Faculty and Institutional Governance in American Higher Education[1]

Jesús Francisco Galaz-Fontes
The Claremont Graduate School

According to Bowen and Schuster (1986) academic personnel, relying upon a unifying learning process, perform four main tasks in higher education institutions: teaching, research, public service and institutional governance.[2] At a concrete level, however, institutional and disciplinary contexts influence the way in which faculty members combine and carry out these activities (Clark, 1987).

Of the functions academics are expected to undertake, teaching has been more conspicuously associated with the academic profession (Altbach, 1991). In the early twelfth century Medieval universities membership into the guild of masters meant, essentially, having a license to teach (Haskins, 1923/1957). Research, public service and participation in institutional governance would come on stage as higher education institutions evolved through history (Perkin, 1991).

General recognition of faculty participation in institutional governance as legitimate and essential for the advancement of higher education is relatively new. Academics, however, have participated in such duties since the earliest times of higher education (Cowley, 1980). In the United States an increased awareness regarding faculty governance participation can be traced to the early nineteenth century, when academic staffs entered a professionalization stage (Finkelstein & Schuster, 1992). Along this line of development the founding of the American Association of University Professors in 1915 constitutes a mile-stone. It consolidated the perspective that saw faculty governance participation both as desirable and necessary if higher education institutions were to advance knowledge, foster higher learning and provide social service ("75 Years," 1989).

Institutional governance in higher education can be divided in two types according to content: academic and general or administrative decision making (Knowles, 1978). Academic decision-making involves issues related to the questions of what should be taught, who should teach it, how it should be teach, who should be taught, how academic funds should be distributed, who and how should academic plans and policies be developed (Smyth, 1978). Administrative decision making, on the other hand, involves general budget allocation, strategic planning and administrative and management issues in general (Knowles, 1978). Using the term "academic" more generally, Cowley (1980) speaks of academic government as the social control of academic institutions. Under his perspective academic government

---

[1] Paper presented to Dr. Jack H. Schuster, Ed 459, Historical and Philosophical Foundations of American Higher Education. Claremont, California, December 11, 1996.

[2] This activity profile characterizes contemporary academic profession and its associated notion of scholarship, which Boyer (1990) has expanded to include teaching as well as the discovery, integration, and application of knowledge.

takes place at two levels of specificity: the policy and the operational. Finally, it is convenient to consider a historical dimension of academic governance, as the term does not have a uniform meaning throughout time (Metzger, 1989).

In this paper I will follow Knowles' (1978) use of academic governance as institutional decision-making having to do more directly with academic issues. Also, I will incorporate Cowley's (1980) notion that such decision making takes place at the policy and at the operational levels of an institution's functioning. These two perspectives allow us to map institutional decision-making along a content (academic vs. administrative) and specificity (policy vs. operational) criteria. However, because in a higher education institution all decisions have some potential influence on its academic life, both the content and the specificity criteria should be considered continuous dimensions. Along the content dimension one can place decisions related to academic programs (nature and organization of courses, evaluation strategies, admission criteria, degree requirements), individual courses (content, teaching, evaluation methods), research (areas to work in, use of grants), and the faculty itself (appointment, evaluation, promotion and tenure).[3] Moving away from the academic side of the continuum one can identify decisions pertaining to student life as quasi-academic. Finally, in the administrative portion of the continuum one finds decisions more closely associated to the planning, budgeting and administration of the institution as a whole and of its departments and schools seen as administrative units. In all three types of content the opportunity exists for decisions to be made at a general, guideline or policy level, or at a concrete or operational level.

Participation of faculty in academic decision-making is usually taken for granted both at the policy and at the operational levels. In contrast, faculty participation in administrative institution-wide issues is less frequent and much more questioned in terms of its potential conflict with efficiency, leadership and environmental pertinence issues (Schuster, Smith, Corak & Yamada, 1994). Again, as with faculty tasks, this academic governance picture is more appropriate for certain higher education institutions than for others. In general, research and graduate oriented institutions allow for more faculty governance participation than comprehensive and two-year institutions, with small liberal arts colleges somewhere in between (Clark, 1987).

Kerr (1995, p. 137) has described the development of institutional governance in American higher education as passing through three broad periods. A first one in which governing boards were the central decision-making agencies (1636-1870); a second where presidents occupied the dominant position

---

[3] The issues related to courses, research and faculty have been especially associated with the concepts of academic freedom and tenure (AAUP, 1915/1961; AAUP, ACE & AGBUC, 1966/1990).

(1870-1920), and a third in which faculty gained considerable institutional influence (after 1920).[4] Putting aside the other three general functions of the professoriate, in this paper I will describe faculty governance participation in American higher education from Colonial times to the turn of the twentieth century, just before the onset of Kerr's third governance era. The paper is organized in four sections. In the first I provide a historical perspective by discussing faculty governance participation within the early Medieval universities. Sections two and three illustrate, along the content and specificity dimensions previously described, the ways in which academics have participated in the governance of higher education institutions throughout the first two governance periods proposed by Kerr (1995). To contextualize faculty governance participation, I describe in each section some relevant conditions of higher education for each of the corresponding periods. Finally, in section four I comment on a few lessons that this historical exploration can provide us with.

Faculty Governance Participation in Early Medieval Universities

People frequently people "see" in the past situations that they would like to be living in the present, especially when their reality is considerably different from such envisioned state of affairs. In building a rationale for a prominent faculty role in higher education institutional governance, some authors have seen the early medieval university as the ideal "free republic of scholars" where these were in complete control of university affairs (Cowley, 1980). Cattell (1913, p. 5), for example, described such institution as

> extraordinary unhierarchical, democratic, anarchic, in its organization. The university was then, as it now should be, the professors and the students. The professors, of course, had complete control of the conditions under which degrees were given and in the selection of their colleagues and successors. The doctor earned the *jus ubique docendi*; he was not employed or dismissed. There was an elected council and rectors were elected for a year or for some other short period.

Despite this optimistic and idyllic description, masters and students of those times had real limits in their autonomy (Cowley, 1980), and conflicts between scholars and external agencies were not uncommon. During the twelfth century at Paris the license to teach (*licentia docendi*) was awarded exclusively by the chancellor of Notre-Dame. This tradition was challenged by the Parisian masters in 1213 (Baldwin, 1982), and after a dispute that lasted almost the entire thirteenth century, a papal decree established that the chancellor could only award such teaching license to those scholars previously certified by the faculty (Metzger, 1973).

At Paris during the late twelfth century the Catholic Church was the main source of support for masters and students to the extent that these were usually clergymen (Baldwin, 1982). However, the

church also supervised what was taught. So, Peter Abelard was tried twice for his heretical positions on religious matters, and Giordano Bruno was actually burned due to his philosophical doctrine (Perkin, 1991). Despite such events, Haskins (1923/1957) considers that the medieval university provided an acceptable "academic freedom" for its masters. As clergymen they did not perceived religious orthodoxy as an external imposition and were, therefore, generally at ease with setting self-imposed limits to their intellectual explorations (Haskins, 1923/1957). Accepting that faith preceded science, masters devoted themselves to facilitate students' learning of a fix set of well-acknowledged textbooks. However, academic motivation, as any other human aspect, is seldom found in pure form, and even in such early times we hear of complaints that "one could study theology not for God's sake but for the advancement to the prelacy" (Baldwin, 1982, p. 153).

The situation at other Medieval universities was not as utopian either. Fourteenth century masters at Bologna faced the existence of an older student body than the one found at Paris. Being an asset for the city government because they represented important sources of revenue and prestige (Hyde, 1988), these students were very effective in organizing themselves and obtained in 1158 several royal privileges from Frederick Barbarossa. On the basis of such privileges they imposed rigorous conditions on their professors (Cowley, 1980). So, for example, if a professor needed to leave the city he had to deposit a certain amount of money to secure his return (Haskins, 1923/1957). To defend themselves from such students' economic control, professors contracted themselves with the municipal government. However, once this happened local authorities organized committees of citizens to administer those contracts, much in the same spirit that later boards of trustees in American colleges would take care of their institution's finances (Cowley, 1980).

In its origins Medieval universities had no property at all and, therefore, its essence was formed by those men that gather to "gladly" teach and learn (Haskins, 1923/1957). However, these institutions existed within a given social environment from which they had to secure resources and, oftentimes, also defend themselves. Teaching and learning were important to religion and to the raising imperial powers of the time. They provided educated personnel for the administration and, on the other hand, they were seen as "important shapers of attitudes toward public authorities" (Ferruolo, 1988, p. 33). In this context the Church and the nobility "protected," through charters and statutes, a diversity of corporations of masters and scholars. It was unavoidable that along with such protection and support something of the original autonomy was lost.

Traditionally Bologna has been seen as a university governed by students, while early Medieval Paris is seen as governed by masters. Although indeed these actors played a central role in their

---

[4] During this last period administrators also gained considerable decision-making power (Kerr, 1995, p. 99).

respective guilds, the role of external sources of influence has been generally overlooked. As noted previously, the city in the case of Bologna, and the Church in the case of Paris, were powerful players in the determination of these universities' internal dynamics.

From the Bologna and Paris models of institutional governance others evolve, including those of Oxford (1167), Cambridge (1209), Lyden (1575) and Edinburgh (1583). While Oxford and Cambridge developed a government structure based on resident fellows, Lyden and Edinburgh, following the Reformation, incorporated the presence of lay and external boards of government. All these governance traditions would be important for the American colonial colleges of the seventeenth century (Cowley, 1980), to which we now turn.

The Governing Boards Period in American Higher Education

According to Kerr (1995, p. 137) the first period of institutional governance in American higher education spans almost 250 years. It goes from the founding of Harvard College in 1636, to 1870, two years after Andrew D. White founded Cornell University and became his first president, and one year after Charles W. Elliot started his 40-year presidency at Harvard (Rudolph, 1977, pp. 131-132). Many changes happened in American society during this time, including the Independence Revolution and the early nineteenth century industrialization. Given such dynamics, it would indeed be surprising if higher education had remained still. Instead, a series of situations gradually emerged and differentiated themselves from each other. Although not clearly discernible when looked closely, a broad pattern emerges when seen from the distance that time provides.

At the institutional level the governing board era encompasses the colonial college and the college movement periods (Rudolph, 1962/1990). Harvard and the first colonial colleges had three identifiable goals. First, to preserve the religious tradition, as colonizers considered it crucial to have learned religious ministers. Second, to secure the availability of educated personnel for the public service. And third, to preserve a ruling class associated with the upper positions and government of the colonies. Few members of the elite class attended college, but these institutions worked on the aristocratic assumption that a college education would distinguish a gentleman with social responsibilities from a common man (Herbst, 1982). Such differentiation could only be accomplished working with youths of a "receptive and refined nature, . . . whose general as well as special training has been liberal and refined both at school and at home" (Rudolph, 1977, p. 133). So, Harvard explicit purpose was to educate "the English & Indian youth of this Country in knowledge: and godliness . . . (that is, to foster) the advancement & education of youth in all manner of good literature, arts and sciences" ("Harvard Charter, 1650," 1961, pp. 10-12). Yale was more direct and state that its central goal was to educate

"many worthy persons for the service of God in the state as well as in church" ("Yale Charter, 1745," 1961, p. 49).

With this goal in mind, the number and diversity of higher education institutions grew slowly at first, but at an accelerated pace afterwards. While 25 colleges were chartered up to 1800, the first three decades of the nineteenth century saw 44 new colleges chartered. At the end of this era, between 1860 and 1870, 175 more colleges were chartered (Rudolph, 1977, p. 60).[5] However, the number of students attending college did not grow proportionately, and the average student population per institution was so small that it would not be until 1860 that the first college graduating class reached 100 students. What is most important, the percentage of the population that went to college actually declined (Rudolph, 1977, p. 60).

American colonial colleges benefited from the Calvinist commitment to learning, as well as from the experiences of English and Scottish universities that use English for instruction, stress science and politics, and had a positive attitude toward experimental inquiry (Rudolph, 1977, pp. 26-27). With these influences colonial colleges developed, despite the rigidity that religion represented, a positive predisposition for change. As Hornberger (1945, p. 81) has stated, "the fundamental purpose of learning . . . was to enable the Christian minister and gentleman to understand the Word of God, and the American Puritans of the first generation had not the slightest fear that learning could be dangerous." Following this perspective, the original colonial college curriculum expanded with new scientific and more pragmatically oriented contents in response to a series of social and economical developments, as well as to European intellectual influences. By early nineteenth century the curriculum was no longer exclusively concentrated upon the traditional liberal arts. Technical and scientific oriented colleges and programs appeared throughout the country (Rudolph, 1977), preparing the way for the American university of the second half of the nineteenth century (Rudolph, 1962/1990).

The first two colonial colleges, Harvard and William and Mary, were chartered corporations with a two-board governance structure. The internal board was formed by the president and the college faculty, while the external was constituted by clergymen and civil members. The absence of a scholar community and the denominational interests of college founders forced governance to relay upon an external board of overseers or trustees (Rudolph, 1962/1990). These external boards of trustees were invested with such powers and privileges as

> to appoint a scribe or register, a treasurer, tutors, professors . . . as they shall find necessary and fit to appoint . . . and . . . at their discretion to remove . . . (And in general over) the government, care and management of the said college, and all the matters and affairs thereunto belonging

[5] Not all colleges chartered during the colonial times survived. Although 25 came into existence up to 1800, only nine of them were functioning before 1770 (Rudolph, 1977, p.60).

("Yale Charter, 1745," 1961, p. 52).

As was natural to expect, these external boards exerted such powers from the perspective of their world-view, and when such view did not coincide with that of presidents, faculty or students, it was not the board that had to compromise or change. Henry Dunster, Harvard's first designated president, was moved to resign in 1654 because he did not baptize his fourth child, and therefore the

> *overseers* of the college became solicitous, that the students there might not be unawares ensnared in the errors of their *president*. Wherefore they laboured with an extreme agony, either to rescue the good man from his *own mistake*; or to restrain him from imposing them upon *the hope of the flock*, of both of which, finding themselves to despair, they did as quietly as they could, procure his *removal*, and provided him a successor ("Cotton Mather on Harvard's First President," 1702/1961, p. 20).

Tutors, faculty and students did not scape from the intolerance of governing boards. Already in the eighteenth century, in 1735, professor Louis Langloiserie at Harvard was found to have unsound doctrines and dismissed (Hofstadter, 1955/1996, p. 157). At Yale, in 1744, two students were expelled because during a vacation they attended a religious ceremony of a different denomination than that officially endorsed by Yale (Rudolph, 1962/1990, pp. 17-18).

Strengthen after the 1819 Dartmouth College case ("Daniel Webster," 1961), the control of the governing boards also extended to curricular particulars. In 1836 faculty at Kenyon College confronted their board of trustees over Greek and Latin pronunciation (Rudolph, 1977, p. 57). Already in the second half of the nineteenth century, "members of the Board of Regents of Wisconsin used to sit with a red lead pencil in consultation over the lists of books submitted by their professors, and strike out those that failed to please their fancy, with irreverent comments on 'fool professors'" (Lucas, 1994, p. 196). Often, however, such control was exerted by the intermediation of the college president, as when in 1846 professor Evert M. Topping of Princeton resigned after "he was called before the president" for incorporating commentaries on Greek literature in his classes of Greek (Rudolph, 1977, p. 90).

Besides controversies over religious matters and curricular content, governing boards also took care that college members followed accepted morals. On these grounds they were equally willing to dismiss a professor who hit his wife as well as another one who was bitten by his (Rudolph, 1962/1990, p. 157).

Although the composition of the first external boards was mainly of clergymen, by mid nineteenth century secular trustees, usually business men, had replaced them (Clark, 1987). Nonetheless, their use of power followed the same logic of being a reflection of their interests and perspectives, as when in the mid 1800's regional businessmen pressured Harvard to bring orthodox economics and the "useful" natural and social sciences into the curriculum (Rudolph, 1977). Stated succinctly,

> the sound, conservative men of wealth who came to dominate the college governing boards were pillars of the better classes, and while their duties permitted them to perform a social responsibility, their authority also enabled them to keep the colleges true to the interests and prejudices of the classes from which they were drawn. Although clergymen at first prevailed on the collegiate corporations, their usefulness in an increasingly secular United States was seriously questioned (Rudolph, 1962/1990, p. 173).

In relation to the professoriate, the governing board era encompasses three stages in the historical development of the academic profession (Finkelstein, 1984): the tutorship stage (1636-1750), the appearance of "permanent" faculty (1750-1800), and the ascent of the institutional career and professionalization of the faculty (1800-1870).[6]

During the tutorship stage (1636-1750) the final decision power over all college matters was vested upon the external governing boards. However, the operational responsibility for running the college, including at first doing all of the instruction (Morison, 1936, pp. 140-142), rested upon its president, who was helped by "tutors" (Rudolph, 1977). These were generally young graduates preparing themselves for the ministry who would teach to a cohort all subjects leading to the degree. The tasks of these tutors were both pedagogical and pastoral-custodial. Because tutors were responsible for teaching the subjects in which there were no professors, and also the fundamentals in subjects where there were (Rudolph, 1962/1990), the opportunities for them to specialize and develop disciplinary expertise were minimal. On the other side, the opportunity to develop a career within the institution was limited to the time the tutor worked in it, which was usually short (Finkelstein, 1984). As more colleges were founded, and as more students attended them, the number of permanent tutors increased little by little, as initial colleges' financial conditions did not allow them to hire professors. Indeed, Harvard had been functioning for more than eighty-five years before it appointed its first professor. Many more years were to pass before transient tutors were outnumbered by regular professors (Rudolph, 1962/1990).

From 1750 to 1800 a small core of permanent faculty appeared in the American colonial colleges (Finkelstein, 1984). Ten professors are reported in 1750, while in 1795 such number had roused to 105. Professorships developed directly from philanthropic gifts. Professors' obligations included the same activities performed by tutors, except that they were appointed to teach a specific subject area. In relation to tutors professors were also older (five to 10 years), more experienced and usually had post baccalaureate "professional" training in theology, law or medicine. Although a permanent professorship did not imply an exclusive career, professors normally taught at only one college throughout their career, most commonly at their Alma Mater (Wagoner & Kellams, 1992, p. 1679). At Harvard a tutorship did

---

[6] Actually Finkelstein (1984) signals the period 1800-1820 as the era of the ascent of faculty's institutional career. On the other hand, for Finkelstein and Schuster (1992) the faculty professionalization stage starts in the first quarter of the

not constitute a road to becoming a professor, while at Yale and Brown tutorship served as a selective feeder for the professorship (Finkelstein, 1984). Tutors at Harvard, however, stopped teaching all subjects in 1767, when they were made responsible of a subject instead of a class (Rudolph, 1962/1990, p. 163).

In the 1800-1870 period faculty started and developed a professional career within their institutions (Finkelstein, 1984; Finkelstein & Schuster, 1992). As leading institutions grew in size professors outnumbered tutors. The professionalization of the academic career meant a specialization in teaching, a formal preparation for becoming a faculty member, a lifelong career commitment, and the notion of the academic as an expert in his field (Finkelstein & Schuster, 1992, p. 190). All these characteristics would push the faculty into a position that made them claim an increased academic freedom and autonomy. Parallel to these changes, professors started to move beyond their original institution of location by the 1850's.

Given the foregoing general account of the governing board era, what governance participation or decision-making capacity did tutors and professors have in such period? During the tutorship stage there was generally little room for tutorship academic say, and when there was, this had to be sanctioned by the president. The contents and approaches to the curriculum, including the admission and degree requirements, were jealously taken care off by the external boards of trustees, who usually specify them in the colleges' charters and statutes. Certainly, the intention of having a detailed control over the curriculum prompted the foundation of many of the colonial colleges, and such control was not going to be left at the discretion of tutors just a few years older than the students themselves. Such was the role of the president. This general situation is exemplified by the Statutes of William and Mary (1727/1961, p. 43), which in relation to its grammar school expected that

> the Latin and Greek tongues be well taught. As for rudiments and grammars, and classick authors of each tongue, let them teach the same books which by law or custom are used in the schools of England. Nevertheless, we allow the schoolmaster the liberty, if he has any observations on the Latin or Greek grammars, or any of the authors that are taught in his school, that with the approbation of the president, he may dictate them to the scholars.

Although it might appear from the above comments that tutors and early professors during this period where essentially implementing the program of study laid down by the governing boards with the advice of the president, the situation was not that straightforward. Controlling a non-isolated institution dealing with ideas and the education of people proved to be much more difficult than what denominational orders had assumed (Rudolph, 1977). When confronted with such a complex task as that of educating, professors and tutors seldomly just carry orders. More often than not they put something

---

nineteenth century and keeps on going for the rest of the century.

themselves, and for the American colleges this "extra" came to have important consequences in the long run, especially in the scientific and professional fields.

At first tutors supported the president's educational effort by taking charge of whole classes. Being in a difficult position to develop an expertise in an area, it was also difficult for them to incorporate new contents to their teaching. So, during the seventeenth century science teaching grew slowly, and "science seems to have occupied little if any more of the student's time at Harvard in 1700 than it had in 1640" (Hornberger, 1945, p. 24). The advent of professors in the eighteenth century, because of their subject matter specialization, eased the changing of the curriculum, "which in most places were instituted by, or at the suggestion of, the presidents and professors themselves" (Hofstadter, 1955/1996, p. 178).

In the early eighteenth century a secularization tendency started. This movement would grow and consolidate itself after the Civil War (Hofstadter, 1955/1996, pp. 185-186). In order to have students colleges were forced to accept them from different denominational religious. This religious freedom awarded to students represented a step in the establishment of an atmosphere of intellectual freedom (Hofstadter, 1955/1996, pp. 152-153). Secularization was also influenced by external conditions. Factors included an increased commerce activity, a larger well-to-do class, the influence of the European Enlightment, and the interest in science and the application of knowledge. All of them promoted a positive disposition toward new ideas and a more liberal attitude in relation to religion orthodoxy (Hofstadter, 1955/1996, pp. 177-178).

In 1714 Samuel Johnson and Daniel Browne, Yale first two tutors, were captured by the "new learning" brought from England in donated books describing the work of Copernicus, Descartes and Newton. Such material would find its way into the curriculum in an unofficial way at first. Samuel Johnson introduced "a good deal of science into the curriculum, more, probably than the Board would have allowed if it had been less busy" from other activities that demanded its attention (McKeehan, 1947, pp. 10-11). However, by 1718 the Yale course of study included algebra, and in 1742 instruction in mathematics began in the freshman year (Rudolph, 1977, p. 33). So, despite the tight control over the curriculum, tutors and later professors were able to communicate their enthusiasm for new knowledge. When this knowledge did not conflict with established authority then it would go on to impact the curriculum.

Beginning in the first half of the eighteenth century professorships were created in scientific fields. In 1711 William and Mary appointed Le Fevre as professor of natural philosophy and mathematics. He was "the first man to hold a chair in science in America" (Hornberger, 1945, p. 25). Harvard named Isaac Grenwood the first Hollis professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in 1727 (Hornberger, 1945, p. 26). As in these new fields there was much less orthodoxy to defend, professors,

tutors and presidents worked actively to enrich the curriculum. This situation was envisioned by the Statutes of William and Mary of 1727, in which, in relation to the philosophy school, the board maintained that

> for as much as we see now daily a further progress in philosophy, than could be made by Aristotle's *Logick* and *Physicks*, which reigned so long alone in the schools, and shut out all other; therefore we leave it to the president and masters, by the advice of the chancellor, to teach what systems of logick, physicks, ethicks, and mathematicks, they think fit in their schools (1961, p. 44).

As previously commented, there was a positive attitude toward learning and, as long as the new material did not openly confront the college religious position, curricular innovations were tolerated and governing boards did not intervene. Indeed,

> what is most impressive, however, it is the quietness and gradualness with which the change took place. It was a long, slow advance, characterized by opportunism rather than daring, preceded by a careful reconnaissance of the terrain, and marked by few explosions (Hofstadter, 1955/1996, p. 178).

However, if the material or, more important, the tutor or professor responsible of it did not respond to the college religious orthodoxy, then it was not uncommon for the professor to be dismissed (Hofstadter, 1955/1996, pp. 157-158).

Within this range of possibilities there were numerous academic innovations introduced by tutors, professors and presidents. At Harvard tutor William Brattle introduced in 1687 Cartesian logic into the curriculum (Kennedy, 1990, p. 549); professor Isaac Greenwood first introduced laboratory practices in a college course in 1727 (Hornberger, 1945. pp. 45-47); professor John Winthrop at Harvard (1738-1779) headed the first laboratory of experimental physics (Rudolph, 1977, p. 34); in the 1820's the blackboard was first used by William Smyth at Bowdoin (Rudolph, 1977, p. 89); in the 1830's both at Yale and at Harvard written examinations replaced oral ones to promote a stronger intellectual effort by students (Rudolph, 1977, p. 146). All these changes, although probably small when seen at the moment of implementation, contributed to create an atmosphere in which inquiry and innovation was not something to be avoided. Moreover, they also help build the appropriate conditions in which more ground breaking innovations could be successfully implemented.

More important, however, was to be the influence of the German university tradition and its notion of academic freedom. Coming back from Germany in the 1820's George Ticknor and several professors at Harvard introduced the elective system and created the departmental structure. In 1825 the first department of instruction was created in America and, with it, the curriculum was placed under the potential control of the faculty. These changes would not be followed to their fullest implications because

of the faculty itself, but they nevertheless set up the conditions for later institutional and curricular developments (Rudolph, 1977, pp. 76-77).

Regarding to the quasi-academic area of discipline and student life decision-making, tutors and professors were expected to follow the policies and concrete instructions of the college president. The Statutes of Harvard (1646/1961, pp. 8-10) specify with great detail the behavior of students which tutors were responsible for encouraging, including being silent in the presence of tutors and aged persons, speaking slowly, and "diligently attend the Lectures without any disturbance by word or gesture" (p. 9). It is easy to imagine that this was not an agreeable situation for students, and tutors were therefore "generally despised by students" (Rudolph, 1962/1990, p. 164).

As long as tutors and professors saw their main mission exclusively in terms of educating their students it was natural for both to be heavily involved in the maintenance of the college moral atmosphere. They took considerable decisions while interacting with students in their role of *locus parentis*. As professors became more involved in intellectual issues, deciding students life lost importance. Extracurricular activities supported by students themselves provided a stimulation that did not encounter either in the course of study or in their relationships with tutors and professors (Rudolph, 1977).

Finally, except for Harvard, tutors in the colonial colleges were not considered in the general government and administration of their institutions. Having been neglected to occupy recent corporation vacancies for the benefit of nonresident persons, tutors at Harvard made an effort to regain a presence in the internal government and administration of the college around 1723 ("Tutor Sever's Argument," 1723/1961, pp. 21-27). Their request to the overseers to be considered for membership in the corporation was made based on the Harvard Charter of 1650 (1961, pp. 10-12). The charter stated that tutors were to be members of the internal board of fellows, which was to function as a "resident government" modeled after the British experience. Tutors were able to regain their presence in the corporation at the time of this conflict, but they were unable to maintain it. After 1778 only one additional faculty member became a member of the corporation (Kilpatrick, 1931, p. 29). This non-systematic participation of Harvard tutors in the resident government of their institution was the exception to the general pattern that prevailed in the colonial colleges, which was of no participation.

In summary, during the governing board era faculty participation in institutional governance grew larger in issues related with non-controversial aspects of the curriculum. This fact reduced their participation in the quasi-academic area of student life. Finally, although not accepted in the administration of the institution, faculty professionalization provided the basics for administrative involvement in those matters related to the curriculum.

The Presidents' Period in American Higher Education

According to Kerr (1995) the president's governance era goes from 1870 to 1920. Cowley (1980, p. 60) speaks of the 1870-1910 period as "the age of titans," and identifies presidents of such time as leaders, not autocrats. In such a role they were able not merely to concentrate considerable decision-making power but, most important, they convinced and led their communities in pursuing an institutional project. In Cattell's (1913, p. 32) terms, real leaders should not only be able to drive the faculty, but also to follow it.

After the Civil War and the Morrill Act of 1862 higher education was seen by the federal government not only in terms of it's intrinsic educational worth, but increasingly as an instrument of a national agenda (Key, 1996). So, higher education institutions faced the challenge of providing an adequate response to the demands of a more pragmatic and democratic education. At the same time, it was essential to keep up with the growing tendency of placing scientific inquiry at the core of higher education. Even before the middle of the eighteenth century many business men had been willing to finance innovative efforts that required new programs and different emphasis in teaching, research and public service. However, after mid-century such willingness extended unprecedently and included the financing of entire new institutions (Metzger, 1955, p. 413). In this way the names of Ezra Cornell, John Hopkins and John D. Rockefeller were associated with Cornell University (1868), John Hopkins University (1876) and The University of Chicago (1892; Rudolph, 1977). In addition to new private institutions important public institutions were revitalized with the spirit of the emerging university, like those at Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin (Rudolph, 1962/1990, p. 277). Finally, old colleges like Harvard, Yale and Princeton immersed themselves in a transformation saga after the university ideal (Rudolph, 1977).

By the turn of the twenthyth century the university movement was for all purposes consolidated. In the process, however, changes have occurred at many different levels within the participating institutions. The university organization, its curriculum and the faculty were all qualitatively different from what they had been. Additionally, the relationships between higher education institutions and external agencies, either important donors or the state legislatures, were similarly transformed.

The emergence of the university, which parallels the onset of the president's period in institutional governance, was not the result of this period, however. The factors that originated the university were present in the American colleges from time ago. They included the elective system and the departmental organization of the faculty set up at Harvard in the 1820's (Rudolph, 1977, pp. 76-77), the influence of German higher education philosophy, the recognition of practical programs within the colleges, the

increased secularization of the academy, and the willingness of wealthy persons to invest heavily in alternate models of higher education. All these factors were present, but there was a need for someone to take charge and lead the way through the enormous changes that had to be made in already existing institutions, or be able to create new ones. So, the president as "titan" was necessary. Given the not always pro-change attitude of governing boards and faculty, they had to exert almost absolute power. They, rather than the governing boards would be the ones that during this time would be the central figures in institutional governance. So, president Charles William Elliot justifies the changes he wanted to promote at Harvard by making his audience aware that "there is a new president" (Rudolph, 1962/1990, p. 291). G. Stanley Hall (1923/1961, p. 652) refers, in relation to first president Daniel Coit Gilman, that faculty at John Hopkins University had a "sense that he always had the final decision with regard to all our appointments and promotions." Seeing these prerogatives as excessive when applied to scholars, J. McKeen Cattell (1913, p. 36) expressed: "that the president should decide which professor shall be discharged, and which have his salary advanced, which department or line of work shall be favored or crippled, is the most sinister side of our present system of university administration."

During the president's governance era changes at the institutional level were evident by the creation of new universities and the transformation of old colleges into universities. While in 1870 there were 563 higher education institutions, in 1900 there were 977, and by 1920 such number had reached the impressive number of 1,041 (Clark, 1987, p. 12). Students going to colleges and universities went from 52,286 in 1870, to 237,592 in 1900, and finally to 597,880 in 1920 (National Center for Education Statistics, 1995, p. 175). Changes were not only quantitative, however, as graduate and professional studies were incorporated into what had been a system almost entirely devote to liberal undergraduate education. At the curricular level the elective system and the departmental organization were essential ingredients in supporting the addition of new subject matters, the creation of new programs and the new role of the faculty (Rudolph, 1977).

During the presidents' era faculty attained their professional status by means of becoming specialists. Their expert knowledge, the vicinity of colleagues with similar interests within the departmental structure, and the elective system allowed them to gain a considerable amount of control over the curriculum. New courses appeared across colleges and emerging universities, where academics were recruited because of their research inclination. The elective system and faculty's research interests prompted them to change the contents of the curriculum more frequently than ever before. Simultaneously, professors separated themselves even more from student life. It is probably no coincidence that during this time sports jump into a prominent place in college student life (Rudolph, 1977). However, faculty did not yet control the appointment of his colleagues. Nevertheless, there were

instances in which conflicts aroused, as when presidents wanted to incorporate people with a very clear lack of academic background. However, presidents control the general and, when required, also the specific picture. That is, they control personnel policies, which were quite simply, whatever policy they considered appropriate at the time. The curriculum at the general level was also controlled by presidents. G. Stanley Hall (1923/1961, pp. 651-652), comments in relation to Gilman's presidency at John Hopkins: "I never quite understood why he opposed my earnest wish to give a course on the history of universities and learned societies."

Given this context, what was the participation of faculty in institutional governance during the presidents' governance era? At the academic level there was a much clearer control of academic decision-making by the faculty in program, course and teaching related issues. In general it can be said that faculty created new courses and decided what their content would be. However, approval of the president was necessary. Religious controversies diminished, but there were still people signaling with a fire finger, especially during the beginning of this governance period, that "even atheists may be professors" (Rudolph, 1977, p. 126). Also, contents as evolution were not as easily incorporated into the curriculum because of its obvious clash with religious beliefs. So, President Julius Seeyle of Amherst was moved to clarify to his faculty that "to speak of Evolution the Department of Psychology and Philosophy . . . feels perfectly competent to handle this subject and will thank all other Departments to keep hands off" (Rudolph, 1977, pp. 107-108

The role once played by religious orthodoxy, however, was now occupied by political and economic orthodoxy, and faculty could get into significant trouble if they manifested an opinion counter the accepted view (Lucas, 1994, p. 194). The dynamics leading to the conflict between professors and businessmen was far from being simple and, besides political and cultural factors there were considerations related to the president's role, the professors involved, and others (Metzger, 1955). A particular aspect that faculty resented during this governance era was the absence of "due process of law" in cases in which academics were separated from their positions. Also, when such situations were taken to court the ruling was frequently in favor of the institution as represented by its governing board (Kirkpatrick, 1931; Metzger, 1955). There were however exceptional cases in which academic freedom was reinforced, as when the University of Wisconsin, in relation to professor Richard T. Ely, stated that its Regents "could not for a moment think of recommending the dismissal or even the criticism of a teacher even if some of his opinions should, in some quarters, be regarded as visionary" (Metzger, 1955, p. 427).

During the president's era the general circumstances were such to make academics, specially instructors and junior professors, felt individually at the mercy of their institution's administration. In

certain universities they were "placed in a situation to which no decent domestic servant would submit" (Cattell, 1913, p. 50). This general state of affairs was a very powerful stimulus for faculty to organize themselves in the American Association of University Professors ("75 years," 1989), although also an important factor was the faculty's desire to obtain an increased job security in an increasing competitive academic marketplace (Metzger, 1955, p. 476).

While faculty participation in academic decision-making was recognized as important in the curriculum, the situation was quite different in issues having to do directly with themselves and, in general, with the institution at large. As President Eliot of Harvard stated in 1911, "most American professors of good quality would regard the imposition of duties concerning the selection of professors and other teachers, the election of the president, and the annual arrangement of the budget of the institution as a serious reduction in the attractiveness of the scholar's life and the professorial career" (quoted in Cattell, 1913, p. 60). Of course, presidents were there for making such decisions. That these, however, could actually be biased in favor of the perspective of the governing boards because it was to them that the president owed his position was something that, apparently, was not something seriously considered or seen in the light of the "conflict of interest" notion (Cattell, 1913, p. 19).

In the quasi-academic area of decision-making, the tendency for faculty to separate themselves from student life continued during this period. Specially at institutions developing themselves into universities they did no longer participate significantly in such spheres of action. This situation influenced the appearance of the student services personnel in the 1910's. Such division of areas of action and decision-making has persisted until the present (Allen & Garb, 1993).

Finally, institution-wide decision making was largely out of the reach of faculty during the presidents governance era. As it has already been mentioned, it was thought that faculty were not prepared, able or interested to participate in institution-wide governance issues. Additionally and not unrelated to the industrial model then highly valued, "trustees have come to regard themselves as the institution and the professors as merely their employees, as, indeed, has been asserted" (Stevenson, 1913, p. 372). Both perspectives made it irrelevant for governing boards and presidents to seriously consider the academics' perspective.

Concluding Comments and Perspectives

After this brief historical overview of faculty participation in institutional governance, several points deserve to be made. First, although faculty absolute autonomy is conceptually possible, it is definitively not an empirical viable notion. Not in the Medieval nor in the German universities was this possible. The claim for faculty participation in institutional governance cannot be made on the grounds

that faculty should have a monopoly on decision-making. Although governing boards in American colleges and universities are legally responsible for them, the evolution of higher education has come to recognize the relevance of different constituencies for institutional governance.

Second, although at times one or another constituency has concentrated considerable decision-making power, such monopoly of power has tended to produced reactions to balance such situations. At times such reactions have had disrupting effects, but it is my impression that the long range consequence of searching for a balance has been more positive than negative. If higher education is to avoid such disruptions in the future, it could benefit from analyzing areas where governance imbalance is taking place.

Third, faculty governance participation in the two periods that I have reviewed here can be said to have different dynamics depending upon the type of decision involved and the specificity level of the same. So, in relation to academic decisions there has been a movement from a situation in which, during the colonial colleges, tutors did not have any relevant participation in it, to a situation, in the presidents' era, in which professors are largely in control, as long they do not openly conflict with the established views on politics and economics. In the quasi-academic area of student affairs there was a retreat. As faculty professionalize itself and got involved in research student affairs issues were left aside. Finally, institution-wide decision-making did not change in general terms. The governing boards were first in charge, presidents coming into such position afterwards. It would remain for the third period proposed by Kerr (1995) to see a deeper involvement of faculty in institutional governance.

Finally, accepting that "'change' and 'continuity' are the staples of all historical inquiry" (Metzger, 1989, p. 4), tracking the history of academic involvement in institutional governance can teach us something about how change comes into being. Usually one thinks of change being rapid, that it is the result of big and obvious events, central among which is leadership, and that it is the result of a planned effort. History provides an antidote to these assumptions. I am amazed by the extent to which events are only meaningful when immersed in a wide time span; how many people are involved in promoting them, often unaware of what they were doing; how small changes can turn out to have large consequences and, finally, how change can be largely unplanned. On the other hand, I am equally amazed by the foresight of persons and institutions, and by how the concrete demands of society impacts, in one way or another, sooner or later, higher education institutions. And last, I have been most impressed by the power of ideas. Undoubtedly ideas have many different sources and probably they can be ultimately reduced to material conditions. Nonetheless, once an idea appears it seems as if it can have a life and power of its own. In this sense the value of the notion of a "free republic of scholars" might reside, not so much in whether it reflects reality, but in the impulse that it has provided for the reappraisal of the central role and

contribution that faculty can have in higher education institutions.

References

75 years: A retrospective on the occasion of the seventy-fifth annual meeting. (1989, May-June). Academe, 75(3), 4-33

Allen, K.E., & Garb, E.L. (1993). Reinventing student affairs: Something old and something new. NASPA Journal, 30(2), 93-100.

Altbach, P.G. (1991). The academic profession. In P.G. Altbach (Ed.), International higher education: An Encyclopedia (Vol. 1, pp. 23-45). New York: Garland Publishing

American Association of University Professors (1961). The A.A.U. P.'s "General Declaration of Principles," 1915. In R. Hofstadter & W. Smith (Eds.), American higher education: A documentary history (Vol. 2, pp. 860-878). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education, & Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (1990). In M.W. Peterson (Ed.), Organization and governance in higher education (4th ed., pp. 157-163). Needham Hights, MA: Ginn Press. (Original work published 1966)

Baldwin, J.W. (1982). Masters at Paris from 1179 to 1215: A social perspective. In R.L. Benson & G. Constable (Eds.), Renaissance and renewal in the twelfth century (pp. 138-172). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bowen, H.R., & Schuster, J.H. (1986). American professors: A national resource imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press.

Boyer, E.L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Cattell, J.M. (1913). University control. In J.M. Cattell (Ed.), University control (pp. 3-62). New York: The Science Press.

Clark, B.R. (1987). The academic life: Small worlds, different world. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education (1973). Faculty tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cotton Mather on Harvard's first president, Henry Dunster. (1702/1961). In R. Hofstadter & W. Smith (Eds.), American higher education: A documentary history (Vol. 1, pp. 20-21). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cowley, W.H. (1980). Presidents, professors, and trustees. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Daniel Webster argues the Dartmouth college case, 1819 (1961). In R. Hofstadter & W. Smith (Eds.), American higher education: A documentary history (Vol. 1, pp. 202-213). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ferruolo, S.C. (1988). Parisius-Paradisus: The city, its schools, and the origins of the University of Paris. In T. Bender (Ed.), The university and the city: From medieval origins to the present (pp. 22-43). New York: Oxford University Press.

Finkelstein, M.J. (1984). The American academic profession: A synthesis of social scientific inquiry since World War II. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Finkelstein, M.J., & Schuster, J.H. (1992). College and university faculty. In M.C. Alkin (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research (Vol. 1, 6th ed., pp. 190-197). New York: Macmillan.

Hall, G.S. (1961). G. Stanley Hall describes Gilman's policies at the Hopkins in the 1880's. In R. Hofstadter & W. Smith (Eds.), American higher education: A documentary history (Vol. 2, pp. 648-652). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

The Harvard Charter of 1650 (1961). In R. Hofstadter & W. Smith (Eds.), American higher education: A documentary history (Vol. 1, pp. 10-12). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Haskins, C.H. (1957). The rise of universities. New York: Cornell University Press. (Original work published 1923)

Herbst, J. (1982). From crisis to crisis: American college government 1636-1819. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hofstadter, R. (1996). Academic freedom in the age of the college. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers. (Original work published 1955)

Hornberger, T. (1945). Scientific thought in the American colleges, 1638-1800. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.

Hyde, J.K. (1988). Universities and cities in Medieval Italy. In T. Bender (Ed.), The university and the city: From medieval origins to the present (pp. 13-21). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kennedy, R. (1990). The alliance between Puritanism and Cartesian logic at Harvard, 1687-1735. Journal of the History of Ideas, 51(4), 548-572.

Kerr, C. (1995). The uses of the university (4th ed.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Key, S. (1966). Economics or education: The establishment of American land-grant universities. Journal of Higher Education, 67(2), 196-220.

Kirkpatrick, J.E. (1931). Academic organization and control. Yellow Springs, OH: The Antioch Press.

Knowles, A.S. (1978). Governance and administration. In A.S. Knowles (Ed.), The international encyclopedia of higher education (Vol. 5, pp. 1880-1901). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lucas, C.J. (1994). American higher education: A history. New York: St. Martin's Press.

McKeehan, L.W. (1947). Yale science: The first hundred years, 1701-1801. New York: Henry Schuman.

Metzger, W.P. (1955). The age of the university. In R. Hofstadter & W.P. Metzger, The development of academic freedom in the United States (pp. 275-506). New York: Columbia University Press.

Metzger, W.P. (1973). Academic tenure in America: A historical essay. In The Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education (Ed.), Faculty tenure: A report and recommendations (pp. 93-159). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Metzger, W.P. (1989). Academic governance: An evolutionary perspective. In J.H. Schuster, L.H. Miller & Associates, Governing tomorrow's campus: Perspectives and agendas (pp. 3-24). New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan.

Morison, S.E. (1936). Harvard College in the seventeenth century. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

National Center for Education Statistics (1995). Digest of education statistics 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Perkin, H. (1991). History of universities. In P.G. Altbach (Ed.), International higher education: An encyclopedia (Vol. 1, pp. 169-204). New York: Garland.

Rudolph, F. (1977). Curriculum: A history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rudolph, F. (1990). The American college and university: A history. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press. (Original work published 1962)

Schuster, J.H., Smith, D.G., Corak, K.A., & Yamada, M.M. (1994). Strategic governance: How to make big decisions better. Phoenix, AZ: American Council of Education and Oryx Press.

Smyth, D.M. (1978). Academic decision making. In A.S. Knowles (Ed.-in-Chief), The international encyclopedia of higher education (Vol. 5, pp. 1856-1876). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Statutes of Harvard, ca. 1646 (1961). In R. Hofstadter & W. Smith (Eds.), American higher education: A documentary history (Vol. 1, pp. 8-10). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Statutes of William and Mary, 1727 (1961). In R. Hofstadter & W. Smith (Eds.), American higher education: A documentary history (Vol. 1, pp. 39-49). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Stevenson, J.J. (1913). The status of the American college professor. In J.M. Cattell (Ed.), University control (pp. 370-392). New York: The Science Press.

Tutor Sever's argument on the constitution of Harvard College, 1723 (1961). In R. Hofstadter & W. Smith (Eds.), American higher education: A documentary history (Vol. 1, pp. 21-27). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wagoner, J.C., and Kellams, S.E. (1992). Professoriate: History and status. In B.R. Clark and G.R. Neave (Eds. in Chief), and A. Mory (Vol. Ed.), The encyclopedia of higher education: Vol. 3, Analytical perspectives (pp. 1674-1686). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Yale Charter, 1745 (1961). In R. Hofstadter & W. Smith (Eds.), American higher education: A documentary history (Vol. 1, pp. 49-53). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.