

*Academic Senate CSU  
401 Golden Shore, Suite 139  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210*

*www.calstate.edu/acadsen*

**SHARED GOVERNANCE IN THE PEOPLE'S UNIVERSITY  
Donald R. Gerth  
President and Professor of Public Policy and Administration, Emeritus  
California State University Sacramento**

**Commemorating the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Academic Senate  
of the California State University  
And Envisioning It's Future**

I want to thank you for inviting me to participate in this celebration of 50 years of work, the work of the faculty, and the work of the Academic Senate of the California State University.

I was educated to become a conventional faculty member, but I went wrong early along the way. It was 55 years ago this past January at the University of Chicago that I met the very new president of San Francisco State College, Glenn Dumke; he was on a faculty recruitment trip across the country, as was the custom of presidents in those years. We had an interesting and even exciting discussion about the then rapidly changing California State Colleges (there were nine campuses in 1958). I had just completed the course work for the PhD, and Bev and I were exploring research for a dissertation about Indian politics – Bev was entering data on a huge computer in the basement of a building at the University of Chicago, but it was only after midnight when graduate students could get access to the equipment. Perhaps two weeks after Glenn and I first met on campus, President Dumke phoned; he had with him on the phone line a dean, Ferd Reddell; together they offered me a position in this extraordinary adventure as I saw it, the California State Colleges. It was only well into the conversation that I learned the position would be that of Associate Dean and Director of Admissions, and that I would teach in the Department of Government. You may ask why director of admissions; both before and after serving 5 years in the Air Force I spent a number of years working my way through the University of Chicago as a graduate student; I worked in admissions and closely related areas, and incidentally built a research program about student recruitment in a private university environment; we were building a student community.

Today we are celebrating an essential dimension of the life of the CSU.

Harold Goldwhite has covered the events of the early and very important years. I want to make a few comments about the early years, especially 1959 to 1962, the years

when the Master Plan was formulated and of Don Lieffer, Buell Gallagher, and Glenn Dumke's first years as chancellor.

The topic of this conference, one central to the future of the California State University, brings back many memories: the discussions with faculty groups and colleagues on a number of the campuses in 1959 and 1960; the ferment on my then campus, San Francisco State, about most if not all of the issues on the table of the Master Plan discussions; our principle participant in the Master Plan process, Glenn Dumke, for all practical purposes, Clark Kerr's opposite number, meeting with all of the presidents, and meeting with all of the chairs of campus senates or whatever body represented the faculty (some campus presidents refused to pay the expenses of the faculty chair, whatever the title, perhaps a portent of tensions to come); the leadership of a faculty member from San Diego State, Don Leiffer, another political scientist who was a member of Pat Brown's staff in 1959 and 1960, and the de facto chancellor from 1960 to the spring of 1962 while the Board of Trustees formed, and through the months with Chancellor Buell Gallagher. There are especially memories of two faculty colleagues, Jordan Churchill, a philosopher from San Francisco State, and Ellis McCuen, a political scientist from Northridge (then San Fernando Valley State College), working with a small group of faculty to design what is now this Academic Senate after Buell Gallagher left his seven month chancellorship. Jordan and Ellis hit the road and visited every campus, meeting with faculty and faculty leaders and some administrators, urging faculty members to vote yes on the proposed formation and constitution of a statewide academic senate. Certainly the leadership of Len Mathy, the first chair of this Senate was pioneering, vigorous, and not easy. Perhaps the thing I remember most vividly is writing a doctoral dissertation for the Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago, a dissertation titled "The Government of Public Higher Education in California" (the research was completed pre Master Plan).

This conference celebrates 50 years of success, not 50 easy years or 50 always positive years, but 50 years linked to campuses that for most purposes were independent in 1959 when Pat Brown became governor, the creation of a center from entities on the circumference of a circle, the creation of a governance structure, and the continuing identification of core values to be shared by all, at least in theory. The statewide Academic Senate has been a central player in all of this, an inevitable central player. The fact that the University of California, in 1959, was a structure that grew from a center, and maintained that center, and that the California State Colleges grew from a circle of largely independent structures that had to establish a center in 1959, is an important characteristic that needs to be understood as we think about the history of the Academic Senate of the CSU, indeed every dimension of the life and work and people of the CSU since 1960.

One topic directly related to shared governance has been addressed for years; I recently re-read some of the papers from an earlier discussion of this Senate about Trustee delegation of authority to the faculty – the absence of delegation. At the time of the Master Plan negotiations and the implementation of the Master Plan beginning in 1960, and for the following years, one objective among many of virtually all faculty and

of many others was delegation of authority in the Master Plan as it was being developed (with an assumption that the governance structure of the State Colleges would parallel the governance structure of the University of California) from the Trustees to the faculty – a faculty body to be defined. This remained an objective as the Senate was created and in its early years; Len Mathy, in his time as the founding chair, met with Trustees Louis Heilbron (the founding chair of the Board) and William Coblentz in Heilbron’s San Francisco law office to urge Trustee adoption of a delegation process to the faculty, paralleling that of the University of California.

The Master Plan proposal written by the Survey Team, and given to the Board of Regents and the State Board of Education and then forwarded to the Legislature and Governor early in 1960, proposed a governance structure and definition of functions for the California State Colleges to be placed in the Constitution. The governance structure was roughly parallel to that of the University of California as it was understood at that time, thus including at least a measure of constitutional autonomy; the definition of functions was roughly similar to the functions carried on by the State Colleges at that time, though not with a teacher education emphasis. Not long after the Master Plan proposal arrived in the Legislature, Governor Brown called a meeting with President Kerr of the University of California, the chairs of the Regents, and the State Board of Education (Louis Heilbron), and a few others; President Dumke was not invited but rather a representative of the Superintendent of Public Instruction was included. Dumke and virtually all of the State College leadership, certainly including the faculty leadership, wanted the State Colleges in the Constitution. So did Kerr, but for reasons very different from Dumke and the state college faculties; Kerr wanted the functions of State Colleges limited to what they were at that time. He wanted the State College functions frozen in the Constitution. That was a major objective – perhaps the major objective – of UC participation and support for the Master Plan. Governor Brown had invited the long-standing chair of the Senate Finance Committee, George Miller, to the meeting. Brown and Miller proceeded to explain to all present that the State Colleges would not and could not be in the Constitution; the Legislature would not permit a same loss of control that would parallel Article IX, Section 9 of the 1879 Constitution establishing the University of California as a “fourth branch of government.” It was made clear that there would be no Master Plan legislation without a change in the proposed legislation. Senator Miller had already introduced legislation with changes. Kerr objected, but was simply overruled by Brown and Miller. That principle, no parallel in governance and administrative procedures that might affect legislative interests, remained in practical force for years; witness only Senator Miller and the 1.8% salary cut of 1965. Arguing for delegation of authority in the 1960s was not useful. In 2013, it would be beside the point.

I want to comment especially about the role of the Senate and of the leadership of the Senate as the CSU and state Legislature and Governor considered the matter of collective bargaining in the 1970s. For all practical purposes, the Board of Trustees as a group and as individuals abdicated from public policy and political dialog and the political process, save for one trustee who believed he had “the alternative” to traditional collective bargaining. For the most part, the Trustees were silent and hostile to collective bargaining, save for the single trustee. His profession was as a builder. The Chancellor,

Glenn Dumke, believing that he had been excluded from the political process by the Board, and in turn, was not willing for his staff to be involved in the Sacramento arena. I might insert that I have read and sometimes heard that the presidents were hostile also. That is not accurate. There was a group, clearly a minority, that wanted the Chancellor and others to be in the process. (I became a president on August 2, 1976, and did not miss a meeting of the Chancellor's Council of Presidents, later named Executive Council, for the next 27 years.) Thus, it fell to the leadership of this Academic Senate to represent both the values of the faculty and of the California State University in the Sacramento political process. Gerald Marley, the chair from 1975 to 1977, and particularly David Elliott, the vice-chair in those two years and the chair from 1977 to 1979, along with other faculty, in many ways were the guardians not only for the faculty, but really for the mission and core values of the California State University. I do not say this to demean the two unions competing in the 1970s, but to describe reality. The unions serve the faculty; the Academic Senate is the faculty; there is a difference.

What is shared governance? I learned recently of Chancellor White's observation to this Senate in January that he prefers the words "shared leadership" rather than "shared governance." I like the spirit of that statement. Who participates in sharing? How? Where does authority reside? The California State University is a complex organization, large in numbers of people, geographically dispersed, and of its intellectual and socio-economic nature not governable in traditional hierarchical ways. We are public, and that fact alone makes us different from the private university where I earned three degrees. We are culturally diverse, to an extraordinary degree. That cultural diversity extends way beyond the socio-economic and ethnic and civic characteristics of the participating individuals. Cultural diversity includes the diversity of faculty and other professional individuals in their disciplines and responsibilities. Cultural diversity includes the students, extraordinarily diverse in so many ways in our communities and state and nation, and in the world. Campus cultures, even campus sub-cultures, vary widely. Factually, there are 23 campus cultures within the California State University, and this is not a surprise. For example, from experience, we all know that on a campus, the cultures or sub-cultures of colleges of social and behavioral sciences are different, even substantially different, from colleges of engineering or business.

And what about responsibility and authority? Faculty, students, administrators, staffs, trustees, presidents, the chancellor, the greater community with many diverse interests, levels of governments, all have interests and responsibilities and in varying ways authority.

Shared governance is very complex. It is too simple to assert that final authority rests in any one place for most or all dimensions of the life of a university. The uses of authority and responsibility are essentially collaborative – the processes are collaborative. Only on the simplest matters are authority and responsibility sometimes absolute. For example, let's look at a political science department budget. The underlying major factors are curriculum and faculty positions. But enrollment and student interests are factors. Student interests come and go for many fields. Normally departmental faculty decide about curriculum, but it is not always that easy. Should a department develop a

new sub-field? In another arena, let's look at a budget for new housing facilities for students. A few weeks ago the Wall Street Journal did an article about the national trend toward up-scale student housing and wellness centers. In the CSU these are most often paid for by user fees and student self-assessments. But in the economy of a university, all dollars are green and relate to overall student costs and student financial aid. Are these broad policy questions?

It might be useful to stand back for a moment and look at shared governance over 50 plus years in the California State University. A serious examination reveals an uneven pattern. It is uneven, to begin with, among campuses. In some measure that is a function of individuals coming and going, including presidents and chancellors and faculty leaders, and in more recent years collective bargaining relationships, and then certainly trustee relationships, and of balance among academic and other programs. In some measure it is a function of the economy, of state and national governmental behavior. Increasingly students and student leaders play a role. On campuses in smaller communities, even some in larger communities, community leaders play a role.

The California State University as a whole or as a system now has five decades of experience with efforts to create shared governance and the reality of governance from which to learn. The decades are not even. The first half of the 1960s was a period of hopefulness among many, certainly among a new wave of faculty and administrative and staff players, that the Master Plan would bring an era of cooperation and agreement among all or almost all. One major mistake was made by a staff dean in the Chancellor's office in 1963 – 1964; the Master Plan process had produced considerable enthusiasm for year-round operations. The Senate initially supported YRO, but then reversed its position. In the meantime, the staff dean, a faculty member from the Fresno campus, did not understand the Senate action and urged the Chancellor to move ahead; the Chancellor did move ahead and this did cause a rift. The Chancellor thought he was following the wishes of the Senate, albeit informally expressed; the Senate leadership thought he was opposing a clear Senate position, and everyone was angry with everyone else. There was a clear lesson, probably lost in bureaucracies of various sorts. Working together requires closeness, openness, and trust. One can learn from rifts. The substantial social unrest of the last half of the 1960s came alive on campuses, although the forms taken underscored the differences among campus cultures and the styles of faculty leaders and presidents and the varied cultures and relationships on campuses. Two campuses were at the extremes: San Francisco experienced prolonged unrest, and in many ways the disappearance of shared governance, while also occasional periods of faculty-administration-student cooperation occurred. At the other extreme, the Cal Poly San Luis Obispo campus, not surprisingly, experienced little unrest and relatively stable governance.

The 1970s and 1980s saw somewhat stable governance. Collective bargaining emerged; the early years were a time of establishing new procedures and customs. Two important policy documents were developed. The Academic Senate developed in 1979 a first draft of a paper "Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within a Collective Bargaining Context." This policy document was adopted by the Senate after substantial

discussion (and then by the full Board of Trustees in 1981). This was followed by another important policy discussion involving the leadership of the Senate, the then Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and two presidents. The resulting draft policy document, “Collegiality in the California State University,” was adopted by the Senate and some campus senates and presidents. The fact that many campuses did not adopt the document should not be missed. On some campuses faculties or the senates did not think it wise to spell out governance; on some campuses presidents were absolutely opposed to the advent of collective bargaining, and in significant measure to many of the ideas in the concept of shared governance. The early years, through the chancellorship of Glenn Dumke, were on the whole at the state level, rather positive. The founding chair of the Board of Trustees, Louis Heilbron, was persistently supportive to the point of pushing individual campuses to have productive shared governance relationships. Dumke was forceful with the presidents and others as the system was being formed. Ann Reynolds, as she succeeded Dumke in 1982, formed a positive working relationship with a Senate chair, Jack Bedell.

The 1990s saw a continuation of the 80s at the state level with reasonably positive relationships in the early years of the decade. A major emphasis of the Munitz years, with the full support of the Trustees, was decentralization of administrative processes, and the continuing elimination of a “one size fits all” approach to the campuses. This was met enthusiastically by all parties. The latter 1990s saw a substantial shift at the state level in understanding and perception of shared governance.

Toward the close of the 1990s, conflict between the faculty union, the California Faculty Association, and a newly appointed chancellor, Charles Reed, became substantial, and it involved the chancellor, the CFA leadership, and inevitably some faculty and administrators on some campuses. Conflict in the past years has been exacerbated by the economic instability of the nation and of the state of California. Inevitably this has moved to some campuses more than others. The campus situations are uneven, and much is determined by the styles and actions of campus leaders in all segments. In some measure, the CSU has not had a strategy, just tactics, about governance. The often unpredictable and unsupportive behavior of the state government has added to the stress.

It is time for a new beginning. The climate in which higher education functions has changed nationally and in California. Where are we now? The California State University has a new chancellor; indeed within a few months the three top leaders of public higher education in California will all be newcomers. The stage is set for strong and sensitive leadership that is active, not reactive and beholden to interests. Leadership, whether administrative or conventional academic in the world of universities, is collaborative – the alternative is a tactical world. The Master Plan envisaged the three segments of California’s public higher Education working together, not in competition. Collaborative leadership and collaborative governance embrace the competence of all the players. A principle characteristic is not hierarchy. We are in a time of energized student leadership on many campuses. We are also in a time where competition in the greater society for social goods has increased and continues to increase. There is a new and still

emerging understanding of what is included among social goods. Governments and the values of the greater society are in the interplay of political and economic processes that all of us have been accustomed to over the years. It is significant that the White House issued two major statements within two days of the President's State of the Union address about the work of universities and colleges, about accreditation, and about finances, student financial aid, and the like. It is significant that the Governor of California and the California Legislature have in the last few years engaged major issues that go to the heart of policy, educational policy, sometimes wisely, sometimes not wisely. It is significant that our colleagues at the City College of San Francisco must address institutional financial bankruptcy and the loss of accreditation now, not at some distant point in the future, and the causes are embedded in governance.

So where are we – the people of the California State University, the faculty, all of the people of the CSU - where are we now? This conference is very timely – not only because it is in fact 50 years since this Academic Senate first met – and not only because the world beyond the California State University is reaching into higher education in unfamiliar ways.

We have a new chancellor, one with experience as a student in all of California's public higher education segments, one with experience in different campus cultures. We have in our history from the early 1980s two excellent documents about governance, and 50 years of experience. We have faculties on 23 campuses which constantly renew themselves. We have energized student leadership on many campuses.

As we reexamine shared governance, shared leadership, collaborative governance, with 50 years of experience and in a public environment reordering itself, what principles might be useful? What questions, some perhaps difficult, should be asked? How does style, the practices and values of individuals and groups, affect shared governance? Can a way be found to address, in an atmosphere of civility, and if necessary almost confront style when that would be needed? As I think back over my career, more often than not, the difficult times and issues have been related more to style than to substance. I have some strongly held values about the nature of general education, the need for structure, the need for general education determined by a faculty, not a department or individual student, or the interests of an individual faculty member doing her or his thing. How can I, as a faculty member in a department or a dean or vice president or president, or a chair of a faculty senate curriculum committee, advocate, even strongly, for my values, be a part of a process where I don't get my way, sometimes even a portion of my way, and live with the result in an academic community or even the statewide community? To a great extent we are addressing a campus culture, a California State University culture. I do not see that we need a new set of rules. The documents of this Senate from the early 1980s are clear; perhaps they could be updated to the world of 2013. We need people, individuals who embrace a culture, lead in the formation of a culture that is broadly consultative, that drives toward sensible resolutions of issues in a manner that brings all or almost all along. There are no surprises; arbitrary behavior is discouraged; collaborative behavior is rewarded in the quality of interpersonal and organization relationships and the substance of results. I am firmly convinced that the formula to

continue that measure of shared governance which already exists, and to build a new level of shared governance, shared leadership, collaborative governance, will be found in addressing openly the reinforcement of cooperation and cultures which value collaboration and trust. Responsibility is another matter – we all have it.

This is what shared governance and shared leadership are all about. We have come a long way in 50 plus years. We can build upon those years, build from today to continue the progress of the California State University, the people's university of California. The senate has a vital and central role to play in that new culture.

Thank you.



