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among the most notable features of U.S. higher education are the rich diversity of institution types and the inherent complexity that accompanies their administration and management. This diversity is not from any purposeful design but through a centuries-long evolutionary process that reflects the educational aspirations of myriad religious, social, and governmental entities seeking independently to pursue higher education ideals within a democratic society that permitted organizational individuality and creativity.

The consequence of this historical evolution of higher education is the vast diversity of choice available to those seeking to attend a college or university. According to the Almanac of Higher Education (2011), there are accredited institutions of higher learning in the United States. Of the 3,672 are public, 1,614 are independent nonprofit, and 1,199 are for-profit. Nearly two thirds of all institutions offering degrees at the bachelor's level or above. Excluded from this vast number of postsecondary institutions are those organizations offering career and technical programs of less than two years and continuing education programs.

Given this rich organizational diversity, how can the subject of administration and management be approached to account for the vast differences? Leadership and decision making by academic administrators, regardless of institution type, become more informed when they are first analyzed by a basic understanding of the uniqueness of academic organizations on several levels: typological, organizational, and contextual. The nuanced understanding of each of these levels increases as one progresses through this conceptual hierarchy toward each individual institutional level within it.

Typological differences among higher education organizations are largely a function of historical development and institutional mission. Organizationally, colleges and universities share certain internal normative behaviors and processes that differentiate them from nonacademic organizations. However, each college or university must be understood within its own institutional context. Every institution of higher learning in the United States is idiosyncratic. Each possesses a unique history and organizational culture resulting from etiological circumstances determined by its founding mission; level and source of resources; structure; and, most significantly, the institution's organizational ethos, which characterizes how the stakeholders have come to interact and behave collectively.

This chapter is meant to provide the reader with a broad overview of the academic organization and its internal operations. It addresses several important questions: How and why are academic organizations different from other organization types? What are the central characteristics and defining features of all academic organizations? Through what perspectives can the academic organization best be understood? What theories of leadership help us understand these complex organizations? What decision-making models are effective in achieving institutional goals? A fundamental understanding of the challenges inherent in the administration and management of higher education organizations can best be achieved by addressing these key questions.

To address these questions, the chapter is divided into three parts. Part One starts with a broad overview of academic institutions as special organizational entities. Within this section we examine the nature of organizations in general and the characteristics of colleges and universities specifically by applying key theories that help us understand their complexity and structures and processes as different from those of other organizational types. A short historical perspective begins the section to provide a useful context for the reader. Part Two examines the operating structure of academic organizations, first describing the different types of functions within colleges and universities and then presenting three models of academic governance. Finally, Part Three focuses on decision making and academic leadership, and selected theories that can help academic leaders better understand how to administer the complex decision environments in which they work.
Institutions as Organizations: History, Typology, Characteristics

The central theme of this book is that effective administration and management of higher education institutions are best achieved when individuals play administrative roles throughout the organization understand and possess a shared vision of the unique culture of the institution they serve. Since the evolution of colleges and universities in America since the 19th century is largely a study of the American spirit itself, for few institutions so harmoniously reflect the ideals, aspirations, beliefs, and spirit of the United States and its people as the growth and evolution of its higher education organizations. Today’s panoply of options include, but are not limited to, two-year community colleges, four-year public institutions, and unaffiliated research universities, universities dedicated to professional education (such as medical or engineering schools), proprietary institutions and rabbinical colleges, and a host of universities providing education exclusively through online means.

The impressive number and array of institutions and the institution represent a particular problem when attempting to characterize the work performed and the outcomes produced by them in terms of institutional effectiveness and the shaping of public policy. The overall efficacy of U.S. postsecondary education. In 1970 the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1972) adopted an initial classification coding structure in an attempt to provide researchers with a useful matrix institutions could be compared with between and among their many different types. Populations today as the Carnegie Classification, it has assumed a singular role as the definitive source of categorizing and organizing colleges and universities into specific institution types for the purpose of evaluating public policy development. In addition, various publications and computerized public have used these classifications as a sorting mechanism for ratifying types to rate institutions on a host of different measures.

Along with the rise of new institution types, such as the for-profit college and the broadening of institutional missions to serve nontraditional populations, the Carnegie Foundation has altered the classification system numerous times to reflect a more layered and complex higher education landscape. The current classification system seeks to compare and contrast differences among and between institutions using data provided by institutions themselves through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics. The Carnegie Foundation notes that the greater level of specificity now seen in the classification system is based upon answers to three general questions: What is taught? To whom? In what setting? In addition to yielding more definitive and descriptive richness of the U.S. higher education landscape, the latest classification system seeks to lessen tendencies by some observers to ascribe qualitative and hierarchical judgments between different types of institutions. The resulting typological matrix employed today involves scores of classifications and subclassifications that are impressive in their diversity and daunting in their comprehensiveness.

An understanding and appreciation of these organizational differences is beneficial to the effective operation of the academic enterprise. This chapter reviews important historical and organizational factors that distinguish higher education organizations from other organizational types, giving special focus to the concept of democratic ideals and shared governance principles that have come to characterize the manner in which the academy’s stakeholders interact to fulfill their individual roles in the organization’s management and operation.

Historical Development of the Academic Institution

Today’s colleges and universities were born from an organizational and evolutionary lineage that ranks among the most enduring of humanity’s intellectual and social creations. In addition to its longevity, when compared with corporate organizations as mentioned in chapter 1, the modern academy continues to enjoy high regard by the public at large and is viewed as one of the United States’ most important social institutions. These institutions’ status and longevity are all the more noteworthy since over the centuries colleges and universities have taken a plethora of forms, and complex decision-making structures have emerged within them to accommodate the various internal and external constituencies competing for authority and legitimacy. Three main factors have contributed to this impressive state of permanence: (a) historical antecedents that established strong intellectual traditions, (b) the application of democratic principles that has encouraged individualism in the expression of educational ideals, and (c) the richness of diversity among those who claim legitimacy in the execution of the organization’s missions. An appreciation of these three factors is important to render more informed management and administration of higher education organizations, which is why they are deserving of mention here.
The longevity of higher education organizations rests in part on the historical traditions that have followed their development. In his nar-
the history of U.S. higher education, Lucas (2006) noted that
ors of the modern college and university essentially began in the
period, between the 11th and 13th centuries. Individuals with shared
interests in learning about specific disciplines collectivized into
centers by representatives elected from within the organizations.
ese elected into oversight responsibilities were reluctant to assume
sional duties because of the friction it caused among and between
their peers. Vestiges of those early frictions continue to exist today
in contemporary faculties. As organized entities, these shared social-
developed into intellectual collectives exhibiting an organizational
hierarchized through the unique knowledge possessed by the organ-
ners. Lucas notes that the strongest resemblance between the
ivilege and the academic institution of today rests in the sense
that institutional identity, together with an elaborate system of
ileges, prerogatives, and special forms of academic authority
his authority was exercised even in the earliest centuries of higher
when "once securely established, universities not hesitate to
in public affairs, to air grievances before kings and popes alike, to
jealously guard the rights of scholars to pursue their studies, and
to pass upon a variety of important legal and religious
(p. 69).
A relative autonomy enjoyed by the medieval guilds provided a histori-
ation for new forms of higher education to emerge in the earliest
United States. Though the earliest American colleges barely
ny of the higher education organizations of today, the European
individual and independent guilds provided a historical template
ity and individuality that permitted highly varied organizational
ions on what higher education should look like in the develop-
learnt society.
new U.S. society itself was emerging, these fledgling institutions
x a variety of environmental influences to help shape and sustain
were able to do so in part because of their independence and
adapt through that independence. In his history of U.S. higher
Thelin (2004) noted that the richness of diversity in U.S. higher
 emerged as much from influences of local, state, and regional
from any national trends that mirrored the development of
from the time of the founding of Harvard College in 1636. Much
use of entrepreneurship that characterized the new American spirit,
higher education became, according to Thelin, America's "cottage industry" (p. 41). Especially during 1783-1860, Thelin argued, higher education
witnessed

a period of extreme innovation and consumerism, with virtually no gov-
ernment accountability or regulation. Yet, it was not a period of chaos for
higher education, because the college displayed a pattern of both initiation
response that was very much in tune with the nation's changing geo-
draphic, demographic, and economic character. (p. 41)
The factors of historical and intellectual autonomy born of a rich and
embedded European medieval tradition, coupled with creative adaptation
demanded by the necessities of adjusting to the societal needs of an emergent
nation, produced a level of higher education organizational diversity that
would later become the hallmark of U.S. higher education.
Geiger (2005) chronicled 40 generations of development in the historical
evolution of the United States' colleges and universities, each lasting about
30 years from the founding of Harvard College in 1636 to the present. He
charted these generations from two perspectives: (a) student origins that
traced the diversity of students and (b) destinations that defined the out-
comes sought for those students as a result of their education. This origins
and destinations perspective is particularly useful when examining the diver-
sity and uniqueness of academic organizations because it speaks to the multi-
ple forces of individuals, religious bodies, governments, and foundations,
among others, that exercised significant influence in the formation of today's
wide array of institution types. Speaking to the democratic principles that
guided this evolutionary process, Geiger stated, "Underlying the fortunes of
individual institutions . . . lay fundamental questions stemming in large
measure from the . . . putative republican model: Who owned the colleges?
What was their mission? What should students be taught? And how could
they be controlled" (p. 41). As the societal needs of a growing United States
expanded and matured, new institutions of higher education emerged
throughout this generational progression, but, just as important, existing
institutions adapted to a changing environment in a fashion typical of the
entrepreneurial spirit of the nation. A noteworthy irony about U.S. higher
education has been its ability to adapt and conform to the external influences
that created and shaped it over the centuries while possessing an organiza-
tional DNA often steeped in inflexible tradition and a codified set of fixed
rights and organizational privileges that hearken to its earliest European
roots.
implications of these historical and developmental factors for the way colleges and universities should ultimately be managed and operated are significant. Basic to any managerial function within these institutions is a firm understanding of the particular mission of one’s institution, which emanates from the societal and historical traditions it was founded. “The key to being effective and the ability to make change in a way that is consistent with an accurate assessment of the type of organization in which one works” (Julius, Baldridge, & Pfeffer, 1999, p. 114).

Nature of Organizations

To explore the unique characteristics of academic organizations, it is important to describe the nature of organizations. According to Scott and Davis (2007), “Most analysts have conceived of organizations as social structures in which individuals to support the collaborative pursuit of specified goals.” Indeed, we live in a world of organizations. Businesses, civic groups, and other charitable entities are all organizations. Because of the nature of organizations, for more than a century, scholars have been trying to answer the question: “How does an organization go about doing what it does with what consequence for its people, processes, products, and services?” (Weick, 1976, p. 1).

Study of organizations is at the core of much of higher education and research, and serves as a foundation for much of this book, as it is the production of knowledge relevant to problem solving or decision-making within organizations (see, for example, Kast & Rosenzweig, 1950). While this book is intended to be understood by readers without an in-depth knowledge of this subject, we feel it is important to provide a brief overview of the field. Attempts to understand and characterize organizational behavior, academic and otherwise, focus on common elements: environment, goals, work and technology, formal and informal structures, and Scott & Davis, 2007). Understanding the essence of an organization involves looking at all its various aspects.

Environment. One cannot fully understand an organization without also understanding the environment in which it operates. “No organization is self-sustaining; all depend for survival on the types of relations they establish with other systems of which they are a part” (Scott & Davis, 2007, p. 19). Environment is generally composed of the actors, organizations, and entities an organization interacts with to survive and accomplish its goals or colleges and universities, the environment significantly affects how they operate. Whether an institution is located in Albany, New York, or Los Angeles, California, the location will affect whom it serves, how it serves, and the types of services and academic programs it offers. Moreover, how and where resources are obtained will have an impact on the ways the organization structures itself (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). For example, whether an institution’s budget is derived from tuition, state appropriations, or donations will affect the emphasis the organization places on such functions as student recruitment, lobbying, and fund-raising. Regardless of where an institution is located, its operations will be affected by such entities in the environment as local high schools, the city council, state government, non-profit organizations, other higher education institutions, and so forth.

Strategy and goals. This second element of organizations determines what an organization intends to accomplish and how it goes about achieving it. At the heart of organizing are entities designed to accomplish certain goals. However, most organizations must deal with goal complexity. That is, there is often a difference between the stated goals of an organization and the real goals that motivate individuals. In addition, there are support goals, which are necessary for maintaining the organization (Perrow, 1970). More than setting goals, organizations also develop strategies to achieve those goals. Leaders make decisions about where they will operate, the type of product or service they will produce, and whom they will hire to perform the work. Most educational institutions, particularly those in the public sector, are often constrained in that they do not always have control over their budgets and have limited flexibility in terms of adjusting their workforces because of tenure and union rules. Yet within whatever constraints that may exist, organization officials must determine how best to achieve their goals. In fact, the constraints can sometimes drive strategy. For example, some public colleges and universities have begun to offer courses in other states, as it is easier to expand outside their home state because of fewer regulatory constraints elsewhere (Lane, Kinser, & Knox, in press). Being able to operate in the midst of goal complexity and strategize within constraints is a key characteristic of successful academic administrators.

Work and technology. The process for achieving goals and implementing strategies is the work and technology of the organization. “Work describes the tasks that the organization needs to accomplish in order to achieve the goals that it has set for itself” (Scott & Davis, 2007, p. 21). Analysis of work looks at a variety of different factors, including the amount of interdependence among different parts of the organization, which affects how the work is accomplished and how actors interact. For example, units in academic affairs
be much more independent of each other than units in student
different departments than among faculty members in different units.
thesis also looks at such things as the flow of work and the necessary
knowledge of participants. For a faculty member in a college of
and science of a large university, for example, the dean is much less
to have direct knowledge of his or her disciplinary expertise than if the
member worked in a college of education. Departments in a college
ation tend to have greater affinity with each other than do those in
science colleges, which include a range of departments from English
istry. The result is that a dean of arts and science will have to rely
on the advice of others to assess faculty member performance than a
Dean of education.
ology is the way the organization transforms inputs into outputs.
ise, we are not specifically focusing on items such as computers,
hones, and electronic tablets, although they are increasingly impor-
t components of how institutions achieve their mission. Colleges and
ities have multiple outputs, but for our purpose here, we focus on the
ion of students. In this case, an analysis of a college's technology
 look at how an institution transforms a newly admitted student into
ate. The focus would mostly be on curriculum design, or on what
s and requirements a student has to meet to earn a degree. How that
occurs varies by academic program and by institution. Understand-
work and technology of academic institutions is a core component
book.
formal and informal structures. All organizations are made up of formal
structures. The formal structures of organizations are usually
hanted on organizational charts and in job descriptions. They are a
ation of the official hierarchy, in terms of reporting lines, job respon-
es, and the rules and regulations that guide the work of the organiza-
izations are also replete with informal structures, which can
times prove to be more important or influential than the formal struc-
The informal structures of an organization include culture and climate,
ial power structures, external social networks, and internal friendship
These informal aspects influence the effectiveness of the formal struc-
and are often part of the organization's work processes.
people. At their core, organizations are composed of people. This detail
less true for academic organizations that comprise students, faculty,
staff, administrators, and alumni. However, one of the difficulties in un-
derstanding this aspect of the academic organization is identifying which people
are part of the organization and which are not. Students are not employees,
but it is difficult to imagine an educational institution without students.
Alumni are neither employees nor students, but many are often active on
university councils, provide substantial resources to the organization, and some-
times exercise influence over institutional decision making. Beyond un-
derstanding who is involved, it is also important to know what induces people
to participate in the organization (see Barnard, 1938; Simon, 1945/1997). In
addition, age, gender, race, knowledge, and skills can affect how people
interact with each other and perform on behalf of the organization.

Organizational Boundaries and Systems

There are numerous schools of thought in the study of organizational theory,
but one of the most relevant to understanding the operation of colleges and
iversities is systems theory, which asserts that organizations are made up
of different components, and the relationship between those components
aries based on the system. "Organizations we must consider as something
in which there is an interdependence between the several organized parts but
in which this interdependence has degrees" (Wiener, 1954, p. 322). This
on of degrees of interdependence led to the concept of organizational
, which describes how tightly or loosely connected two components
are (see p. 31 for a discussion of coupling). However, systems theorists did
ot only explore the relationship between internal components.

Open systems theorists have studied the extent to which organizations
operate in conjunction with their environment. In open systems the stability
of the organization is dependent on its ability to obtain adequate resources
from its external environment (Buckley, 1967). As discussed previously, no
organization can be self-sufficient. Organizations need, for example, employ-
ees, consumers, and suppliers. Most times these individuals are found in the
vironment. Indeed, engagement with multiple stakeholders can sometimes
blur the boundary of the organization. As Scott and Davis (2007) explain,

This is not to say that open systems do not have boundaries. They do, of
course, and must expend energy in boundary maintenance. But it is of
equal importance that energies be devoted to activities that span and, more
recently, redraw boundaries. Because of the openness of organizations,
determining their boundaries is always difficult and sometimes appears to
be a quite arbitrary decision. Does a university include its students within
The boundaries do exist, identifying their exact location can be quite difficult. A useful approach put forth by Pfieffer and Sabaneik (1978) is to consider individuals not as unitary actors who have to be on one side of the boundary or the other. Rather, it is a set of their actions that exist at the organizational boundary. However, while this approach is helpful, it does not provide total clarity. As Scott and Davis (2007) go on to note, actions can affect more than one system. For example, a student attending one institution may be viewed as a newly admitted student at a college or university, while the same student may be perceived as a grad student at a graduate school.

Another important aspect of systems is that they usually comprise multiple subsystems and are often themselves part of larger systems (Scott & Davis, 2007). For example, the University of Albany in New York is composed of several different colleges and schools, each of which represents a different subsystem within the organization. Moreover, the University at Albany is one of 64 different campuses (or subsystems) within the State University of New York; each of these campuses has its own organizational structure and operating norms but is connected as part of the State University of New York system.

A. Scott and Davis (2007) argue that the complexity of their environment fosters the creation of great colleges and universities. Their assertion is based on the law of limited variety put forth by Pondy and Mitroff: “A system will exhibit no more variety than the variety to which it is exposed in its environment” (p. 7). The idea here is that organizations that develop strong boundaries to buffer themselves against the components of the environment fail to evolve and grow. “Great universities do not thrive in deserts or other sparsely inhabited areas” (Scott & Davis, p. 97). Still, we believe that great universities arise from dealing with complex and varied systems.

Study of Academic Organizations

Is a college or university? A deceptively simple question, with no clear answer. It has been discussed by a wide array of scholars and educational colleagues. Still, no common answer exists. Great thinkers such as Adam Smith (1776/1991), John Henry Newman (1852/1990), and Thorstein Veblen have all contributed to the discussion, debating the role of teaching, research, curriculum, knowledge creation, and knowledge dissemination. The scholarly study of colleges and universities as unique organizations began in the early 1960s and has rapidly developed since that time. In a 1974 review of the literature, Peterson found that fewer than 200 research-based articles dealing with the subject had been published at the time. Since then, hundreds of studies have surfaced in academic journals, books, book chapters, reports, dissertations, and conference papers. In sum, the discussion about the nature of higher education is quite expansive, and many different terms have been used to describe academic organizations. There is no way to provide a complete overview of the study of higher education institutions or organizations. Next, we describe three of the most popular theories on the topic and then discuss common characteristics of academic organizations.

Theories About Academic Organizations

Three of the most classic theories pertaining to academic organizations are organized anarchies, loosely coupled systems, and professional bureaucracies, which are only briefly described in this section. There are many more, some of which are discussed throughout this book. These three provide a base for much of what is discussed throughout this volume.

Organized anarchy. Since the seminal study by Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972), academic organizations have been labeled as organized anarchies. Such organizations contain three common characteristics, the first of which is a high degree of goal ambiguity. While participants in the organization may have a general idea about the purpose of the organization, specific goals are often in dispute. Administrators of each department and each faculty member may have a different idea about the purpose of the college or university and their role in it. This is in large part because of the multiple functions performed by the academic organization and the high level of professional autonomy experienced by faculty. Second, decision-making processes are not clear. While the system of decision making may be familiar, the exact nature of the process changes based on the nature of the problem to be solved, the solutions available at any one time, and the individuals involved in the process. Third, participation in the decision-making process is fluid. People continually join and leave academic organizations, and their membership in decision-making groups varies over time, depending on when they choose to be involved or show up.

Loosely coupled systems. Coupling describes the extent to which departments in an organization are aligned (Glassman, 1973). Coupling can be
attempt to implement internally a high degree of standardization among the workers they hire.

Professional bureaucracies are most common in environments that are complex but stable. As our environments become increasingly unstable and dynamic, some colleges and universities may come to resemble adhocracies. Adhocracies, like professional bureaucracies, rely on professional staff, but the structure used to organize employees becomes more fluid (Mintzberg, 1979). Employees with different specialties are grouped together to deal with specific problems that arise in the environment. For example, the rise of interdisciplinary faculty teams to address complex social or environmental problems may be viewed as a move toward the adocracy, where departmental structures become less important than the problems the organization chooses to address.

**Characteristics of Academic Organizations**

As organizations tend to have common components, academic organizations also have common characteristics. The theories described in the preceding section provide different lenses an academic administrator can use to evaluate the operations of an academic organization. We know that academic organizations are characterized by high levels of goal ambiguity, client-focused missions, highly professionalized staff, unclear decision-making processes, and environmental vulnerability. These characteristics, first described by Baudrillard, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley (1978), will be found in most public and private nonprofit organizations. However, while some of these characteristics may be found among for-profit institutions, they are not likely to be as universal as in other sectors because of their different business models. Some of these characteristics are derived from the previously discussed theories.

**Goal ambiguity.** Whereas most bureaucratic organizations operate with high degrees of organizational rationality—that is, they are focused on the attainment of a specific goal or goals—academic organizations possess significant goal ambiguity. Do these organizations exist to teach or to perform research and create new knowledge? Do they provide services to the community, the state, or the nation? What goals are ascribed to the organization by its administration, faculty, trustees, alumni, students, parents, and community? Because of the diverse expectations that different constituencies place upon colleges and universities, higher education institutions are susceptible to myriad purposes that may be consigned to them by organizational stakeholders. Not only do they often try to be all things to all people but they
have a single mission; because their preferences are unclear, they also have a hard time to decline additional goals (Baldridge et al., 1978).

Client-focused missions. As organizations designed for and intended as agents of social transformation, academic organizations are client serving in purpose. Academic organizations serve a cadre of clients, such as staff, governments, foundations, businesses, and local community organizations. It may also be argued that they serve parents, alumni, and donors. Because of the focus on multiple clients, academic organizations are often directed in multiple directions, and services provided are often complicated by the need to hire highly professionalized staff. For example, the educational process, highly complex, is based upon the nature of the content to be taught, the skills of the teacher, the learning styles of the student, and how learning can be empirically assessed. Unlike manufacturing organizations which employ static processes and machinery to yield a given product, and universities grapple with problem-solving technologies in their educational products (i.e., a graduated student). The author of programs and approaches to improve teaching and learning have been attempted at the local, state, and federal levels for decades and still yield a consistent and broadly accepted teaching template for application in all educational circumstances. "Servicing clients is to accomplish, to evaluate, and show short-term successes. Consider the entire person is a holistic task that cannot be easily separated into routine technical segments" (Baldridge et al., 1978, p. 22).

Highly professionalized staff. Professionalism is perhaps the most important of the five distinct characteristics of colleges and universities. Baldridge (1978) lists four aspects of professionalism that affect the interpersonal dynamics in academic organizations: (a) a demand for work autonomy, (b) the tendency to have divided loyalties between one's discipline and the organization he or she works for, (c) the strong tension between professional and bureaucratic expectations, and (d) the expectation of professionals who are evaluated by their peers. Of these components, the inherent difference between formalization and professionalism provides the most consistent point between administration and faculty. As Hall (1977) reported, "All the studies ... have concluded that professionalism and organization are incompatible. The more professionalized the work force, the more likely that formalization will lead to conflict and alienation".

Unclear decision-making processes. The fourth area of departure between academic organizations and other organizational types rests with the technologies used to produce outcomes. The many variables that account for differences in students and how they learn translate into equally challenging ways to teach them. Students access and absorb information differently according to learning style, and methods of instruction may vary within and between disciplines. The process of education is highly fluid and must be modified according to a host of factors associated with the student, the content taught, and the institution providing the education. Assessing success in meeting educational goals is highly elusive for this very reason.

Environmental vulnerability. The fifth distinguishing characteristic is the academic organization's environmental vulnerability. Hall (1977) noted that organizations vary in the extent to which they are vulnerable to environmental pressures, and the level of environmental influence is correlated to an organization's dependency upon external resources. This relationship has important implications for the manner in which an organization is managed since its structure and processes will be required to conform to the expectations and resource opportunities placed upon it by the environment. This arrangement is especially true in the case of academic organizations, which can vary in their susceptibility to environmental pressures depending upon their reliance on external factors:

When professional organizations are well insulated from the pressures of the outside environment, then professional values, norms, and work definitions play a dominant role in shaping the character of the organization. On the other hand, when strong external pressure is applied to colleges and universities, the operating autonomy of the academic professionals is seriously reduced. (Riley & Baldridge, 1977, p. 6)

Higher education institutions are now buffeted by pressures from a wide range of environmental actors, greatly limiting operating autonomy. For example, in many parts of the United States, the number of high school graduates is shrinking, creating greater competition among the institutions for traditionally aged college students. Nontraditional students often need to balance family and work life in addition to their studies and expect the institution to be more flexible and accessible. The availability of financial resources provided by states and private donors affects an institution's operating ability and staffing levels. Moreover, institutions are expected to be
the notion of institutional culture but, as importantly, to recognize that organizational culture is not monolithic but fragmented, as subcultures exist within and beyond the academy at multiple levels. In discussing the various cultures related to faculty, Austin noted:

faculty cultures include the culture of the academic profession, the culture of the academy as an organization, the cultures of particular disciplines, the cultures of institutional types, and the culture of the particular department or unit where the faculty member has a position. Deans, department chairs, and institutional researchers seeking to support the work of department and college leaders must understand the values of each of these cultures. (p. 48)

By understanding faculty culture, institutional leaders can understand their own faculty better, and faculty members can better understand one another. Sensitivity to faculty cultures by administrators yields a more informed and astute leader capable of better decision making since one can more accurately project the consequences of future decisions based upon the values and norms already embedded in the organization. “The key to being effective and the ability to make change begins first with an accurate assessment of the type of organization in which you work” (Julius et al. 1999, p. 114).

But how does one assess culturally the type of organization one helps to lead? It is first important to distinguish between the culture of the academy and the culture of the institution, because each operates on different levels and exhibits different characteristics. The culture of the academy is present throughout U.S. higher education and is based on a concept we shall call collective individualism, whereby the values of personal independence and professional autonomy—held by individual faculty members, legitimized and protected through the doctrine of academic freedom—are juxtaposed with a broader social and institutional value of shared intellectual collegiality, forming an academic community that exhibits a socially cohesive body in appearance but in actuality is a loosely aligned confederation of independent scholars. The concept of faculty as an amalgamation of independent contractors is not an inaccurate depiction when one considers variations in remuneration patterns among faculty members even at the same institution based on such variables as scholarly discipline, academic rank, course load, overloads to the normal teaching load, additional compensation for non-teaching duties needed outside the normal teaching load, ability to attract external grant sources, and a variety of other factors all negotiated through individual contractual relationships or collective bargaining agreements. Understanding the
The practice of collective individualism requires higher education administrators to balance the group identity of the faculty with the individual professional identities of each member of the faculty. This tension between individualized faculty members and the collective interests of the faculty as a group is highlighted by Gumport (2000), who noted the “chasm” that exists between faculty self-interest and the broader concern for the common good. He stated, “at the most basic operating level, the tension appears when faculty members try to get what they can from their institutions rather than puzzling over how best to serve them” (p. 9).

The culture of the institution is specific to the organization itself and is a reflection of the idiosyncratic nature of each and every college or university. The ethos or personality of an organization, built from a sense of shared accomplishment and distinctive purpose. This topic was addressed by Clark (1981), who examined the psychosocial determinants of a group's collective sense of self as the organization's history and achievements as an institutional identity. He defined identity as “a collective understanding of a unique accomplishment based on historical exploits of a formal organization, offering normative bonds within and outside the organization” (p. 178).

Clark's definition of identity as the themes of history, uniqueness of organization itself, and the shared value placed upon that uniqueness by organization's members.

While the concept of identity is useful in understanding the uniqueness of individual academic organizations, other factors affect the culture of an institution. One of them is the collective personality of the institution's faculty. The existence of tenure and its role as a protector of academic freedom is an important factor in shaping that personality. Though the merits of tenure are increasingly debated as financial pressures and a need for more rational fiscal flexibility rise, the presence of tenure has provided continuity and stability to an institution's faculty and thus has contributed to the sense of a particular group dynamic unique to that institution. This phenomenon is widely overlooked in debates over the benefits or challenges of tenure. Imagine how the culture of an institution would change if all its faculty members were free agents, unbound by tenure and institutional loyalty, to ply their intellectual skills competitively in an open market. Such a scenario would result in a significant loss of institutional memory and continuity to a fluid, rather than stable, organizational personality.

To assess institutional culture, new higher education administrators will benefit from early, strong communication between and among constituents and an expansive inventory of the attitudes and perceptions of the organization by those within their oversight. This process will allow the administrator to determine not only the issues but the overall collective mind-set as well. Such a dialogue should include a thorough understanding of the organization's history, its norms, and the nature of its influential relationships and power structures.

If constituent compliance to decision-making actions is to occur effectively, leaders must be perceived by others as having a prior working understanding of the organization, its history, and its constituents beyond the administrative issues at hand. The concept of institutional fit is appropriate to this discussion. Many failures in academic leadership occur when the incumbent is unable or unwilling to incorporate, adapt to, or, at a minimum, understand an academic or institutional culture that has been shaped over decades or even centuries.

Having examined the typological, organizational, and contextual differences that exist in higher education organizations, and having given added attention to cultural factors that influence administrative decision making, we can now examine the theoretical models that have emerged to characterize colleges and universities as unique organizational types. Specific to this examination are issues of legitimacy and authority in matters of institutional governance and decision making, as various stakeholders, internal and external to the institution, stake claims to their spheres of influence.

Part Two
Operating Structures of Colleges and Universities: Administrative Units and Governance Models

This book focuses specifically on the academic affairs of colleges and universities, but these functions do not take place in isolation from other aspects of the institution. According to Kerr (1963), the 20th century witnessed the birth of the "multiversity," a conglomerate of the following:

- the community of the undergraduate and the community of the graduate;
- the community of the humanist, the community of the social scientist, and the community of the scientist;
- the communities of the professional schools;
- the community of all the nonacademic personnel; the community of the administrators. (p. 14)

These communities then connect with other communities of elected officials, foundations, nonprofit organizations, industries, alumni, and local
Throughout this book, we describe various external communities whose internal communities that directly relate to academic affairs. However, many colleges and universities are complex organizations with hundreds or thousands of support staff members who are responsible for something, from making sure the sidewalks are clear of snow to overseeing student judicial office. Many of these functions are mentioned throughout the book, and although they are not our focus here, they are important in some cases vital to the performance of the institution.

Administrative Units

This section we describe some of the more common functions in the academic organization. Each college and university organizes these units in different ways. For example, in some institutions the director of athletics reports to the president, whereas in others he or she may report to the vice president for student affairs. Institutions also use different labels for similar roles. Those responsible for the curricular functions of the institution may report to a vice president of student affairs, student services, or student success. Our purpose here is to provide readers with a basic understanding of most common units in a college or university.

Moreover, studying an institution's organizational chart can yield insights about the importance the institution places on particular units and philosophy about different functions. Designating the athletic department as a direct report to the president may suggest the importance the unit has within the organization. Similarly, whether the office of residence life reports to the vice president of finance or the vice president of student affairs may suggest whether the institution places greater value on the revenue-generating aspect of residence halls or the student development role they serve for their residents.

Academic Affairs. This unit is at the core of the organization. It is usually structured around academic disciplines and fields of study. Faculty members are generally organized into academic departments. In larger institutions, several departments are grouped into schools or colleges, which are led by deans. The academic deans then report to a chief academic officer, usually referred to as a provost or vice president of academic affairs. In some larger institutions, department chairs report directly to the institution's chief academic officer. Divisions of academic affairs may also have separate units that oversee research and graduate education. In some larger institutions with expansive research and development enterprises, vice presidents of research report directly to the president. Also, in response to concerns about the lack of attention paid to undergraduate education, medium and large institutions have developed support structures for academic advising and support outside the traditional academic departmental structure. These academic advising and support units may be placed in the student affairs division. The functions of academic affairs are widely explored throughout this volume.

Athletics. College and university athletics is a phenomenon that is somewhat unique to U.S. higher education. Since the latter part of the 19th century athletics has been a significant part of collegiate culture. Institutions now provide an array of athletic opportunities for their students, and consequently athletics has emerged as a significant administrative function for many colleges and universities. Most college students only participate in intramural competitions organized by an office of recreational sports, usually affiliated with the institution's recreation center, or an athletic or physical education department. Most attention, however, is given to intercollegiate athletics, wherein teams from different campuses compete against each other. An athletic director serves as chief athletics officer for an institution and oversees coaches, compliance with athletic rules, and marketing of teams. In addition to the coaching staff, larger athletic departments may also comprise academic support staff, athletic trainers, compliance officers, and marketing personnel.

The major governing body of intercollegiate athletics is the National Collegiate Athletic Association, a private nonprofit organization led by a president who reports to a governing board made up of college and university presidents from across the country. The association is divided into three separate divisions (DI, DII, DIII); DI is subdivided. The largest number of schools participates in DII, where student-athletes are treated no differently than the rest of the general student population in that they receive no special living accommodations, facilities, or scholarships. In contrast, the other two divisions offer varying amounts of athletic scholarships and special treatment for student-athletes, depending on the school, league, or division. Institutions across all three divisions offer a wide range of athletic opportunities for men and women, but it is DI men's football and basketball that often draw the most attention and controversy, primarily because of the expense of these programs as compared to expenditures on academic programs at the institution as well as the revenue produced from athletic contests that comes from ticket sales, television network rights, and sponsorships from corporations and individuals associated with the schools.
Academic organizations usually maintain communications and marketing staff to help promote the institution as well as manage media inquiries and public relations problems. Public and private institutions are increasingly focused on raising funds from private donors and commit resources to maintaining strong relationships with alumni and building relationships with potential donors. Most public colleges and universities (and large private institutions) now maintain (or share) lobbyists at either (or both) the state and federal levels as a means of influencing education policy and funding decisions. Because of the connection between institutional reputation and resource acquisition, we are increasingly seeing the functions of fund-raising, lobbying, alumni relations, and publications/communications offices merged to better integrate the institution’s external messages. Such merged functions are often referred to as institutional advancement, an activity that has grown in stature and visibility because of the heightened competition among colleges and universities for students as well as for public and private resources.

**Student affairs.** While academic affairs are at the core of the enterprise, the curricular experience is also a meaningful component of college life, particularly for traditional undergraduate students. A growing number of nontraditional students, however, are also taking advantage of student activities and support that are often part of student affairs divisions. When considering student affairs divisions, what usually comes to mind are student organizations, campus activities, and the like, but such divisions are much more diverse, offering students an array of support functions, such as counseling, mentoring, and peer support; community service engagements; and leadership opportunities as part of student government and programming councils. These units provide resources for students with disabilities as well as students united through race, culture, or sexual orientation. Other offices generally oversee in this division are judicial affairs, career services, and recreational sports.

**Other units.** There is no way to capture all the different types of enterprises a college or university may be engaged in, and the following are just some examples of these activities. Some institutions have broken into the travel industry, managing airports and hotels. Those with medical schools often have responsibility for a hospital as well. To aid students and staff with young children, they provide day care facilities on campus. As an extension of their academic mission, several institutions also support academic presses, which publish scholarly books and journals. In addition, a growing trend is for colleges and universities to host research parks and small-business incubators for facilitating the development of patentable and profitable research products.
understanding academic organizations

Yet for all the applicability of the bureaucratic model to academic organizations, significant weaknesses exist. According to Riley and Baldridge (1977), the bureaucratic model focuses more on formal power and the hierarchical structures that define it than the informal power relationships that often exist in organizations and that often change over time depending on the issue or policy being debated. Another weakness in the bureaucratic model can be its preoccupation with policy execution over policy formulation. The model also tends to minimize the role of multiple interest groups and political struggles that exist among them in campus settings.

The collegial model. A second way academic organizations may be viewed is as a community. This thesis was first introduced by Millett (1962), who believed that the application of hierarchical principles to colleges and universities failed to account for the internal decision-making pluralism that exists in higher education organizations. Millett argued that a focus on hierarchy emphasized the role that absolute authority played within an organization since the concept of bureaucracy implies formal power structures and a system of superior and subordinate relationships:

In terms of their own internal organization our colleges and universities have sought arrangements which would equally reflect a concern to avoid absolute authority. In this endeavor the colleges and universities have built up a practice of community as the fundamental basis of organization.

(p. 6)

In his book, Millett highlighted the various institutional constituencies that participate to varying degrees in institutional decision-making processes, citing the roles that students, alumni, and faculty all play in academic governance. As president of Miami University of Ohio when he published his book, Millett likely was reflecting on the administrative challenge of accommodating multiple interests in a spirit of group accommodation.

One central theme of the collegial model is the values that members of the faculty share as they relate to the academic profession itself and their role within the decision-making structure of the institution. Implied in the model is a strong sense of collegiality within the professoriate. In her discussion of the culture of the academic profession, Austin (1994) noted how faculty members share a commitment to intellectual honesty and fairness, as well as a commitment to the concept of a community of scholars whose collegiality guides their interactions and their involvement in institutional decision making. “However, these values are expressed in different ways depending on institutional and disciplinary contexts” (p. 49).
The involvement of different interest groups in academic decision making by virtue of their role and expertise provides the legitimacy for the concept of shared governance developed by Mortimer and McConnell (1978). We include shared governance in our discussion of the political model because decision making in a shared governance environment is performed through the exercise of influence rather than formal position. Matters of shared governance are largely an issue between faculty and administration (and to a lesser extent trustees and students) because of the tensions identified in earlier organizational models between professional authority (the faculty) and formal authority (the administration). The notion of shared governance involves the acceptance of the authoritative rights possessed by certain constituencies based on their expertise or formal position. A central question in the discussion of shared authority is, How is authority distributed in recognition of the legitimate expertise ascribed to a particular incumbent or group? According to Mortimer and McConnell,

A full account of governance should cover four basic questions: (1) What issue is to be decided? (2) Who—what persons or groups—should be involved in the decision? (3) When (at what stage of the decision-making process) and how should such involvement occur? (4) Where—at what level in the organizational structure—should such involvement occur? (p. 13, emphasis added)

The political model has several weaknesses. First, the model was developed in an era predating the creation of the growing for-profit education sector and of institutions specializing in online learning modalities. The mission of some for-profits and the online campuses without walls often bear little resemblance to their more traditional academic counterparts in their structure and relationship among faculty, employees, and management. Second, the rise of collective bargaining and the role of faculty unions have significantly altered the decision-making process on campuses where unions exist, thereby substituting functional authority by virtue of expertise with formal authority that is legislatively and legally derived. Finally, the political model focuses predominantly on the internal organizational relationship between faculty and administration but fails to account sufficiently for the rise in external environmental factors that are substantially affecting college and university governance today. Diminishing federal and state resources designated for higher education, coupled with governmental efforts to exact greater accountability on the part of colleges and universities, are resulting
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ruler encroachment by governmental entities on how precious resources will be expended and what society should expect in the way of outcomes from those investments.

An evaluation of the future challenges facing higher education governance, Kezar and Eckel (2004) provided a thorough review of 40 years of research. They concluded that the primary models of academic governance we described focus on structural and political theories of governance provide a limited explanation of how academic governance could actually improve. An important theme they highlight is that the structural political models that have guided the understanding of governance in the past decades will be inadequate to understanding and accommodating organizational change in the coming years as colleges and universities adapt to new internal and external constraints. The authors cite three areas that have emerged in the last decade that will make governance more challenging: (a) an increase in the number of significant retirements and a more diverse faculty to fill them, and (c) a need to expedite decision making to accommodate the new external environment, (b) the changing role of the faculty with significant retirements and a more diverse faculty filling them, and (c) need to expedite decision making to accommodate change (p. 371). Efficiency, effectiveness, participation, leadership, and organizational responsiveness are the five key challenges to future governance cited by Kezar and Eckel.

Now that we have reviewed how academic organizations significantly differ from other organizational types and how different theoretical models have been employed to describe academic governance, let us turn our attention to the theoretical and practical aspects of leadership and decision making.

Three Decision Making and Academic Leadership

Higher education organizations are arguably among the most difficult organizations to administer and manage for the reasons outlined in this chapter. In addition to the organizational variables discussed in this chapter, a vast number of practical challenges face academic leaders: internal constituencies lay claim to authority over operational domains of the enterprise based the necessity of their administrative or professional roles; boards of trustees have fiduciary responsibility over the entire organization and can exercise responsibility in ways that are supportive or detrimental to the interests of alumni, parents, and students; institutional leaders increasingly exert influence as a result of rising consumerism, which translates into greater feelings of entitlement over how tuition or philanthropic dollars are applied; and legislatures and government agencies demand greater institutional accountability through efforts to ensure legislatively mandated educational outcomes. Academic leadership at all levels, therefore, requires a special set of skills, knowledge, and sensitivity to navigate effectively the ever increasing governance challenges facing today’s college and university decision makers.

Leading in a Bifurcated Organization

Leadership in an academic organization requires the ability to work in a highly professional environment. Central to the concept of professionalism are individual autonomy and creativity to exercise one’s unique professional knowledge. The question for any administrator is how to maintain organizational control and direction without imposing undue influence on these embedded professional values. As Erzioni (1964) explained.

Only if immune from ordinary social pressures and free to innovate, to experiment, to take risks without the usual social repercussions of failure, can a professional carry out his work effectively. It is this highly individualized principle which is diametrically opposed to the very essence of the organizational principle of control and coordination by superiors—i.e., the principle of administrative authority (pp. 76–77).

Noted sociologist Blau (1974) focused on the inherent conflict between bureaucracy and professionalism when addressing the issue of authority in organizations:

The various components of professionalism must be distinguished in analyzing its implications for hierarchical authority in organizations. Full-fledged professionalism entails not only expert skills but also a body of abstract knowledge underlying them, a self-governing association of professional peers, professional standards of workmanship and ethical conduct, and an orientation toward service. Some of these factors may easily come into conflict with the discipline required by bureaucratic authority (p. 147).

In his research specific to academic organizations, Blau (1973) described colleges and universities as organizations bifurcated into two spheres, the bureaucratic and the academic, and outlined the organizational tension that
between these centers of authority. Noting that academics claim exclu-
siveness and self-regulation create potential conflicts with the bureaucratic authority of administrators, since admin-
istrative and professional considerations are often at variance, for example,
when budgetary requirements conflict with optimum professional service
clients, or when administrative demands infringe upon the specialized
possibilities of experts. (p. 189)
A bifurcated system, which aptly describes the higher education organ-
izations as substantially different from other organizational types, provides a
way to categorize the decision structures of colleges and universities.
The simplicity of Blau's (1973) bifurcated system does not fully account,
however, for the differences in organizational structure and process that exist
in different types of institutions. McKelvey (1982) noted that certain
colleges and universities respond differently to environmental change,
adding that systems could be facilitated by placing them
in heterogeneous groups based upon decision structures, a vastly different
way from the more traditional Carnegie Classification scheme.
Using this concept, Hendrickson and Bartkovich (1986) created a new
model that built on the Blau (1973, 1974) and McKelvey (1982) con-
cepts. They proposed that academic organizations could be arrayed on a
continuum ranging from highly bureaucratic to highly academic (using a
bifurcated system), with assigned factors such as decision-making
priority, functional differentiation, administrative configuration, and par-
Wherein operational procedures to determine where a particular type of
organization would reside on this continuum.
Since bureaucratic organizations tend to be vertical in structure with
decision making centralized at the top, whereas academic organizations are
lower with decision centers at lower levels, the locus of power provides a
full understanding of how a specific college or university reacts to change.
Many permutations of structures and process exist among academic organi-
izations that this approach to understanding academic organizations
emphasizes again how vastly different they are from other organizational
models, a key point highlighted in the work of Hendrickson and Bartkovich
(1986).

**Decision Making in Academic Organizations**

So messy is decision making in academic organizations that it has been
described as similar to a garbage can (Cohen et al., 1972). In their study of
universities as organized anarchy, Cohen et al. suggested that academic
organizations are collections of solutions looking for problems, issues and
feelings looking for decision opportunities to be vented, and decision makers
looking for something to do. Thus, decision making in academic organizations
can be construed as a set of problems, solutions, and participants who move from one decision-making opportunity to another. The outcome of a
decision is influenced by the availability of solutions, the people involved in
the process, and the nature of the process. Cohen et al. argued that in such
organizations, solutions are often uncoupled from decisions. While decision
making is believed to be a process to find a solution for a given problem, it
actually is a complicated dance to align problems, solutions, and decision
makers to allow action to occur.

Clearly, leadership and decision making in a college or university is a
highly fluid and dynamic process that assumes different characteristics
depending on the particular role one holds in the organization. For example,
decision making for department chairpeople is significantly different from
that of a dean or provost, whose decision circumstances in turn are quite
unlike the decision-making conditions faced by an institution's president.
Though all operate within a shared governance environment in which
spheres of influence and responsibility are allocated according to one's func-
tion, acceptance of a decision is determined by the legitimacy and authority
ascribed to the decision maker by others inside and outside the organization.
For example, among the most challenging of administrative positions on
today's campuses is that of provost. Having most often risen to that position
from within the professorate a provost must precariously straddle serving as
an advocate for the faculty and its interests and serving at the pleasure of the
president in an executive administrative capacity. Provosts must deftly support
faculty autonomy through shared governance while firmly asserting
administrative accountability:

As trust is the cornerstone of academic leadership, the Chief Academic
Officer (CAO) must be vigilant about not letting faculty go around their
department chairs or deans, must avoid sharing information with just one
dean or having a backdoor for negotiations, and must be consistently even-handled in all matters. The CAO cannot undercut the authority of deans
and department chairs by publicly second-guessing them or getting
Earlier in this chapter we briefly examined three models of academic governance: bureaucratic, collegial, and political. One could argue that certain leadership and managerial styles have historically been associated with each. For example, leaders of organizations resembling the bureaucratic model often assume the role of hero—visionary and highly goal-oriented individuals who by virtue of their vision, drive, and position at the top of the organization provide the guiding imperus behind the organization’s growth. Figures such as former General Electric President Jack Welch or Microsoft’s Bill Gates are examples. An entirely different leadership style is required for organizations mirroring the collegial model of governance in which academic professionalism dominates. Here the leader serves as colleague in that his or her authority is derived from the expertise attributed to that individual by professional peers. When the federal government organized the Manhattan Project in Los Alamos, New Mexico, during World War II to develop an atomic weapon, it recognized the importance of placing an individual in supervision over the scientists working on the project whom they would defer to professionally. Physicist Robert Oppenheimer served as the ideal choice in that instance given his high stature within the scientific community. Finally, in the political model, the leader acts as facilitator, which requires strong negotiating and social skills to manage and influence competing interest groups in support of a common objective. As chronicled by historian Doris Kearns Goodwin (2005), Abraham Lincoln effectively managed a “team of rivals” in his cabinet during the Civil War. Prior to his administration, some of these individuals had been bitter political enemies but emerged from the experience of serving on Lincoln’s cabinet with the deepest admiration and respect for the president.

Jus: as one single governance model cannot effectively describe academic organizations (which actually contain elements of all three), no single style of leadership can be applied to the task of managing and administering colleges and universities. An excellent and useful guide for decision making and leadership was proposed by Bolman and Deal (2008), who argued that leadership style is situation specific according to the circumstances at hand. The authors suggested four frameworks to view leadership. The leader who employs each of these frames as it is needed will be a more effective leader.

- **Structural.** Decisions and solutions are achieved through the realignment of structures, tasks, roles, and operations. This framework is useful in organizations with high degrees of formalization and rationality with clearly defined goals and little organizational conflict. A structural leadership style is analytical and highly strategic.
Human resource. A focus on empowering and assisting the organization's people is the dominant theme of this frame. Organizational process and movement are consequences of motivations stimulated by management toward the workers and are especially beneficial when morale is either high or very low. Ample resources to provide that motivation are important to this framework. The human resource leadership style is one of servant leadership and advocate of the individual employee.

Political. Effective management under this framework requires the identification and understanding of the organization's various constituencies and their leaders with a focus on negotiating desired organizational outcomes through influence and compromise. Scarce or declining organizational resources often stimulate use of the political framework. The leadership style of this framework involves strength in coalition building and use of persuasion.

Symbolic. Traditions and values of the organization predominate in this framework, and organizational loyalty is prized. Workers look to a visionary leader and motivator for support and guidance. The importance of the organization's culture is central. Leadership in the symbolic framework requires high energy, foresight, and a charismatic personality to motivate employee productivity.

The utility of Bolman and Deal's (2008) four frameworks for leadership academic organizations is that leaders must consider employee motivational factors during decision-making processes. Given the myriad constituencies confronting academic leaders on a host of organizational issues, the model correctly suggests that leaders adjust their style according to the issue addressed and the decision to be made. In addition, the ability to consider complex issues through multiple frames can help leaders avoid (or at least prepare for) potential hazards and negative reactions to decisions. Indeed, research suggests that many university presidents use at least two frames when making decisions (Bensimon, 1989). Any holistic approach to the study of leadership, especially as it relates to academic organizations that are becoming increasingly consumed by external variables, must account for these emerging influences.

Conclusion

In chapter 1 we outlined several principles that serve as a foundation to our study of U.S. higher education: the understanding of the role of mission, the need for institutional adaptation to changing environmental and societal circumstances, and the value of democratic partnerships in the formation and operation of colleges and universities. Those entrusted with governance responsibilities as either fiduciaries or administrators in U.S. higher education institutions cannot effectively lead without embracing these principles and appreciating how each affects management decisions on an ongoing basis. This chapter suggests how issues of institutional mission and democratic partnerships have evolved over the centuries into a dynamic and complex array of thousands of separate and unique organizations, each requiring of its leadership a separate set of understandings and strategies equally unique to the organization. It is not nearly enough to understand how colleges and universities differ markedly from other organizational types. More important, informed administrators will be well served to understand how their institution distinguishes itself from any other, and what they must understand about themselves and those they serve to effectively manage it with success.

Notes

1. More information about open systems can be found in Scott and Davis (2007).
2. More comprehensive information about these and other organizational theories pertaining to academic organizations can be found in Bastedo (2012) and Bess and Dee (2007).
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