Please find attached a summary of key points from the literature on governance and a list of core readings. Participants are expected to familiarize themselves with this pre-reading as well as the Brandeis Faculty Handbook available on the Faculty Senate website (http://www.brandeis.edu/provost/faculty-info/faculty_handbook.html) and the NEASC Reaccreditation Self-Study Standards and related information on the Provost website (http://www.brandeis.edu/neasc/).
Prior to the nineteenth century, institutional decision-making in the US was the exclusive domain of the president and board. The executive hold on institutional governance was weakened when, in 1825, faculty protests against this top-heavy model at Harvard resulted in a redistribution of institutional power, as faculty gained control over instruction and student discipline.1

In the first half of the twentieth century, the faculty role in shared governance, as articulated by major higher education associations, was broadly defined. In 1920, the AAUP’s Committee on College and University Governance released its first statement on shared governance “emphasizing the importance of faculty involvement in the selection of administrators, preparation of the budget, and determination of educational policies.”2 This statement coincided with the growing professionalization of the faculty role.3

The 1966 Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities, jointly issued by the AAUP, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) emphasized the cooperative and interdependent nature of shared governance. The joint statement “articulated the importance of faculty involvement in educational policy more generally,” and expanded the faculty role to include “the setting of institutional objectives [and] planning.”4

Despite these statements, opinions diverged with respect to the definition of shared governance and its application in practice. In 2003, the Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis (CHEPA) attempted to address this issue. Based on results of a survey of 750 institutions about definitions of shared governance, CHEPA developed three models. In the collegial model, faculty and administrators strive for consensus in decision-making. Decision-making in the consultative model is reserved for the administration and board, with input from faculty. The distributive model assigns authority to faculty in certain areas, and to the board and administration in others.5

Structurally, the faculty role in governance varies by institutional type. Generally speaking, governance at liberal arts colleges typically involves the whole faculty. At larger institutions, faculty involvement is representative, in the form of faculty senate and joint committees. Unions often play a role in governance at community colleges.6

The faculty senate is the most common vehicle for systematic faculty involvement in governance.7 James Minor, in his article, “Assessing the Senate,” proposes four models which describe some of the structural and cultural aspects of the faculty senate. Intended to “represent a frame to collectively view faculty senates,” rather than as a means to assess senate effectiveness, the models are described as follows:

6 Kezar, A. (Fall 2004). What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, trust, and leadership, or structures and formal processes? New Directions for Higher Education, 2004 (127), pp. 35-46.
• Traditional faculty senates “function primarily to preserve and represent the interests of the faculty during decision-making processes.” Decision-making authority is limited to areas related to the faculty role, e.g., curriculum and instruction, and promotion and tenure. Traditional senates “function as an association that represents the interests of faculty during decision-making rather than an integrated partner in campus governance.”

• Like traditional senates, influential senates maintain control in the faculty domain. In addition, they “are assertive and take the initiative on issues that extend beyond faculty matters to those that concern the entire institution.” Influential senates tend to be well-organized and are accepted by “other governing constituencies” as “a legitimate integrated governing body [that has] the ability to create change.”

• Dormant faculty senates are typically inactive, existing “largely as a ceremonial pastime for faculty.” While their role in campus decision-making is negligible, dormant senates “may serve latent functions that are important to faculty or for maintaining the existing power structure.” In institutions with dormant senates, faculty decision-making takes place at the school or college level.

• The decision-making role played by Cultural senates is “dictated by fluid cultural dynamics more than structural qualities.” Cultural senates can be susceptible to the influence of individuals. For example, its role in decision-making may change with the turnover of key members. “Structural ineffectiveness can lead to informal processes, or ‘deal cutting,’ that circumvents the formal processes of the senate.”

Empirical and theoretical literature on faculty senates is sparse and is chiefly concerned with their effectiveness in the governance process. Determining the aspects of an effective faculty senate is complicated by the diversity of institutions and senate compositions, as well a lack of consensus about the role of faculty in governance. According to Minor, faculty senates that are perceived to be effective have the following attributes: "(a) high levels of faculty involvement in the senate, (b) high levels of faculty interest in senate activity, (c) having significant influence over issues related to tenure and promotion, (d) having significant influence in the selection of the provost and president, and (e) having significant influence in setting strategic and budget priorities.”

Kezar emphasizes the role of leadership, relationships, and trust in effective shared governance. Administrators often use “the quality of senate leadership” as a proxy for senate effectiveness. Senates that build relationships “outside the hierarchical structure and beyond designated roles” enhance opportunities for faculty success in shared governance.

---

12 Kezar, A. (Fall 2004). What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, trust, and leadership, or structures and formal processes? New Directions for Higher Education, 2004 (127), pp. 35-46, p. 39.
Trust between faculty and administrators, “often epitomized by the relationship between senate chair and president,” is essential to effective governance. In some cases, mistrust among faculty groups can impede the governance process.  

As the boundaries between higher education and the public realm became more permeable, external forces exerted more influence over colleges and universities. Demands for accountability and increased scrutiny from state governments, changing student demographics and a changing academic workforce, technological innovations, pressures from market forces, shifting political and social conditions, and globalization have compelled institutions of higher education to undertake change at a pace to which they were unaccustomed.  

Implications for shared governance are embedded in calls for new approaches to institutional leadership in these changing times. In 1996, the AGB released *Reviewing the Academic Presidency: Stronger Leadership for Tougher Times*, which, according to Gerber, represented a “partial repudiation” of the jointly issued 1966 *Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities* referenced above. While the authors of the report argued that shared governance needed to be “reshaped” to accommodate the leadership demands of a new era for higher education, its recommendations, according to Gerber, “amounted to an attack on collegial decision making and a call for a more corporate model of management.” In fact, attacks on the faculty decision-making process are not uncommon. Critics claim that it is both inefficient and ineffective due to its cumbersome nature, characterized by “excessive consultation.”

The growing interest in running universities like businesses has also influenced board composition and authority. In the first half of the twentieth century, according to Birnbaum, the board’s primary function was to “hire and fire the president.” Boards began to assume more power in the aftermath of the 1960s, when activist faculty and students challenged the authority of institutional leaders. In addition, calls for a “more efficient business-like approach to college and university governance,” beginning in the 1970s, were accompanied by increased representation from business and industry on boards. In its 2014 *Statement on Faculty Communication with Governing Boards*, the AAUP claims “some critics of the tradition of shared governance claim that...”

---

13 ________. (Fall 2004). What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, trust, and leadership, or structures and formal processes? *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2004 (127), pp. 35-46, p. 44.


governance have encouraged boards to adopt top-down decision-making strategies and to intrude into decision-making areas in which the faculty traditionally has exercised primary responsibility. 20

Some scholars argue that the answer to the problems posed by the current environment for higher education is more, not less, faculty input into institutional decision-making. Kezar writes, “Because of the complexity of institutional issues, well-considered decisions should be based on a high degree of input and thought, usually achieved through participation of multiple constituents. Institutions may jump to poor conclusions since decisions do not benefit from a thorough examination of the issues or multiple perspectives.” 21

While acknowledging that “intense environmental demands on higher education place great responsibility and strain on institutional leaders to make difficult decisions in a timely manner,” and that faculty senates were not “created to cope with these types of decisions and demands,” Kezar argues that it is incumbent upon “campus senates and other joint administrative-faculty committees” to develop processes for solving problems arising from the current dynamic and challenging environment for colleges and universities. 22

In today’s session, we will explore the role of Faculty in shared governance: What is it now and what we want it to be.

---


Abstract: In 2007 the Faculty Senate's Committee to Review Faculty Governance published a
final report that expressed the general sense of faculty, based on two years of investigations:
"The Administration and Board of Trustees have not consistently consulted in a timely and
adequate manner with the University Faculty and Faculty Senate on important issues."

Abstract: In early August 2007, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute’s newly appointed provost,
Robert Palazzo, summarily suspended the university’s Faculty Senate. He claimed that the
Rensselaer Faculty Senate (RFS) had failed to amend its constitution according to a directive
from the university’s Board of Trustees. At the heart of debate were the disenfranchisement of
nearly 200 faculty, and contention over who should be voting members of the Faculty Senate. In
fall 2007, the Rensselaer faculty voted overwhelmingly for reinstatement of the Senate. The
Board of Trustees, President Shirley Jackson, and the provost ignored this referendum despite
AAUP concerns and negative national publicity. Until this impasse, the Faculty Senate had
played an advisory role to the Office of the Provost and had participated in the governance and
direction of scholarly activities and instruction at Rensselaer, a model of shared governance
typical of many universities across the country. However, notions of governance are changing
on campuses that have adopted a business model with corporate-style management. The rise
of this administrative governance model, while ostensibly premised on notions of faculty
rights and freedoms, actually produces structures and policies hostile to shared
governance, detrimental to faculty empowerment, and undermining of faculty unity and morale.
This article analyzes the demise of shared governance at Rensselaer and the imposition of a
form of governance in which the administration dominates all decision-making processes.
A chronology is appended that supplies the background and timeline of the unfolding events on campus, and chronicles the increasing chasm between faculty, administration, and the board of trustees.

Abstract: Shared governance between administration and faculty needs to be viewed as a sanctioned vehicle of collaboration, not a rivalry. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]

Abstract: The faculty senate is the agent of the faculty, and its mission statement stakes the faculty's claim in the institutional decision-making process. It is in this context that the chair of the faculty senate at a large southwestern state university tasked an ad hoc committee (comprised of the authors) with writing its inaugural mission statement. The committee approached this task with the strong sense that developing a mission statement was an important step in establishing the faculty senate's role in shared university governance. In this article, the authors document the structure, process, and content of the developmental activities that led up to the acceptance of the mission statement by their faculty senate. They begin with an overview of mission statements in organizational activity. Then they review prior research, offer a theoretical framework for the creation of a mission statement, and operationalize the construct. Next, they use theory to develop a four-step, committee-driven, technology-assisted process to customize a mission statement for a faculty senate. Finally, they offer their own experiences as evidence of the viability and effectiveness of applying the four-step process. (Contains 3 figures and 2 notes.)

Abstract: Grant Sterling, professor of philosophy, attended the Faculty Senate meeting that discussed these recommendations and said, "One thing we didn't notice in 2011 is the degree of committees not being able to perform their function."  

Abstract: Texas State Faculty Senate members were approached last month to sign a petition stating they "support the shared governance of the (University of Illinois) Faculty Senate in requesting the chancellor to rescind his order to revoke Salaita's employment," according to a document read by Sue Weill, faculty senate secretary. According to the document sent from the UI Faculty Senate, Salaita commonly referred to Israelis as modern-day Nazis who are "slaughtering Palestinians like the Jews."

Abstract: Faculty Senate members met to voice their opinions on the administration's recent disregard for the senate's ability to make a nomination for the Selection Advisory Committee on Sept. 11.


Abstract: In 1994, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) adopted a policy
The statement, *On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom*. The statement asserted that these two principles—faculty governance and academic freedom—are “inextricably linked,” so that neither is “likely to thrive” except “when they are understood to reinforce one another.” The statement further noted that the close connection between academic freedom and faculty governance was reflected in the earliest work of the AAUP. In 1915, the first year of its existence, the AAUP established “Committee A on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure.” At its annual meeting the following year, the members of the association voted to create “Committee T on the Place and Function of Faculties in University Government and Administration” (now called the Committee on College and University Governance).

A brief examination of the conditions in American higher education in the early twentieth century reveals how the same forces brought about the development of academic freedom and faculty governance—principles that the AAUP has done so much to advance. At bottom, the development and subsequent legitimization of both principles was the product of the increasing professionalization of faculty in the United States. Thus, it is no coincidence that the AAUP itself became a crucial cross-disciplinary vehicle for the development of a professional identity for faculty at the same time that it came to define academic freedom and faculty governance as necessary means for the fulfillment of the faculty’s professional responsibilities. By the mid twentieth century, the professionalization of higher education faculty resulted in the institutionalization of tenure as a protection of academic freedom and a broad recognition of the faculty’s primary responsibility for academic decision making. More recently, however, an alarming trend toward the deprofessionalization of faculty at American colleges and universities, most clearly reflected in the rapid expansion of contingent appointments, has seriously eroded the institutions of tenure and faculty governance, and thereby undermined the basic protections of academic freedom and the quality of American higher education.

Abstract: Using national survey data, the author finds little relationship between decision-making authority and the actual decisions that are made.


Kezar, A. (Fall 2004). What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, trust, and leadership, or structures and formal processes? *New Directions for Higher Education, 2004* (127), pp. 35-46.
Abstract: Changing structures may be a less important factor in creating an effective approach to governance than leadership, relationships, and trust. [ABSTRACT FROM AUTHOR]

Excerpt: Undoubtedly faculty play an integral role in the intellectual enterprise of colleges and universities (Barnett, 1994). Their role in governance and decision-making, however, is a point of contention on many campuses (Gerber, 2001). In the tradition of higher education, approximately 90% percent of four-year institutions have a faculty governing body that, for better or worse, participate in campus governance (Gilmour, 1991). Yet research and theoretical knowledge about their involvement in campus decision-making is limited (Kezar & Eckel, forthcoming). For example, functional and structural differences that exist among senates, within or across institutional types, are virtually unknown. As a result, litigious discussion about faculty governance continues in the absence of descriptive or theoretical understanding about how faculty senates participate in decision making.

Abstract: In the resolution the Faculty Senate also recommended the Board of Regents to convene a commission of UW System faculty, students and staff members to evaluate the effects of a public authority and complete a public report of their findings before the end of this legislative session.


Abstract: Information technology (IT)—hardware, software, and networks—is enormously important in the daily lives of everyone on college and university campuses. Yet decisions about academic IT are usually made by a small administrative team with almost no faculty input. This can lead to policies and priorities that poorly serve pedagogical and scholarly needs, and it is often actually an inversion of the traditional academic division of responsibilities as set out, for example, in the 1966 AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities.

This essay examines some of the assumptions and traditions behind the IT governance structure currently prevalent on so many campuses and suggests some different perspectives on these issues. These alternative ideas then suggest a new approach—similar to, and in fact supporting, the open access movement for scholarly products but centered on the openness of the IT infrastructures themselves of college and universities.

To clarify the foundations of this new model of shared IT governance in academia, the essay states two important new principles: the principle of academic network freedom and the principle of shared academic network governance. These principles can clarify the appropriate roles of the various actors in university governance and give guidance about how to implement new governance models.


Abstract: The Faculty Senate and standing committees allow the faculty to approve changes in academic programs, give advice about budgeting for those changes, assess those programs and evaluate our peers for tenure and promotion.


Abstract: Twentieth century governance models used in public universities are subject to increasing doubt across the English-speaking world. Governments question if public universities are being efficiently governed; if their boards of trustees are adequately fulfilling their trust obligations towards multiple stakeholders; and if collegial models of governance are working in increasingly complex educational environments. With declining public funding for tertiary education, growing international competition among institutions of higher learning in our information age and worrisome evidence of dysfunctional governance, critics question if established governance structures are able to meet these and other challenges. Some insist that members of faculty are most suited to govern public universities because they appreciate the vision and mission of the university. Others demand that boards of governors be skilled in financial matters and drawn primarily from corporate life. Yet others call for governance based on trust and confidence between those who govern and those who are governed. The article evaluates competing trends in models of university governance in the United Kingdom, the British Commonwealth and the United States. Arguing against a one-size-fits-all model, it
sets out specific factors to consider in reforming governance models to meet the demands of our times.

Dissertations.

Anderson, S. (2007). The creation of faculty senates in American research universities. Order No. 3284898 The Pennsylvania State University, 2007. Ann Arbor: ProQuest. Web. 15 Nov. 2016. Abstract: This study examines how and why faculty senates were created in American research universities. Senates were created by faculty in reaction to conditions on campus, such as faculty dissatisfaction with their role in institutional governance, or were created by presidents as a means to proactively modernize the functions of the university. In some cases, the conditions that lead to the creation of a senate were dramatic crises that immediately brought to light the limitations of the campus governance system. A major cause for the creation of senates was the growth of the faculty of the university, which created a need for a representative body to replace meetings of the faculty as a whole. At the time of instituting senates, universities were also making improvements in the quality of the faculty and becoming increasingly focused on research. This study employed theories of political power (agenda setting) to demonstrate how the creation of a senate took place. The creation of a senate was advocated by an entrepreneur who took advantage of existing conditions during a window of opportunity to advocate for a change in the role for faculty in university governance. The creation of faculty senates at 151 universities was investigated and historical case studies were conducted at six institutions: the University of Utah, the Pennsylvania State University, the University of Virginia, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Pennsylvania, and Carnegie Mellon University. The study is divided by era, examining senates created in the university building period, during World War II and the post-war period, and during the 1960s and 70s. Universities that have not created a university-wide senate are also discussed. Ultimately, senates were created proactively to improve the campus organization or reactively, in response to conditions or crises that drew attention to inadequacies in the governance structure.

Castro, R. (2012). Faculty unions and their effects on university shared governance. Order No. 3530669 California State University, Long Beach, 2012. Ann Arbor: ProQuest. Web. 29 Oct. 2016. Abstract: Unions have been a part of many university political landscapes for over four decades. During the early years of faculty unionization, researchers explored the effects of faculty unionization on university governance bodies and the shared governance process, but the results of these initial inquiries were often mixed. Nonetheless, several researchers predicted that over time the union would have the effect of diminishing the influence and power of faculty senates as the union's strength and influence grew. Employing several Southern California CSU campuses as the study's primary research site, this qualitative study further explored the impact of faculty unionization through the eyes, ears, and experiences of thirteen faculty senators. This process provided the participants an opportunity to individually reflect on the events and issues most relevant to their experiences with shared governance from their own vantage point, allowing me to unearth a richer and thicker description of their perceptions and views. The result was a dialogue that yielded responses that were unconfined by predetermined or conventional responses which in turn allowed me to explore the question of whether or not faculty unionization results in a loss of power and influence for faculty governance bodies by using the participant's own experiences as a window to the phenomenon.

Chappell, C. (2013). The Virginia Commission on Higher Education Board Appointments: The impact of legislative reform on public university governance. Order No. 3591030 George Mason University, 2013. Ann Arbor: ProQuest. Web. 29 Oct. 2016. Abstract: Recent national attention to issues of access, cost, and institutional performance in our public institutions of higher education have included numerous critiques and calls for reform at the level of board appointments and board governance. There has been considerable
attention in both scholarly and popular media regarding governance issues including shoddy political appointment practices, lack of orientation and preparation, run-away boards, arrogant chief executives, and the negative effects of under-prepared, under-qualified trustees. These concerns have persisted as national, even congressional, attention has turned to high college costs, student debt-load, and the use of university endowments to offset costs to students and their families. These concerns were amplified by the recent economic recession and its impact on higher education. The use of appointment commissions or councils (whose responsibility is to recommend board member appointments based on merit) has been identified as a way in which to improve higher education governance. This study will examine the context surrounding the establishment of the 2002 Virginia Commission on Higher Education Board Appointments (which will be referred to as the Commission), and will explore its impact on subsequent boards of visitors at the four largest public universities in the Commonwealth. The question, Has board governance in Virginia state-supported higher education institutions changed with the advent of the Commission? will be investigated. The methodology employed and the conclusions reached may inform and encourage other state systems to consider similar reforms in the trustee appointment process and will add to the literature on best practices in higher education governance.

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to ascertain how the leaders, faculty and administrative staff perceive the role of shared governance in their respective institutions of higher education. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Committee T developed an instrument to measure the state of shared governance at universities. The original survey was modified and sent to participants who were leaders, faculty, and administrative staff working at public universities in the State of New York. The study was led by five research questions. The results indicated agreement, to strong agreement, with how leaders, faculty, and administrative staff perceive the role of shared governance, except on two items. The majority of the faculty members disagreed that they have timely access to the information they need to make informed decisions or recommendations on institutional matters. The majority of the faculty disagreed that they had a strong influence on the selection of academic administrators. There were no significant differences among the perceptions of the participants. Correlation analysis indicated a significant relationship between equality and appropriate boundaries. There was a significant relationship between faculty autonomy and appropriate boundaries, equality, and acknowledgment of leaders. There was a significant relationship between stakeholders' input and appropriate boundaries, equality, faculty representativeness, acknowledgement of leaders, and faculty autonomy. There was a significant relationship between mutuality and equality, and faculty autonomy. There was an inverse significant relationship between experience in higher education and faculty autonomy, and age. There was a significant relationship between experience at a current position and age, and experience in higher education. A discriminant analysis was attempted to determine the extent to which collegiality, appropriate boundaries, influence, faculty representativeness, acknowledgement of leaders, faculty autonomy, stakeholders' input, and mutuality predict whether a respondent is a leader, faculty, or an administrative staff. None of the variables were significant predictors of role because of a small sample size.

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to investigate how faculty, administrators, and staff perceived the climate for shared governance at 36 member institutions of the Appalachian College Association (ACA), based on standards for sound shared governance in higher education as outlined by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Numerous
reports and studies have focused on shared governance practices, but no research exists on perceptions of climate based on standards outlined by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), which published the seminal Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities in 1966. This study was conducted through the Appalachian College Association, a non-profit consortium of 36 independent, four-year liberal arts colleges and universities spread across the central Appalachian Mountains in Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Virginia. A total of 12 different institutions from all five states in the ACA participated in the study. Participants included faculty, staff, and administrators who were identified by their presidents or vice presidents for academic affairs as most knowledgeable about the shared governance and decision-making process on their campus. The survey, developed under the auspices of the AAUP to gauge the climate for governance, was distributed via an online link e-mailed to 480 faculty, administrators, and staff during the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 semesters. A total of 176 survey responses were received, representing a response rate of 36.66%. The 29-item anonymous survey included three optional demographic questions, allowing respondents to indicate gender, status as tenured or non-tenured faculty member, a cabinet-level administrator or lower-level administrator, a staff member, and years in higher education. The survey used a five-point ordinal Likert scale to indicate level of agreement— including "I don't know"— with 26 statements about each of the following seven shared governance standards: institutional climate, institutional communication, the board's role, the president's role, the faculty's role, joint decision making, and structural arrangements. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze and describe the survey results for each of four research questions. The results of this study indicated there were different perceptions between tenured and non-tenured faculty on a number of the seven standards relative to the climate for shared governance, and between cabinet-level administrators and lower-level administrators, with the latter representing the largest group of respondents (52) in the study. Staff members' responses indicated that they were least informed about shared governance on their campuses compared to faculty and administrators. While the majority of respondents indicated there was a climate of collegiality and respect on their campuses, survey results indicated a lack of knowledge about shared governance at some ACA schools. Recommendations for practice and for research were included.


Abstract: The tensions existing between faculty and administrators at colleges and universities have come to be an accepted part of postsecondary education. Calls from lawmakers for increasing federal and state oversight, decreasing enrollments, and diminishing resources are among the many issues facing colleges today. Faculty and administrators who work at colleges subscribing to a shared governance model of decision-making attempt to address these and other challenges together, in the same room. Finding ways to assure the success of the shared governance process can be a challenge for most colleges, but one on which the future of such governance relies. The purpose of this heuristic phenomenological, qualitative research study was to look at the phenomenon of faculty's lived experience working in a shared governance environment at small private liberal arts colleges. The researcher presents four themes that emerged from the primary data source, which was three interviews of nine tenured faculty members at three different small, private liberal arts colleges in the Midwest. The four themes are: 1) the relationships between faculty and their administrators influence the level of faculty engagement in shared governance; 2) faculty value communication and transparency and recognize how it influences their participation in decision-making; 3) the extent to which administrators value faculty input influences faculty morale and motivation to participate in governance; and 4) the complexities of power influence faculty engagement in governance. These findings could be used to aid faculty and administrators in the conversations about how to improve their own college's practice of shared governance.

Abstract: Shared governance and its effectiveness continues to be debated among scholars. This study examined the relationship between higher education organizational governance and faculty governance. It was based on two theoretical frameworks: four organizational governance models; and four faculty governance models. Both have been accepted and cited in higher education literature (Heaney, 2010). However, no study has examined the relationship between organizational governance with faculty governance as shared governance. There were 615 faculty senate leaders contacted nationwide according to institutional type: 207 doctoral; 208 masters; 200 baccalaureate. A total of 71 faculty senate leaders responded: 33 doctoral; 22 masters; and 16 baccalaureate. The study was ex post facto where participants completed the researcher-developed Higher Education Shared Governance Instrument. Data were analyzed according Cronbach’s alpha, descriptive, correlational, t-test, and MANOVA statistics. Results revealed that shared governance is alive and well across colleges and universities, but strongly influenced by a state’s political environment. The shared governance model that emerged is a political/influential model regardless of institutional type. It indicated faculty and administrators need to build coalitions to establish a power base for decisions while dealing with policy and policy change. The results indicated several implications and insights for future research. State political environments drive how organizational governance models and faculty governance models interact for shared governance. Current lack of resources have forced faculty and administrators to band together in various types of coalitions to build power structures to be more competitive for resources such as budget allocations, ownership of policies and procedures, curricular decisions, and accountability measures. Thus, shared governance perspectives should be expanded to include senior administrators on campuses. Additionally, although shared governance is present on campuses, information regarding how much sharing takes place and in what areas is lacking. Overall, across the spectrum of shared governance for operations and academics, research should examine the extent to which faculty are involved in decisions pertaining to academics and operations, as well as the extent to which administrators are involved in decisions pertaining to operations and academics. The issue is not so much as who is in control, but how are limited resources distributed?