

The image features a central logo for FWO (Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek) on a textured, light brown paper background. The logo consists of the letters 'FWO' in a bold, brown, sans-serif font, enclosed within a thin brown circular border. Below the letters, the text 'AL 90 JAAR DE PERFECTE HABITAT VOOR KENNISMAKERS' is written in a smaller, brown, sans-serif font. The entire logo is surrounded by stylized botanical illustrations in shades of green and teal. On the left, there are several fern fronds. On the right, there is a branch with small, pointed leaves. At the bottom, there are more leafy branches. The overall aesthetic is natural and scientific.

FWO

AL 90 JAAR DE
PERFECTE HABITAT
VOOR KENNISMAKERS



Good Governance in Universities: The Challenge of Collegial Control

David D. Dill

Professor Emeritus of Public Policy

University of North Carolina

Governance

- ❖ governmentally determined laws, rules, and norms assuring proper functioning of organizations and acceptance by public

Higher education governance:

- ❖ “External governance:” national framework of finance/regulations designed to assure public interest in university education, research, and public service
- ❖ “Internal governance:” university-designed processes to coordinate and control academic activity to assure the public interest.

“New Public Management” Approaches to External Governance

Require universities to take more corporate responsibility for their own futures.

- ❖ award more authority to university rectors and their senior management teams
- ❖ encourage university dependence on private funding as well as tuition support
- ❖ require greater public accountability for universities through market forces

Potential impact:

Lessening of academic values and collegial authority represented by strong academic senates/councils

Poorly Designed Regulatory Policies

More centralized, hierarchical, administrator control of university governance:

- ❖ long-term academic staff more likely to provide truly independent judgments on critical university decisions
- ❖ shorter-term administrators more likely to pursue decisions which personally benefit selves in status/salary

US study:

- ❖ Administrator decisions led to an overinvestment in university “non-academic quality”/higher first degree student costs
- ❖ Faculty decisions led to higher levels of graduate enrollment, greater sponsored funding, and increased academic quality measured by the scope and rigor of academic program offerings and faculty qualifications

Poorly Designed Regulatory Policies II

Impact of simplistic regulatory measures of university research:

- ❖ Funds for university instruction used to cross-subsidize funds for research
- ❖ Expanding numbers of part-time instructors; evidence of declining student progression/completion

Impact of simplistic regulatory measures of university teaching:

- ❖ Biased evaluations of instructors
- ❖ Promotion of grade inflation

Regulations imposing means-based standards or performance-based outcomes likely ineffective with multi-product universities, producing complex products, and utilizing dynamic technologies

The “Soft Institutions” of University Governance

“Neither regulatory rules of state nor market forces most effective institutional arrangements for governing, managing, and providing complex public goods in self-organizing institutions” (Ostrom, 2010)

Effective collective action in self-governing organizations dependent upon internal processes for socializing and invoking social norms: “the shared understandings about actions that are obligatory, permitted, or forbidden” (Ostrom, 2005)

In “world class” research universities academic quality in research primarily sustained and improved through social interactions (Paradeise and Thoenig, 2015).

- ❖ Formal/informal internal conversations as well as repeated self- and cross- evaluations, which strongly regulate behaviors of faculty members in differentiated academic units
- ❖ Communal norms generated and communicated through internal regulation and socialization are primary form of social control in research universities

Collegial Control: Lazega's (2001, 2005) Model of Collective Action Among Peers

- ❖ “values and norms essential to effective professional performance”
- ❖ “lateral control mechanisms”
- ❖ “the authority to know”
- ❖ “graduated sanctions”
- ❖ “precarious professional values”

US Human Subjects' Research Policy I

Policy Scope:

- ❖ Unitary policy affecting all public and private universities in US
- ❖ Violations of the policy involved suspension of all Federal academic research funds

Comparison to Other Nation's External Governance Policies:

- ❖ *Did not* establish a new regulatory agency
- ❖ *Did not* require universities to publicly publish information on their professional performance
- ❖ *Did not* assign greater authority to university administrators

Policy Design:

- ❖ Defined set of ethical requirements and research responsibilities for academic staff; required universities to effectively communicate these professional norms to all academic researchers
- ❖ Required each university academic staff to collectively develop and implement Institutional Review Boards (IRBs), composed primarily of respected university academic researchers, to apply these ethical norms in the approval of all relevant proposed research

US Human Subjects' Research Policy II

“Shared values and norms essential to effective professional performance:”

- ❖ Ethical guidelines on human subjects research developed by nationally appointed Commission; majority of members respected university scholars/researchers
- ❖ Ergo, relevant social rules for research behavior tailored by members of academic profession (Ostrom, 2005)

“Lateral control mechanisms:”

- ❖ Policy required each university academic staff to collectively develop/implement Institutional Review Boards (IRBs), composed primarily of university academic researchers, to apply ethical norms in reviews of all relevant proposed research

US Human Subjects' Research Policy III

“Authority to know:”

- ❖ US research universities make distinctions in academic authority based upon experience/expertise
- ❖ All university IRBs required to include academic peers expert in ethics and research design, also professionals knowledgeable about human research subjects
- ❖ Composition of IRBs assures proposed studies ethically appropriate, scientifically valid, and subject to independent review
- ❖ A possible mechanism for addressing criticism that universities constructed of separable “academic silos,” requiring more horizontal coordination in collegial governance

US Human Subjects' Research Policy IV

“Graduated sanctions:”

- ❖ Respected academic colleagues on the IRBs talk with/counsel potential research violators on means of improving flawed research proposals
- ❖ Only if efforts at personal education/socialization ineffective will negative IRB decision be rendered

“Precarious professional values:”

Ethical human subject research methods and academic freedom

- ❖ Collegial IRB process provides new means for university to make/clarify/continually communicate to university researchers revised ethical standards based upon institutional peer-reviewed case decisions

• Conclusion

Does governance process facilitate principled, factually-informed deliberation about the terms of organizational accountability?

- ❖ Does our university's governance process clearly convey and successfully socialize academic staff to the "values and norms essential to effective professional performance" in instruction, research, and public service?
- ❖ Does our university possess effective "lateral control mechanisms" for monitoring and enforcing the "shared understandings about actions that are obligatory, permitted, or forbidden?"
- ❖ Does our university governance process specify who justifiably possesses "the authority to know" in the evaluation of instruction, research, and public service?
- ❖ Does our university governance process consistently apply "graduated sanctions" for the control of unprofessional or opportunistic academic behavior?
- ❖ Does our university governance process possess mechanisms for renegotiating the shared "precarious professional values" essential to effective academic work?