of study is adopted. In considering the ways faculty leaders can be effective, these broader viewpoints are critical to understanding leadership among faculty.

There is great concern today about whether faculty can continue to play a role in campus leadership through governance. Given the shrinking number of tenure-track professors, from 70 percent with tenure or on the tenure track in the 1970s to only 30 percent of faculty currently with tenure or on the tenure track, far fewer can feel free to speak up on governance issues without fearing retribution. This leaves open questions about how authentic shared governance is today.

The 70 percent of faculty off the tenure track are generally not involved in governance, so a large majority of faculty no longer have any input into institutional decisions. Those who are tenured and tenure-track faculty may not well represent the views and priorities of the whole professoriate. A recent report from the Association of Governing Boards highlights the lack of faculty input into today's governance processes and questions whether a true shared governance approach exists to any meaningful extent. The report also calls on boards to reengage and re-envision shared governance with a changing faculty.

Additionally, Minor has identified that the new generation of tenure track faculty are not interested in participating in governance, which represents an-
other challenge to creating effective shared governance. While the desire to participate is greater in bachelor's institutions, at doctoral institutions, where faculty tend to have the most influence, the interest in participating in governance is the lowest, with only 19 percent showing a strong interest in participating and 75 percent saying they do not have an interest. Minor's survey also highlighted the fact that faculty have authority over a narrow range of topics, which contributes to the perception that senates are not influential and cannot impact institutional operations in consequential ways. Given reports that administrators have centralized decision making in the last twenty years, it is not surprising that faculty are feeling a lack of involvement in important institutional decisions. So the lack of a meaningful role that faculty perceive among senates feeds into the lack of interest into participation.

Kezar and Lester suggest that as a result of the decline of shared governance, faculty increasingly lead from outside formal structures. In this grassroots leadership approach, faculty form informal groups and lead change, but not from within the formal structures. The research suggests that leadership is defined as bringing about important changes on campuses and that this is increasingly happening independently from institutional structures. Effect not structure matters most. For example, faculty are creating new majors, forming centers on environmentalism, advancing institutional policies related to environmental sustainability, helping foster environments of inclusion for students of color, and obtaining funding for new buildings and programs but from outside of senates and committee structures. If traditional structures are involved they may be so only at the end of the process and out of necessity. Thus, new directions for faculty leadership are being documented and may be more prominent in the future.

As faculty leadership faces various challenges not only internal to the institution but also externally, the future of shared governance remains fragile. For instance, state legislatures have put increased emphasis on linking institutional funding to certain performance-based outcomes, in an attempt to improve undergraduate teaching, to assess faculty performance, and to contribute to state economic development. Anderson notes it is reasonable to have administrators deal with these issues because faculty do not have the time, expertise, nor inclination to do so and that administrators are better equipped to respond to these challenges. As pressure increases and the challenges become more complicated, the future of shared faculty leadership via traditional governance structures does not look good.
The Contexts Shaping Influence

Leadership in all three domains occurs within the context of the institution, which shapes how leaders act, the impact of those actions, and how others perceive the importance of those actions. For example, the literature on senates, cited above, documents how external contexts, campus environments, changes in the academic workforce, and other contextual features shape the nature of academic leadership. Writing about presidential leadership, Birnbaum notes that "presidential leadership is influenced by interacting webs of administrative routines, environmental pressures, and political processes that take place in the context of institutional history and culture." Such webs influence boards and faculty as well. Colleges and universities, while having characteristics similar to other types of organizations, have a set of atypical organizational dynamics that mitigate the direct influence of any single group. This section explores three of the institution-specific contexts that shape leadership: dual sources of authority, loose coupling, and garbage-can decision making.

First, unlike more traditional hierarchical organizations, where authority is correlated with one's administrative position, colleges and universities are defined by their dual sources of authority—bureaucratic (or administrative) and professional (or academic). As discussed above, colleges and universities evolved in ways that gave faculty priority over the curriculum and administrators responsibility over managerial elements. The result of this evolution is two sources of authority within a single organization. Bureaucratic authority is grounded in the organization's structure and arises from the legal rights of the board as delegated to senior administrators to set direction, control and monitor budgets, develop institution strategy, hire and terminate employees, develop and implement policies, and assess progress toward objectives and priorities. The second source of authority—professional authority—stems from the high degree of knowledge, expertise, and specialization required to perform the core functions of the institution (i.e., teaching and research). This authority provides the faculty with a different and often competing source of influence, in many ways akin to doctors in hospitals, lawyers in firms, and consultants in professional service consultancies. The effect is that authority is not consolidated in the hands of the organization's positional leaders. Instead, it is dispersed; some might suggest that authority is shared, but in reality there exist two types of authority. Depending on the topic and the context (such as budgeting and planning), administrative authority can be the stronger source. However, professional authority is
dominant in decisions about faculty hiring, curricular offerings, and the research that is pursued. It even strongly shapes the overall strategy an institution pursues.\textsuperscript{71}

This dynamic is captured in the 1966 “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities,” jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. The Statement attempts to outline areas of responsibility for faculty, administrators, and trustees, as well as areas of shared authority. However, decisions are not easy to categorize, and a topic can easily overlap traditional areas of responsibility, leading to conflict between sources of authority. When Duke University sought to open a campus in China, administrators invoked administrative authority regarding planning, budgeting, and setting the strategic priority of the institution. Faculty, however, invoked professional authority focusing on the curriculum and the conferring of degrees. The result was a longstanding stalemate that needed continued negotiation between influence wielders.\textsuperscript{72}

Second, the relationships between various units and the central administration and between the units and departments themselves can be described as “loosely coupled,” which makes central coordination and oversight, and, by extension, the role of the president, difficult.\textsuperscript{73} Loose coupling describes weak connections among organizational units. Both the relationship between units, and that between units and the center are weak. Information travels slowly and indirectly between these areas, and coordination among them is difficult and minimal. Long-time University of Chicago president Robert Hutchins’s definition of a university serves as a pointed reminder of the nature of loose coupling in higher education: “The university is a collection of departments tied together by a common steam plant.”\textsuperscript{74} While it can be expected that loose coupling is most descriptive of large institutions, smaller colleges can also be defined by it.

While loosely coupled organizations create problems for central administrators seeking to coordinate organizational activities, these weak relationships also have some advantages.\textsuperscript{75} First, loosely coupled systems are able to respond more sensitively to environmental changes. However, the likelihood is just as great that the unit will pay attention to external stimuli rather than requests from a president. The benefit here is that changes pertinent to one department, such as new professional standards in accounting, may affect the curriculum there, but these changes do not require a curricular overhaul throughout the institution. Second, loosely coupled organizations promote and encourage localized
innovations and, at the same time, prevent poor adaptations from spreading to other parts of the organization. The curricular change described above does not require the consent of a busy president or consensus by other departments; instead, the individual department concerned can respond more quickly. Furthermore, poor ideas are not spread easily throughout the institution. Keeping bad decisions quarantined means that although presidents may not know about the adaptations occurring throughout the organization or may not be able coordinate those changes, they will probably not have to fix widespread damage caused by bad ideas. Third, loosely coupled organizations benefit from localized expertise. For instance, the president does not need to be an expert in all disciplines. Local decisions can be made by the people who know best. Lastly, loosely coupled organizations have few coordination and centralization costs. A large central bureaucracy is not required, allowing institutions to invest more resources locally rather than centrally.

Regardless of the organizational pluses of loose coupling, one drawback is that administrative leaders cannot easily create organizational efficiency because of weak central coordination. Instead, they struggle to disseminate helpful innovations widely, because communication between units occurs indirectly, sporadically, and unevenly. Senior administrators often learn that units are working at odds with one another, and with the central administration, as they each scan their own environments and pursue local adaptations. Of course loose coupling empowers faculty leaders to be highly innovative in their own units. For example, one unit may be advancing its service-learning activities, while another is focusing on graduate education, and a third internationalizing its curricula. Aligning activities and priorities is a continual challenge for university leaders, what the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities called "institutional coherence."

A final dynamic is garbage-can decision making that takes place in organizations labelled "organized anarchies." Three additional organizational dynamics beyond the control even of presidents create these conditions. First, colleges and universities pursue a set of inconsistent, ambiguous, and uncertain goals, and these goals may conflict. For instance, institutions are concerned both with serving local students and with having a global effect; they seek the unfettered pursuit of knowledge and the leveraging of scientific breakthroughs for economic gain. Second, the ways in which they conduct their core functions—particularly teaching and learning—are complex. Most faculty do not really agree on how students learn best, nor do they understand the essential processes involved in
creating civic-minded students or globally competent citizens. The result is that multiple informal theories of what should happen and how it should happen exist within the institution. Third, because time and attention are limited, participation in decisions is fluid as faculty and administrators choose among competing opportunities, based on their own preferences as to what is important. Although they are busy people, key decision makers cannot be in all places at all times. "Every entrance is an exit somewhere else . . . Participation stems from other demands on the participants’ time."82 Taken together, these three elements create situations Cohen and March label “organized anarchies.”80

The effect of these organizational realities is that decision outcomes depend on the combined flow of (1) decision makers, (2) institutional problems, and (3) potential solutions that are present in the institution. In places where they are in contact, these three streams of people, problems, and solutions come together in a range of metaphoric garbage cans throughout the institution. Solutions are in search of problems as much as problems are in search of solutions, and decisions depend on the mix of people, problems, and solutions in the garbage can at any particular time.81 Organizations are often thought to render decisions after leaders have defined the problem, explored potential outcomes, and selected a course of action to maximize the effect of the decision.82 However, the dynamics of colleges and universities create a situation within organized anarchies—described as garbage-can decision making—in which the prototypical, rational approach to rendering decisions is only one way to actually reach a decision.83

In the garbage-can model, decision making takes place in one of three ways. Decisions can be made by resolution, in which participants make a concerted effort to apply solutions to recognized problems. Decisions can also be made by flight, when problems become attached to other unintended solutions or participants. For example, a suggested science or foreign language requirement can easily turn into conversations about faculty hiring, classroom space utilization, or the undue influence of accrediting agencies, different and seemingly unrelated sets of problems and solutions. Finally, decisions can be made by oversight. Key participants are too busy to participate in all decisions, so problems and solutions in another garbage can become coupled together with little attention and involvement from key campus leaders.

It is the mix of problems, solutions, and people in a decision opportunity that shape the outcome, not just the preferences of administrative leaders. To render their desired outcomes, presidents can (1) spend time on the problem, since people willing to invest time on any particular decision are likely to
have a disproportionate effect on its outcomes; (2) persist in the decision process and see the decisions through to fruition, as intended outcomes may be undone if the mix in the garbage can changes; (3) exchange status for substance, since individuals may be more concerned about being involved than in achieving a particular outcome, and facilitating their involvement in decision processes may be more important to them than the actual outcomes; (4) put a large number of decisions on the table to hedge one’s bets, so that eventually a decision on one of these presidential issues will be rendered unobtrusively; (5) provide multiple garbage cans to attract undesired solutions to other problems; and (6) focus on a series of small-scale changes that have a cumulative effect and avoid the attractiveness of a high-stakes decision.\textsuperscript{84}

Institutional leadership not only operates within an organizational context, but also in a larger environmental one.\textsuperscript{85} Public college and university presidents lead institutions that are either a part of a state system for higher education or under the auspices of a state-wide coordinating board. Part of the political environment also includes state legislatures. They determine the amount of general state support for public institutions through block grants. Furthermore, in many states legislatures set tuition levels (although this is sometimes done by state boards), thus determining the amount of resources from the institution’s primary source of revenue. Legislatures also develop accountability goals and metrics for public institutions that shape institutional priorities. Federal regulation and the courts also shape the context in which institutions operate. Decisions regarding admissions and financial aid—as they relate to diversity and affirmative action goals—are common, if not frustrating, examples of federal and legal influence. Other topics—such as privacy, sexual misconduct, international student visas and admissions, patent policy, college costs, and even toxic waste produced in university labs—are additional issues shaped by federal and legal interventions. Birnbaum notes that “as the locus of influence moves from the campus to the state, public sector presidents may find themselves becoming like middle managers in public agencies rather than campus leaders.”\textsuperscript{86} The organizational and environmental contexts in which presidents, trustees, and faculty must operate create a complex set of rules of the game.

**Effective Leadership in the Academy**

There is much longstanding interest in effective leadership within the academy. The above groups, to be effective, leverage leadership to move the institution and their agendas forward. Different schools of thought help illuminate
different approaches and strategies to exert influence and are applicable to boards, senior administrators and faculty. Much of the empirical literature focuses on presidents, thus our examples below will highlight them more often than the leadership of boards or faculty, but these theories have shown promise across different types of leaders.

**Contingency Leadership**

Perhaps the most insightful school of thought has focused on the **contingency of leadership**. Effective leaders understand the importance of the context in which they are operating, and they know that leadership varies by the institutional context, environmental conditions, campus culture, and organization dilemma being addressed (advancing a campus diversity versus a cost savings/efficiency program, for example). As John Levin notes regarding presidents, “in all cases, institutional context is equally or more important than the perception of presidential influence in contributing to organizational actions and outcomes... Presidents who were perceived as the most influential are those who fit into the socially constructed story of the institution.” In other words, the organizational and environmental contexts vary so much that those seeking influence must modify their actions to make sense of and be effective within their specific campus context.

One very important contextual element that effective leaders pay attention to is the set of unique characteristics individual institutions possess. As discussed above and throughout this volume, colleges and universities are characterized by certain features that distinguish them from other organizations and, in turn, affect their leadership. Some examples of these features are shared governance; academic freedom and autonomy; tenure; multiple and complex authority structures, with boards of trustees and faculty senates; and unique reward structures that are distributed between the disciplines and the institutions. Birnbaum noted that presidents in his studies were more successful when they worked within and acknowledged these various aspects of the academic culture. Neumann noted that presidents who develop communication skills, style, and a strategy that is culturally appropriate are perceived as more effective by key constituencies.

It is not the specific behaviors, styles, traits, or actions of leaders that make them effective, but the extent to which those elements are accepted and viewed as legitimate by key stakeholders. Underlying contingency theories of leadership is the notion that leaders need the support of different groups of individuals in an
institution, groups that often have very different priorities, passions, and perspectives. As Birnbaum notes, "good leadership is what its constituents believe it to be—and they don't always agree." \footnote{16} For faculty members, effectiveness may mean having significant autonomy and being included in key decision-making processes, while for trustees, it may mean defining an aggressive campus growth agenda or raising money to advance the institution's mission.

A third element in the contingency approach to effective leadership is temporal. Over the last forty years, the characterization of effective leaders has changed, reflecting shifts in society. \footnote{17} Forty years bounds the timeframe, because it is the period during which the college presidency has been more formally studied. Forty years ago, more hierarchical and authoritative images of college presidents were seen as being effective. \footnote{18} The characteristics noted for effective presidents were also often considered typical masculine traits, such as risk taking, task orientation, confidence, and the ability to work alone. Contemporary views of effective presidents focus more on relationship building, collaboration, and a quest for input, characteristics often associated with women and reflective of more contemporary social customs. \footnote{19} It is only more recently that women have moved into college presidencies in substantive proportions, and therefore these changing qualities may reflect alterations in expectations of what is deemed appropriate. In 1986, women held approximately 10 percent of all presidencies, while in 2011 their share more than doubled, to 25 percent. \footnote{20} For instance, James Fisher and James Koch, drawing largely on studies done in the 1980s, suggest that presidents should use more unilateral forms of power, and judiciously punish and reward; demonstrate expertise; maintain appropriate distance; and develop charisma and public presence. \footnote{21} Later studies, in contrast, focus on power and influence as a two-way process and show that effective leaders are negotiators, coalition builders, and facilitators. \footnote{22} The fact that presidents use power effectively has remained important throughout the decades, but the understanding of the concept of power and its dynamics is different.

\textbf{Trait and Behavior Approach to Leadership}

Although the most complex and nuanced approach to understanding leadership effectiveness is through contingency theories, there is a long tradition in higher education and in the broader leadership literature that focuses on the \textit{traits and behaviors} of effective leaders. Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum summarized much of this tradition that tried to identify certain traits that would make a leader effective. \footnote{23} Rather than actually testing whether certain traits
were associated with more effectiveness, they argue that most of the studies seek characteristics of people who had been identified as effective presidents. The problem with this approach is that such studies strongly mirror expected characteristics, corresponding to the period of time in which each study was conducted.101

Studies that concentrate on behaviors, such as whether leaders should focus on goals, vision, planning, or motivating people to action, fall into similar traps. These studies reflect people's expectations or perceptions, rather than testing effective behavior by looking at how behavior affects certain outcomes. If expectations of traits and behaviors differ by campus climate and culture as well as time (as they often do), then the identified traits and behaviors of effective leaders will vary with individual expectations within the setting, but they may not be correlated with change or effectiveness.102 The importance of qualities such as credibility and integrity suggests that presidents, faculty, and trustees must be clear about their values and act authentically; they will jeopardize their effectiveness if they are perceived as lacking these qualities. Overall, the search for universal traits and qualities has not proven to be particularly helpful. Instead, such studies tend to offer time- and context-specific insights. That said, certain themes do appear vital to understanding leadership effectiveness: honesty, integrity, and respect, for example, seem to transcend context, stakeholder, and institutional type. Research has generated further consensus regarding certain qualities that tend to be identified as important across any institutional setting, such as trustworthiness; fairness; honesty; respect, or treating people with dignity; caring; and credibility or integrity.103

**Transactional and Transformational Leadership**

An ongoing debate in the literature is whether leaders should play a *transactional* or *transformational* leadership role.104 Transactional leadership focuses on leader-follower exchange, such as allocating resources, rewards, or status; controlling budgetary processes; creating priorities; and establishing accountability and assessment structures. Transformational leadership, alternatively, involves leaders who interact with followers in ways that appeal to their higher needs and aspirations. They motivate others by connecting through higher moral purposes. Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum argue that transactional leadership might be the more effective approach in higher education, given the relationships between presidents and faculty and the organizational contexts in which they must work (such as loose coupling), as a more directive influence by a president may
not be effective. They believe that presidents should rely on exchange, rather than a higher calling, and be influential through ongoing organizational activities such as the yearly budgetary process, the allocation of rewards, and accountability structures. Other studies, however, suggest that effective leaders can be transformational by creating an overarching vision for the campus, playing a role in its overall guidance and direction by motivating and inspiring, and demonstrating commitment for moving forward in a new direction.

A middle ground exists, and recent studies demonstrate that effective leaders use both transactional and transformational approaches. For example, we examined college presidents who are successful in advancing campus-wide diversity agendas and found that such presidents articulate a preference for strategies that could be described as transformational, but that they were much more effective when they used both transactional and transformational approaches. These presidents recognize that different stakeholders respond to different approaches, and that both are needed. They found that the appropriateness of certain approaches is often tied to the stage of the change efforts. For instance, when a campus is initially starting a concerted effort to advance campus diversity, strategies that inspire (transformational leadership) are necessary. As the campus advances in its efforts, more transactional leadership is necessary, using rewards and accountability structures. Our study also reinforces the importance of thinking about effectiveness as varying by stakeholder, phase of change, and cultural context—again reinforcing contingency approaches to leadership.

Cognitive Theories of Leadership

While theories of transaction and transformation suggest that leadership is more than behavior or traits, cognitive theories of leadership focus specifically on the ways leaders make sense of and shape understanding within a campus. Cognitive theories examine the socially constructed world of organizations. The premise of such approaches is that organizations consist of events and actions that are open to interpretation: Is opening a state-of-the-art student recreation center a good thing, for instance to create community, or a waste of precious institutional resources that should focus on academic priorities? It probably depends on whether the institution serves traditional-age, residential students or students who are only on campus for classes. Action and behavior thus proceed from cognition. Shaping and understanding the meaning and cognition associated with ambiguous and uncertain elements of campus life is the centerpiece of this approach.
One of the largest studies of university leadership focused on how presidents approach and view their organizations, and people's actions within them, through archetypes: bureaucratic, collegial, political, and symbolic. Leaders using a bureaucratic frame observe their campuses through a lens of structure and organization, pay attention to goals and priorities, and invoke authority and control. Leaders using a collegial frame focus on people, relationships, team building, consensus, and loyalty. Leaders using a political frame see the inherent politics of organizations, build agendas, mobilize coalitions, and focus on negotiation and conflict. Lastly, presidents using a symbolic frame focus on mission, vision, values, symbols, stories, and the history of the institution. Regardless of how complex leaders strive to be (even ones with doctorates), Birnbaum's research suggests that most college and university presidents see the world through one or two sets of assumptions or frames.

**Team-Based Leadership**

Researchers furthermore have shifted the unit of analysis from an individual leader to a team of leaders to ensure greater cognitive complexity. A single individual rarely possesses all of the skills and knowledge required to be an effective leader. Leadership teams provide an avenue for creating greater presidential effectiveness by capitalizing on different people's strengths—some people might be good at working with others and developing relationships, different individuals can influence institutional politics, others can effectively examine data, while still others can communicate and translate information in effective ways to the campus community. Bensimon and Neumann propose that presidents can be much more effective if they work in "real" leadership teams (as opposed to illusionary teams), using examples such as working with the presidential cabinet and capitalizing on greater expertise throughout the institution. They advocate moving beyond the image of leadership as being invested in a single individual and to conceptualize leadership as a group process. Their research demonstrates that teams can develop and leverage greater cognitive complexity and be more effective, but only if the teams act in what the authors call "authentic ways." Their study outlines many of the characteristics needed to develop real leadership teams, such as ensuring that criticism is embraced, building relationships among the team members so that people feel free to share information, guaranteeing that the president is truly open to sharing power and being challenged, and recognizing the importance of the collective sense leadership team members make together. They also note that real leadership teams fit into
the unique culture and context of higher education that has traditionally been based on consensus, collaboration, and an intellectual environment.

As a set, these theories of leadership provide insight into leadership effectiveness in the academy and, used in combination, can help us better understand the complexities of what makes presidents, faculty and, to some extent, trustees influential. Leaders, regardless of formal position, must analyze and be fully aware of the multiple contexts and environments in which they operate. In a way they must become anthropologists. They must also balance tasks and relationship building. They need to examine and understand organizations, problems, and people in complex ways that lead to complex actions. And they need to build effective leadership teams, as well as distribute leadership by helping to identify and develop leaders throughout the campus. Given today’s complex and contradictory environment, contingency approaches are particularly important, suggesting that what it takes to be an effective leader depends on stakeholder expectations, time period, and institutional context.

Conclusion: Shared Influence, Shared Leadership

This chapter argues that within higher education are multiple spheres of leadership that interact through governance structures to shape institutional direction—trustees, presidents, faculty, and others not discussed here in depth, such as administrative staff and students. These multiple spheres can be catalyzed to create a shared notion of leadership that benefits the university. Today and into tomorrow, the effectiveness of academic leadership may well depend on how strongly a complex web of leadership exists—involving cabinet, external stakeholders, faculty, staff, and students.112

A shared leadership approach, albeit difficult to implement, may serve institutions well. While the idea of shared governance is common to the academic arena, shared leadership is not, and traditional forms of shared governance are not substitutes for shared leadership. Shared leadership involves the delegation of authority, and very little authority is delegated in shared governance; instead, it is often divided or limited to particular topics. See, for instance, how the 1966 Statement seeks to direct and divide areas of responsibility. In shared leadership, administrators and faculty are asked to approach challenges much more collaboratively, rather than sequentially with one group weighing in on the decisions of others. There are other key distinctions. For instance, shared leadership involves a great number of individuals while shared governance involves only officially voted or nominated individuals.
A shared leadership model has many advantages, but it is difficult to execute effectively. Shared leadership is particularly well adapted to addressing the organizational characteristics noted earlier, such as dual sources of authority, loose coupling, and garbage-can decision making. For example, within a shared leadership, presidents vest more power in leaders across campus, and they put accountability systems in place to monitor decision making and its effect. These new accountability structures might yield more decisions through resolution and less through oversight.

Shared leadership also can help better address challenges that leaders face in the external environment. The rate and pace of decision making has increased; a single individual is no longer capable of understanding the vast array of issues that face higher education, and leaders increasingly need to rely on a broad group of people with varying expertise to address all of these challenges. An overwhelming number of tasks vie for presidential attention. As leadership is shared with more individuals, formal leaders, such as presidents and vice presidents or elected faculty senate leaders, can delegate responsibility to others and ensure that they spend their own time only on the most critical issues. Second, a shared leadership model allows the institution to address a larger and more diverse agenda more effectively. Colleges and universities will have more priorities, rather than fewer. Shared leadership helps to ensure that an issue is being worked on by the campus, even though the president is not directly addressing this issue. Third, a shared leadership model expands the number of people who embody the values of the institution. Diversity, access and affordability, and quality are often values that are in conflict, and a shared leadership approach may be better able to cope with such disparate priorities. Finally, a shared leadership approach is a natural evolution for higher education, which has gone from relatively small institutions with a narrow mission to complex corporate structures with multiple missions and a vast array of stakeholders and external influences.

One of the reasons that shared leadership may seem more fictitious than reality is because of the headlines generated when faculty, trustees, and administrators clash. Little is more contentious than when faculty vote “no confidence” in the president, which often call for boards to step in and take action. This is a drastic situation that reflects the potential contentiousness of both shared governance and shared leadership, so much so that it is often referred to colloquially as the “nuclear option.” MacTaggart in his review of twenty cases of no-confidence votes in the past ten years made the following observations, although he notes
that "the realities of a no-confidence vote are always more complex than any one of the parties may allege":

- Most calls of no confidence are grounded in faculty perceptions that presidents fail to engage, become arrogant, and issue top-down edicts (mirroring Birnbaum’s findings).
- No-confidence votes tend to be tied to presidents trying to affect drastic change without engaging the faculty in expected ways.
- Conversely, faculty use these votes to express serious dismay with leaders’ poor judgment or lack of progress on key institutional priorities.
- Ethical lapses such as excessive expenditures, disproportionate compensation, and moral turpitude are other causes of no-confidence votes. Presidents who overspend or have little accountability on their actions seem ripe for such actions by the faculty.

Such deep strife between the faculty and administration require boards to act but this can be difficult as the issues may not always be clear and boards need to consider carefully which side—faculty or the president—they will support. What might be shared leadership becomes leadership coalitions and conflicting interest groups. Boards need to respect faculty voices and not rush to judgment. Such situations put into direct conflict the leadership of the three key groups.

While shared leadership can be challenging based on the multiplicity of stakeholders, unclear lines of control and power, diffuse influence and authority, and difficult environmental circumstances, the evidence in support of a shared approach to leadership suggests it is worth the struggle. This chapter also argues for the importance of a robust shared governance approach as part of shared leadership. While higher education institutions have a long history of shared governance, AGB’s recent report suggests that shared governance has been in decline in the last two decades. Pressures to cut costs and respond to external challenges have led to trends of top-down decision making. We hope to encourage further examination of the need to view various stakeholders as shared stewards of the overall organization in difficult times.

As the opening metaphor of the orchestra suggests, many institutions may end up with an enterprise that soon sounds like a brass section only instead of the rich array of complex and rich music that has characterized higher education leadership. And while we often have not fulfilled the potential of a full orchestra, research tells us this is where we should be headed.
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