

Running Head: LOCATING POWER AT THE HEART OF CONFLICT

Locating Power at the Heart of Conflict:
The Role of the Faculty Senate in Establishing Curriculum

Daniel F. Pigg, PhD, EdD

Paper Presented at the 2004 Midsouth Educational Research Association Meeting
Gatlinburg, TN
November 17-19, 2004

Abstract

The belief that university faculty own the curriculum is held widely throughout American institutions of higher education, both public and private. The 1990s saw the first significant challenge to that belief. Using the Marxist and Foucaultian understanding of power and using a paradigm for understanding the functions of faculty senates in the context of larger university governance structures, this paper examines the curricular debates and their implications at Texas A & M (TAMU), the State University of New York (SUNY) system, and George Mason University (GMU). Lying behind the struggle for power and understanding was a significant paradigm shift from positivistic modernism to postmodernism. What on the surface seems like a loss of power for the traditional understanding of faculty senates with respect to curriculum development and changes becomes a new paradigm for power. Shared governance, a term widely used in higher education administration, no longer seems to represent the shifting power relationships between faculty senates and administrative bodies. New ground rules must be established for a better working relationship.

Locating Power at the Heart of Conflict:

The Role of the Faculty Senate in Establishing Curriculum

The belief that university faculty own the curriculum is held widely throughout American institutions of higher education, both public and private. Universities often give that policy voice in faculty handbooks as an unquestioned assumption. The belief received its formal statement in AAUP guidelines dating from 1966, and those guidelines have not changed (*Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*):

When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine the appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction.

Special considerations may require particular accommodations: (1) a publically supported institution may be regulated by statutory provisions, and (2) a church-controlled institution may be limited by its charter or bylaws. When such external requirements influence course content and the manner of instruction or research, they impair the educational effectiveness of the institution. (Section II. B.2)

It seemed almost ironic to read one year later that “Curricular policy should be carried out by the administration” (Patterson, 1967, p. 438). Hamilton (2002) observed that the central premise behind the 1966 AAUP document is “shared governance” (p. 51). A “compelling reason” (Hamilton 2002, p. 52) must be given by a governing board or central administration to overturn a faculty decision regarding an issue such as the curriculum.

In a practical way, curriculum development and change begins with a department, then proceeds through a college curriculum body, and finally reaches the Faculty Senate, where it is accepted or rejected. Of course, a positive decision for curricular change still has to be approved by an administrator or administrative board. Such a position of recommending authority for the Faculty Senate, in light of how the representative body functions with regard to the larger administrative campus structure and to a seemingly loosely connected Board of Trustees, can be problematic. The AAUP statement on faculty control of the curriculum included the significant qualifying word “primarily.” That AAUP saw the need to qualify the statement is significant, yet many faculty and their governance bodies, termed variously as Faculty Senates, Academic Senates, or Academic Councils, have proceeded as if a kind of absolute authority did exist.

Markedly different is the language of the *First Principles of the 1998 Association of Governing Boards*: “Curricular matters and decisions regarding individual faculty appointments, promotions, and contract renewals would normally fall within the delegated decision-making authority of appropriate faculty and administrative entities” (Hamilton, 2002, p. 58). The language and locus of power were shifting from the AAUP statement to the First Principles statement.

In the last decade of the twentieth century, university faculties and their elected governing bodies began to encounter resistance in the growing turf war for control of almost every aspect of university life from governing boards, student groups, legislatures, and accrediting bodies. Parkay and Hass (2000) contended that faculty must not only be sensitive to growth and change within their disciplinary discourses, but they must also be aware that curriculum is the creation of social, political, and environmental forces beyond

immediate identification (Parkay & Hass, 2000). Those social and political forces exist both as definable entities such as communities and as symbolic perspectives that are matters of perception from external and internal groups to the university.

Curriculum, by practice, is a political act that brings to the fore, suppresses, or alters the transmission of knowledge. Who determines what knowledge is valuable? In fact, who determines what knowledge is? Levin and Clowes (1991) noted that a shift from a modern, positivist perspective, normative until the 1970s, to a post-modern perspective made considerable changes to institutional discourses on curriculum. They described the modernist perspective as grounded in “logical positivism” (p. 4) and the post-modern perspective as a questioning of “the hegemony of a world view dominated by western, male, majority perspectives (the master narrative) and discipline-based perspectives which explain the whole (totality): it represents belief in individual agency (free will and rational decision-making)” (p. 4). Scholarly and pedagogical developments in the social science and humanities, particularly with the rise of critical approaches such as Marxism, feminism, and deconstruction were noted as major tools whereby the shift in perspective was facilitated. Cohen (1998) credited the concerns of multiculturalism as one of the most noteworthy areas for exploration and curricular revision in the period.

By and large, these curricular and cultural debates have been waged within disciplinary areas, such as in English and history departments, but by the 1990s, these debates were being waged on college campuses and impacting curriculum decisions. In English departments the primary areas of contention were canon and critical practice. In history departments, the debate was often focused on identity issues such as what aspects of history were being reported and considered. Whose literature was important? Which

voices of history were to be heard? Debates regarding the discourses of various disciplines were primarily worked out in departments, the most obvious location of power for faculty decision making (Williams, Gore, Broches & Lostoski, 1987). Faculty senates saw themselves as the final points of change for those curriculum debates—particularly in general education—and the curricula they established were products of those wide-ranging debates, often unobserved by the public, but a topic for criticism by Alan Bloom (1987) and William Bennett (1988) who contended the basic values of American higher education were being eroded (Levin & Clowes 1991).

This study examined three of the curriculum debates in the 1990s at Texas A & M (TAMU), the State University of New York (SUNY) system, and George Mason University (GMU), where faculty felt pressured to accept the governing principles of a university president or a Board of Trustees, even as they sometimes respond with words of censure. Each of these cases merited investigation because the problems that resulted were directly tied to an ideology of faculty senate governance. Central, of course, to all of these issues of senate governance in curriculum areas was the locus of power. Throughout the study, the term curriculum could have been described as a formal program of study, a group of courses for which there are discernable learning outcomes (Eisner, 2002).

To examine the construction of power relationships, this paper outlines the notions of power from both Marxist and Foucaultian perspectives and then outlines Minor's model categories of senates as "functional, influential, ceremonial, and subverted" (2004, p. 344) to serve as a prism for analyzing the implications of the curricular controversies in the TAMU, SUNY, and GMU cases. With the help of critical

theory and sociological models for shared leadership, this paper demonstrates how the subtle dance of faculty senates with local administrations, governing boards, and accrediting bodies is not only vital to a healthy view of curriculum, but is also vital to the success of shared governance. Faculties have always had to meet the requirements of accrediting bodies with respect to number of hours in degree programs and specific learning outcomes that can be measured during and after the completion of a program. Generally, the requirements of accrediting bodies have not been viewed as violating the principle of faculty control of curriculum. From an examination of these representative cases, a pattern emerged that will be suggested as a means for resolving these faculty senate versus governing board difficulties.

Defining Critical Terms

When examining power in terms of intellectual and material capital, the work of Karl Marx and Michel Foucault emerge as possible definitions for analyzing that power and its instrumentation. Karl Marx, grounded in historical studies of feudalism, categorizes history as a struggle of the social classes for domination, in essence, the will to power. In fact, history in Marx's view could be thought of as "the exploitation of one social class by another," with the result being "alienation" of the group displaced by the overt display of power (Barry, 1995, p. 157). In that struggle, ideologies of power are created, but those ideologies are examples of "false consciousness" (Hawthorn, 1992, p. 97-98), symbolic constructs. Power is ultimately a subversive act; it oppresses.

Working from a post-modern perspective, Foucault defined power in a very different way:

Power must be analyzed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localized here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed through a net-like organization. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or consenting targets; they are always also the elements of its articulation. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power. (1980, p. 98)

From Foucault's perspective, power seemed more like energy. Power was highly decentralized, and its ownership was shared and continually shifting, if it could be said to have ownership. From Marx's perspective, individuals owned power, and it became the source by which control was given. From Foucault's perspective, power seemed to provide almost limitless potential, never with the intention that it became oppressive. The adoption of the Marxist perspective leads to the examination of struggle and explosion of myths to power. The adoption of the Foucaultian perspective leads to an examination of the way power is distributed through bodies and organizations. In the literature on higher education, both perspectives have found their way into scholarship. The phrase "loosely coupled," a term used to describe connections that are not direct, sometimes ad hoc, and often shifting, seems more closely allied with Foucault's notion of power (Weick, 1976).

In addition to critical terms for power and its means of instrumentation, models for understanding faculty senates are important in aiding the present examination. In

perhaps one of the most important studies of faculty senates, Birnbaum (1991) outlined the senate based on its symbolic functions. Drawing implicitly on Marx's notion of ideology and power, Birnbaum noted that with the faculty senate, "an institution can suggest the existence of faculty authority even when it does not exist" (p. 12). In the study, Birnbaum enumerated the "latent functions" as opposed to "manifest functions" of the senate as symbol, status provider, garbage can, attention cue, screening device, organizational conservatory, and pastime (all terms he developed in his study). The edge that a Marxist analysis, emphasizing manifest and latent power, provided here also contributed toward a more than potential trivializing of the role of the faculty senate. Minor (2004), departing from Birnbaum's study so that he may stress how senates do functional effectively, examined information from actual surveys and interviews with faculty senate presidents. From his study, he developed a set of marking characteristics for four models: functional, influential, ceremonial, and subverted. Functional senates developed where faculty were in charge of traditional areas, including curriculum development and change. In universities with functional senates, "administrative authority is often strong" (p. 349), and where the faculty "are not particularly assertive and usually do not set their own agenda" (p. 349). Influential senates are characterized with more global campus concerns than just those connected with faculty. In curriculum development and change, they have "authority," and in other areas not traditionally associated with faculty, they have influence (p. 350). Minor noted that influential senates "usually maintain a collaborative, rather than a confrontational, relationship with administration" (p. 351). Ceremonial senates were described as "relatively inactive and inoperable" (p. 351), and they served as "scapegoats for the administration, provide status

for particular faculty, or act as a screening device for future administrators” (p. 352)—characteristics also noted in Birnbaum’s study on the ritual and symbolic aspects of leadership (1991). Subverted senates, according to Minor (2004), are those whose “governance is undermined by alternative venues of faculty participation” (p. 352). The senate exists, but actual decision-making often happens in administrative “kitchen cabinets” (p. 352). Such senates are often noted as contentious, and their role on campus is continuously under scrutiny and suspicion. These categories provide significant insights for understanding the flow of power within a faculty senate and between the faculty senate and administrative bodies.

Universities in Conflict: Faculty Senate vs. Administrative Control

Case One: Texas A & M (TAMU)

History of conflict. After a two-year curriculum discussion at Texas A & M University, in November 1995, the Faculty Senate passed a proposal that would have required all students seeking undergraduate degrees to complete two 3-hour courses under the rubric “U.S Cultures and International Requirements.” At the December 1995 meeting, a letter from President Ray Bowen was presented that detailed his reasons for rejecting the proposal (*Faculty Senate Minutes*, December 11, 1995):

You and the members of the Senate leadership know of the criticisms that have been directed towards higher education by national and regional groups. Books attacking higher education and perceived abuses surrounding the rarely defined concept of multiculturalism have been a growth industry. Most of the criticism of the Senate proposal has been out of the belief that the proposal is identical to, or

will evolve into something that is identical to, a requirement like those that have been criticized nationally. . . .

It is my nature to try to respect the views of other individuals and groups. I also try to evolve compromises on issues where there are differences of opinions. The faculty, students, former students, parents, state political leaders and many others represent the stakeholders of our university. Within each set of stakeholders, I have found those who support the Senate proposal and those who oppose it. The sense of community at Texas A & M University is so strong that all of these groups feel they should have a special role and a special influence on the final decision. . . .

My decision will inevitably raise the issue of faculty control over curriculum content. We all know that in many universities curriculum content is delegated to the faculty. The usual nature of this delegation is to empower the Faculty Senate to represent the larger University. This delegation has never taken place at Texas A & M University. It is regrettable that the issue of faculty prerogatives will become embroiled with the issue of the U.S. Cultures and International requirement. However, it seems that this linking is inevitable.

At the same meeting, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution condemning the president's rejection of the multicultural proposal. The resolution noted that such a rejection "negates the Strategic Plan goals," that it would "damage the academic integrity of the university," and that the President had violated his role as a "leader of vision who is committed to participatory decision-making and shared governance" (*Senate Minutes*, December 11, 1995). Both material and philosophical/cultural violations of the relationship between

faculty and administration were thus noted. Rhetorical flourishes also continued in the January 16, 1996 meeting, in which a speaker related the rejection of the curricular proposals to the dismissal of Galileo's findings about the universe by the Church: "in the final analysis, truth prevailed" (*Faculty Senate Minutes*).

Analysis. The disagreement between the TAMU Faculty Senate and the president provided an almost textbook case of the challenges facing a university with the paradigm shift from modern positivism to postmodernism that Levin and Clowes (1991) outlined. There were clearly differing models for understanding American and world history and culture at the center of this ideological conflict. In fact, that President Bowden referred to politically conservative publications on the state of higher education without specifically using the authors' names was indicative of the knowledge of multicultural discourse and its backlash that must have been present on campus. An examination of the faculty senate minutes both before and after the conflict arose showed that the senate was attempting to be an "influential senate" (Minor, 2004), given their attention to student behavior that involved racial/ethnic stereotyping and in attempting to address HIV/AIDS awareness on campus (*Faculty Senate Minutes*, May 9, 1994; *Faculty Senate Minutes*, November 13, 1995). In Foucault's term, the senate was attempting to employ power through a "net-like organization" (1980, p. 98). Bowen's language was more reflective of the language to oppressive power—a power with which he symbolically presented himself as only the apparent instrument rather than the source. He claimed to be acting on behalf of multiple constituent voices to disguise his own control of power. Floyd (1986) noted a trend among university presidents to see their roles as "managers of an institutional decision

process” (p. 2). Bowen’s language was one of management, including protecting the institution.

President Bowen did not use the language of shared governance; the Faculty Senate did. He spoke of multiple constituents; faculty did not. Wright (1995) noted that some of those constituents were the Texas Republican party and the TAMU Collegiate Republicans. Bowen’s actions, rejecting the curricular changes, reduced the body to that of Minor’s “functional senate” (2004). One of his remarks about the lack of communication of the Faculty Senate with the entire faculty also followed Minor’s model of the “subverted senate,” in which a suspicion of “lack of confidence” (2004, p. 353) surfaces in their representative abilities. If the Faculty Senate meetings of December 11, 1995, and January 16, 1996, are taken as battlegrounds for struggle, the TAMU Faculty Senate appeared to have lost an amount of power in representing some of its most fundamental aspects. The war was certainly one of language and metaphor—an aspect that one faculty member hinted at with his reference to a line in T.S. Eliot’s “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock”: “Dare I dare to disturb the universe?” (*Faculty Senate Minutes*, January 16, 1996). Clearly the Faculty Senate was dismayed, but they vowed to continue their pursuit of knowledge. The power they had hoped to display through their net-like postmodern conception of truth met another force—one of oppression. President Bowen called into question both material and symbolic aspects of faculty senate governance and representation.

Case Two: SUNY

History of conflict. In 2000, another curricular battle occurred between the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York, a system consisting of 64 campuses. On

the website for the system, there is a list enumerating the responsibilities of the Board of Trustees. Near the bottom of the list is the following series: “Regulate tuition, fees and charges, curricula and all other matters pertaining to the operation and administration of each state-operated campus” (SUNY Board of Trustees, 2004). To create transferability of program coursework throughout the system, the Board established a common general education core throughout the system. The Faculty Senate for the entire system had proposed to allow the Faculty Senates or governing bodies on each campus to develop their own curricula with certain prescribed areas based on learning outcomes (Arenson 2000). The new core, developed and approved by the Board of Trustees, that was imposed on all campuses, consisted of requirements in the “natural sciences, mathematics, foreign languages, Western civilization and world civilizations. Also on their list were American history, humanities and arts, information technology and communications” (Arenson 2000, p. B1).

The problem arose because of the way the core was imposed. As one observer noted with regard to faculty opposition, it was a “matter of principle versus practical politics” (Schmidt, 1999, A43). On some campuses such as SUNY Albany, the new curriculum was simply announced as a faculty bill (*Senate Report 2000-2001*). A controversy on the Binghamton campus gained attention in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (Schmidt, 1999). On December 14, 1999, before the new curriculum was imposed, the following note was sent to the SUNY Board (*SUNY Binghamton Faculty Senate Minutes*):

In response to your expressed concerns regarding a system-wide general education requirement for the bachelor's degree, Binghamton University is

suggesting the following changes in its current general education requirements. These changes are being proposed in the spirit of our continual attempts to improve our students' already acclaimed education. However, the BU Faculty Senate wants it to be known that we as a faculty have not, cannot, and will not consider your expressed concerns as mandates regarding how our courses are actually taught here in the classrooms of Binghamton University. Instead we intend to continue to teach our courses with the intent of having our students engage in critical thinking about issues concerning the ever-changing world and its potential future.

There is a noticeably strident tone, with some defiance. In the final analysis, however, because there was the potential loss of campus funding for offering general education courses and an increased scrutiny of its own campus general education courses, the Binghamton Faculty Senate decided not to pursue action after the implementation of the core (Schmidt, 1999).

Analysis. SUNY boasts itself as being the largest system of higher education in the United States and as such would require a great deal of central administrative control. In fact, the Board of Trustees has given itself responsibility and control for all aspects of university governance (SUNY Board of Trustees, 2004). With respect to the imposed curriculum, two levels of faculty governance were disavowed: the university-wide Faculty Senate and the individual campus unit organizations. The effect, using Minor's models, was the creation of a "functional senate" (p. 348). An examination of minutes from the systemwide senate shows little activity above that designation, perhaps because the Board of Trustees controls not only potential but actual power (*Senate Reports 2000-*

2001). Unlike the situation at TAMU, in the SUNY system the problem seemed to be one of procedure—a violation of an established custom for approving curriculum. While there seemed to have been consternation, the product—systematic curriculum—seemed to represent the goal of easing transfer and interaction among the campuses. Power indeed did come from above, but in this case, not necessarily from outside the structure.

Connecting funding to curriculum decisions ultimately held the power of the SUNY Faculty Senate in check; they were powerless to act in any way except to comply. Their voices had been silenced, yet they were the agents whereby curriculum was administered to students.

Case Three: George Mason University (GMU)

History of conflict. Similar to the situation that initiated change in the SUNY system, the Faculty Senate at George Mason University was asked to revise their curriculum following a 1998 external visit (Benning, 2000). The curricular debates of 2000 followed on a decision in 1999 to award 8 additional hours credit for an ROTC credit program above what the Faculty Senate had passed (Magner, 1999). In 2000, the GMU Faculty Senate proposed a change in curriculum that would raise the number of general education hours from 30 to 40 (Benning, 2000). The faculty presented its new curriculum to the Board of Visitors, a group composed of some notable conservatives such as Edwin Meece, William Kristol, and Edwin Feulner (Benning, 2000). According to Meece, “The board has sole responsibility for basic education policy” (Benning, 2000, B7). As a result, the specific requirements—micro-tuning the Faculty Senate proposal—were established as the GMU core. Most noticeable among the changes was the one relating to the teaching of history. The GMU Faculty Senate had proposed a one-semester

course entitled “United States and Western Institutions, Traditions, and Economies” (“Board overrides,” 2000, 8). Instead the Board of Visitors proposed two courses: one in Western civilization and one in American history. In each case, the Board also provided some criteria for the actual courses. The American history course was to address American history “to the present, with emphasis on founding documents and values and institutions” (Benning, 2000, B7). The western civilization course was described as “beginning with Greek and Roman civilizations, ending with the Congress of Vienna” (Benning, 2000, B7). The *Chronicle of Higher Education* reported that Meece said, “We didn’t add a history requirement. We defined it further. The board felt any educated person should know U.S. history and Western civilization, both of which are the foundations of the society in which we live” (Magner, 2000, A 20).

One day after the Board of Visitors announced its revised form of the general education core, the GMU Faculty Senate met to consider the changes and ended with a vote to censure the Board of Visitors for their attempt at changing curriculum. Minutes from the Faculty Senate meeting recorded the positions of various faculty senators and the university president relative to a decision, which resulted in a censure vote of 21 to 9 in favor of the action (Magner, 2000). The recorder at the meeting noted that

Senators supporting the motion for censure stated that the fight goes beyond the recent general education issues. For over a year now, we have pulled back and appeased the BOV and attempted to please them, but this has not worked. Further, it is a matter of principle for the faculty to stand up for their responsibility in curricular matters. When the BOV changes are aimed at the way courses are taught, it is not the quantity of changes but the point of change at all that we

must react to. The BOV waved a set of syllabi for a “reputable university” at us. The issue is central to what faculty does. We do not expect the BOV to change in the future, so now is the time to censure. (*Faculty Senate Minutes*, May 18, 2000)

Another speaker used the word “micromanaging” (*Faculty Senate Minutes*, May 18, 2000) to describe the Board’s actions. The result was a censure, which had little effect. The general education core curriculum as changed and approved by the Board of Visitors became the GMU requirement (Benning, 2000).

Analysis. Of the curriculum debates examined in this study, the GMU case was the most developed along the modern/postmodern divide, and it was also the most advanced case where the traditional prerogatives of the Faculty Senate had been transgressed. Both macro and micro levels of curriculum were impacted in the Board of Visitor’s decision, and the particular intrusion into the actual classroom—the micro level—was seen as the greater encroachment. While it was the case even as early as 1966 that governing boards held the ultimate authority in university governance, faculty through their senate organizations were accorded a measure of shared governance. Such a position began to change.

What seems ironic on one level is the lack of communication that existed between the Board of Visitors and the GMU Faculty Senate. Meece’s initial commendation of the Faculty Senate’s work on curriculum seemed to operate from the vantage that the senate was merely an advisory body. The members of senate, on the other hand, believed they had operated not only in good faith effort, but had exceeded those bounds, thus generating the need for a censure. The battlegrounds here were those of a typical and almost classic Marxist struggle for power, with the Board of Visitors generating an

ideology of power and responsibility and the Faculty Senate re-envisioning the almost mythic notion of faculty control of curriculum. In terms of Minor's models of senates, the GMU Faculty Senate operated most clearly as a "functional senate" (2004). The governing body with a particularly focused ideological agenda controls the limits of senate responsibility and in fact defines the role. From the perspective of the governing board, a functional senate is precisely what was needed. From the senate perspective, such treatment relegated them to the status of Minor's "subverted senates" (2004). In the year following the curriculum debate, the Board of Visitors allowed a liaison committee to the governing body; thus there was some gesture toward communication as well as participation granted (*Faculty Senate Minutes*, January 24, 2001).

Conclusion

As Birnbaum (1991) noted, Faculty Senates will continue on college campuses. In his study, he noted that both latent and manifest aspects are important to the faculty, with the latent aspects being the principal reason that those who wish to abolish Faculty Senates should rethink their positions. Yet if faculty senates are to work with campus administrators and governing boards, certain ideological grounds must be established.

With respect to the role of administrators and governing boards, the following must be observed:

1. While campus administrators and governing boards are always responsible in a public way to a variety of constituents, an adversarial relationship with the faculty senate will not aid administration in speaking to those various constituencies.

2. While campus administrators and governing boards are responsible for curriculum in general and programs in particular, they must rely on the expertise of faculty to determine the nature of specific programs in the context of accrediting bodies and particular curricular requirements.
3. While campus administrators and governing boards may impose curricular changes at universities, they must understand that imposing such changes against faculty senates undermines not only campus good will but even the very foundation of university power. There are consequences.
4. Power must function as shared engagement, never the property of anyone primarily, but almost free floating in the sense that Foucault noted.

Administrators or governing boards at all three institutions investigated made mistakes in each of these areas that undermined the credibility of those senators who not only approved, but also the faculty whom those senators represented.

With respect to faculty senates, the following are important considerations in light of cultural changes that have been misunderstood and will likely continue to challenge the understanding of those outside particular academic discourses:

1. With the advent of critical theory, most faculty understand that any position relative to their disciplines is the product of ideology. What they must do is to communicate the reasons for those ideological positions in terms that their constituents, including administrators and governing boards, can understand.
2. Faculty must be willing to concede that their own notions of power in curriculum matters is not one of imposing requirements in a magisterial sense, but one that must function within a net-like organization of power relations of

which they are only a part. Such a position does entail some loss of the previous understanding of autonomy and control. To a certain extent, however, such control has long ago passed to accrediting bodies for the overall university and to special programs in particular.

3. Tierney and Minor (2003) suggested that faculty senates must also understand that not all campus decisions need to be senate concerns and that to be successful university structure must be “loosely coupled” (p. 12). The desire for tight coupling—seen in some of the examples—simply does not represent the best situation for campus organization and academic life.
4. Faculty senates must be more aware of their own protectionist mentalities, so that they do not create armed camps at the university.
5. If faculty senates are to be effective, they must also be willing to scrutinize their own actions in order to see if they are representative of their campus communities. Challenges will come to governance; being prepared is important.
6. Faculty must do more to educate their colleagues on the nature of how university decision regarding curriculum are made. As Gaff and Lambert (1996) have noted, no Ph.D. program prepares the new assistant professor with the realities of university governance, curriculum governance, and instructional practices.

In each case examined, the faculty senates began to develop some of these notions. Crises does often produce ideologies of knowledge and power. At TAMU, the SUNY system, and GMU, when the initial period of conflict was over, faculty senates assumed positions

of making the new curricular changes operational. By no means did these faculty senates lose ultimate power; in fact, they have learned more about the subtle construction of power in its postmodern phase. Research by Tierney and Minor (2003) showed that between 82 percent and 93 percent of institutions ranging from four-year universities to doctoral institutions have faculty senates and that they remain durable institutions for faculty representation. To quote Foucault (1980) along with an addition, “[faculty senates] are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. [Faculty senates] are not only its inert and consenting targets; they are always also the elements of its articulation. In other words, [Faculty senates] are the vehicles of power” (p. 98). To quote Eliot, they have “dared to disturb the universe.” The challenge remains for those powerful and positive ways to “disturb the universe” that are not confrontational, in ways that are promote administrative understanding, and in ways that represent the challenge of growing knowledge in the post-modern world.

References

- American Association of University Professors (1966). *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Govern.htm>
- Arenson, K. W. (2000, June 6). SUNY fight over curriculum mirrors larger debate. *New York Times*, p. B1.
- Barry, P. (1995). *Beginning theory: An introduction to literary and cultural theory*. Manchester, Eng.: Manchester University Press.
- Benning, V. (2000, May 18). GMU board expands course requirements. *The Washington Post*, p. B7.
- Benning, V. (2000, May 21). Faculty, board clash at George Mason. *The Washington Post*, p. B1.
- Birnbaum, R. (1991). "The latent organizational functions of the academic senate: Why senates do not work but will not go away. In R. Birnbaum (Ed.). *Faculty in governance: The role of senates and joint committees in academic decision making* (pp. 7-25). New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Board overrides faculty recommendation on curriculum at George Mason University. (2000). *Academe*, 86(5), 8.
- Cohen, A. M. (1998). *The shaping of American higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

- Floyd, C. E. (1986). Faculty participation in decision making. Washington, D. C. : Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED284520)
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gaff, J. G., & Lambert, L. M. (1996). Socializing future faculty to the values of undergraduate education. *Change*, 28(4), 38-45.
- George Mason University Faculty Senate. (2000, May 18). *Faculty senate minutes*. Retrieved from <http://www.gmu.edu/facstaff/senate/2000%20minutes/18May00-Special.htm>
- George Mason University Faculty Senate. (2001, January 24). *Faculty senate minutes*. Retrieved from <http://www.gmu.edu/facstaff/senate/2001%20minutes/24Jan01.htm>
- Hamilton, N. W. (2002). *Academic ethics: Problems and materials on professional conduct and shared governance*. New York: Praeger.
- Hawthorn, J. (1992). *A concise glossary of contemporary literary theory*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Levin, B. H., & Clowes, D. A. (1991). From positivism to post-modern: Can education catch up with the paradigm shift? Newport News, VA: Virginia Social Science Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED339437)
- Magner, D. K. (1999). Battle over academic control pits faculty against governing board at George Mason U. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 45(41), A14-16.
- Magner, D. K. (2000). Faculty accuses George Mason U. Board of improper meddling with curriculum. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46(39), A20.

- Minor, J. T. (2004). Understanding faculty senates: Moving from mystery to model. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(3), 343-363.
- Parkay, F. W., & Hass, G. (2000). *Curriculum planning: A contemporary approach* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Patterson, K. D. (1967). The administration of university curriculum: A suggestion for a model organization. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 38(8), 438-443.
- Schmidt, P. (1999). Binghamton faculty balks at course changes. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46(11), A43.
- SUNY Albany Faculty Senate. (2001). *Senate report 2000-2001*. Retrieved from http://www.albany.edu/senate/senate_report.html
- SUNY Binghamton Faculty Senate. (1999, December 14). *Faculty senate minutes*. Retrieved from <http://facultysenate.binghamton.edu/1999-2000/agendas%201999-2000/minutes%201999-2000/121499.minutes.htm>
- SUNY Board of Trustees. (2004). Governance statement. Retrieved from http://www.suny.edu/Board_of_Trustees/index.cfm
- Texas A & M Faculty Senate. (1994, May 9). *Faculty senate minutes*. Retrieved from http://www.tamu.edu/faculty_senate/minutes/may1994.html
- Texas A & M Faculty Senate. (1995, November 13). *Faculty senate minutes*. Retrieved from http://www.tamu.edu/faculty_senate/minutes/nov1995.html
- Texas A & M Faculty Senate. (1995, December 11). *Faculty senate minutes*. Retrieved from http://www.tamu.edu/faculty_senate/minutes/dec1995.html
- Texas A & M Faculty Senate. (1996, January 16). *Faculty senate minutes*. Retrieved from http://www.tamu.edu/faculty_senate/minutes/jan1996.html

- Tierney, W. G., & Minor, J. T. (2003). Challenges for governance: A national report. Lost Angeles, CA: Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED482060)
- Williams, D., Gore, W., Broches, C., & Lostoski, C. (1987). Our faculty's perceptions of its governance role. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 58(6), 629-657.
- Wright, S. W. (1995). Texas A & M president scraps plan for multicultural courses: Supporters hail it as victory over political correctness. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 12(21), 24.