SHARED GOVERNANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION UNDER THE INFLUENCE OFCOMMERCIALIZATION AND CORPORATIZATION: AN AMERICAN CASE STUDY

Zhaohui Hong

Professor in the Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education at Fordham University, USA
Email Address: puc826@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Commercialization and corporatization (C&C) in American higher education since the 1980s have gradually marginalized shared governance in various areas. This article is a case study of an American public university, based on empirical studies through in-depth surveys, observations, and base data collection. It addresses the issue of academic commercialization and corporatization and their impact on shared governance, faculty morale and faculty strain in their research, teaching and service. After defining the key concepts, explaining the methodology and discussing the data, this article examines the roles of commercialization and corporatization in decreasing shared governance and lowering faculty morale in academic research, teaching and service. The article concludes that, with the erosion of academic freedom and faculty power, academic commercialization and corporatization have created dissatisfaction among faculty members who lack pride in their profession and distrust administrators.

INTRODUCTION

Low faculty morale and shrinking faculty governance have sounded serious alarms in higher education. Global survey revealed that 45% of university professors felt personal strain due to various reasons (Teichler et al. 2013:107). These findings were supported by another 2014 faculty survey at an American university (see UAR Survey II). In the open-ended comment section of the survey, one faculty member complained, "Morale is very low. We work very hard without much support or acknowledgement of the work we do. The expectation seems to be to do more with less." Another faculty member summarized the changing patterns of faculty morale: "Decline in faculty morale, increase in faculty dissatisfaction, less congeniality, more tension among faculty members, increase in faculty politics and group formation."

Obviously, there are various reasons for the lower faculty morale and declining faculty governance. But this study focuses on the roles of commercialization and corporation (C&C) as one of the key factors in shaping and reshaping American faculty governance in the past thirty years. After discussing the key concepts supported by literature review, data and research methods, this article presents empirical evidence in faculty research, teaching and service through a variety of quantitative and qualitative indicators.

This is a case study of an American university (hereafter referred to as UA), a public university with

several regional campuses in the U.S. The study is designed to enhance awareness of important issues, including shared governance, faculty morale and academic freedom. Generally speaking, faculty shared governance in the United States essentially is an issue of academic freedom which includes faculty authority over curriculum development, faculty employment, faculty promotion and, to some extent, university budget. Although faculty governance in the U.S. is arguably better than that in mainland China and other countries, C&C in American higher education since the 1980s have gradually muted professors' voices and marginalized their power in university governance which eventually damages the academic freedom. Through comparisons and contrasts with higher education institutions in East Asia, the study further illustrates what may constitute the best practices in higher education governance and academic freedom. It is hoped that in doing so, a positively productive light will be shed on higher education, especially in terms of shared governance and academic freedom.

II. Defining Concepts and Data

There are various definitions of "shared governance" or "faculty governance," but no one has a more authoritative definition than the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). In 1967, AAUP's Joint Statement addressed the two principles of shared governance or faculty governance. The first is that "important areas of action involve...the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components." The second is that "difference in the weight of each voice...should be determined by the reference to the responsibility of each component...." (AAUP, 2001: 218).

AAUP's definition has empowered faculty to fulfill their responsibilities for all educational matters, not only including instruction, curriculum and research, but also educational policy, planning, budgeting and the selection of administrators (Birnbaum, 2004: 6). Specifically, in Dreyfuss's view (2014), shared governance must be demonstrated by roles for faculty in university budgeting, administrative search, evaluation of administration and program review. According to Birnbaum (2004), the key for shared governance is not about its degree of effectiveness or level of quality, but rather, it "is a matter of ideology" (p. 20) because the bottom line is that higher education is an "academic institution" instead of a "market institution" (p. 8). In addition, some scholars address the important role of trust in shared governance (Kezar, 2004:35-40; Pope, 2004:75-84), maintaining that it is essential because it can either sustain or destroy faculty governance. After all, "Governance is a means to an end" (Birnbaum, 2004: 19).

In addition, the commercialization and marketization of higher education can be defined as "an effort to build up a market-like resource allocation system and develop competition between and within higher education institutions" (Enders, 2001:20). As a result, university commercialization contributes to academic capitalism, which is characterized by "competitiveness, a strong emphasis on productivity, the search for ever-expanding and new income streams, drastic cost cutting, and the academics' growing insecurity" (Enders, 2001:20). Various scholars have also provided similar interpretations of academic commercialization (Peters &Etzkowitz, 1990: 427; Mirowski& Van Horn, 2005:503; Breznitz, O'Shea & Allen, 2008:129; Hong & Walsh, 2009: 145; Kumar, 2010: 324–351; Moles worth, Nixon & Scullion, 2009: 277).

As for the definition of the corporatization of higher education, it can be characterized by

"processes, decisional criteria, expectations, organizational culture, and operating practices that are taken from, and have their origins in, the modern business corporation" (Steck, 2003:74). Other scholars also shared their understanding of the corporatization of higher education (Giroux, 2002:103; Jain, George &Maltarich, 2009: 922; Mills, 2012: 6-9; Parker, 2011: 434). As Henry Steck (2003) states, higher education managers were driven to use "the tools and techniques of corporate management, including increased pressure to replace public support with revenues raised by increasing student costs or by competing more aggressively in the market" (p. 69). The president of the University of Florida claimed in 1997 that "we have taken the great leap forward and said: 'Let's pretend we're a corporation.'" Someone even directly declared that the university is not "like" a business corporation; it is a "corporation" (Steck, 2003:70, 67). More and more, American universities are "aggressively and coherently" embracing the ideology of the new university, that is, "a modern university must behave like a modern corporation" (Steck, 2003:72). There are many telling indications that "consistent with the centralized managerial decision-making structure and the university's corporatisation and commercialisation has come a reduction in academics' autonomy and freedom of speech" (Parker, 2011:445).

C&C are closely connected in affecting university governance. According to Steck (2003), under the influence of commercialization, university culture is "colored by values appropriate to the modern business corporation" as well as "by corporate economy, culture, and practices" (pp. 76, 75). Meanwhile, "selection and evaluation of top administrators--perhaps even mid-level academic managers--by criteria and expectations is more appropriate to a CEO of a corporation than of a dean or provost or president" (Steck, 2003:77). Consequently, in support of university commercialization, university administrators now encourage "faculty members to obtain corporate funding for their work. That quest produced ambiguous results, since such entrepreneurial ventures could violate academic freedom" (Schrecker, 2010:43).

Meanwhile, as faculty by nature are teachers and scholars who may be unwilling or unable to run a university as a corporation or a business firm, university administrators have found more opportunities to expand their share and power in governance. Operating a university as a corporation can be a practical approach in making a university competitive and cost effective. Accordingly, the principles and practices of shared governance--such as fair representation, transparent process, inclusive discussion, consensus building and mutual accountability--are ignored, discouraged and even abandoned. Condemning such a trend, Schrecker states, "academic freedom is under attack— both in its traditional form as the protection of the faculty's freedom of expression in and outside of class, as well as in its equally important, though less obvious, role in preserving the faculty's autonomy and ability to carry out its academic responsibilities" (2010:38-39). Schrecker (2010) further declared that the most serious consequence of the lack of academic freedom and arbitrary leadership is the "casualization of faculty labor" (p. 39), and that "without academic freedom, the quality of higher education will almost certainly decline" (p. 40). According to Shrecker (2010), "by casualizing the faculty, the academy is eating its seed corn. Eventually, even the most dedicated scholars and teachers will abandon the dream of an academic career" (p. 45).

Needless to say, university commercialization will lead to corporatization, and the fusion of C&C will adversely affect the faculty's academic role. In today's American higher education, C&C acts as a hybrid. Therefore, it is necessary to address the two phenomena together while discussing their

effects on academic freedom and professors' roles in university governance.

To examine the role of professors in university shared governance, a UA's regional campus Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) conducted its first campus-wide survey (hereafter referred to as "UAR survey I") in October 2013, focusing on administrative responsiveness and shared governance. It received 93 responses, including 67 faculty (28 AAUP members), four staff, seven administrators, two others, and 13 non-classified. Meanwhile, to investigate the impact of commercialization and budget pressures on shared governance and morale, UA's regional campus Chapter of AAUP completed its second survey in January 2014. There were 70 faculty respondents and 55 completed the surveys (hereafter refers to "UAR survey II"). In addition, in light of the unification of UA's two regional campuses, a special survey was completed by UAR's AAUP from May 22 to June 27, 2014. There were 83 respondents, including 72 faculty members (hereafter refers to "UAR survey III"). Approved by the UA's Institutional Review Board (IRB), these UAR surveys are cited in this article as an important reference.

With regard to the basic information and data about UA, all data after 2000 is available to the public at the UA website, and the data before 2000 is also available upon request. The project collected and selected information on 13 relevant topics from 1982-2013, including the university's mission statement, vision, strategic plans, institutional history, student enrollment information, degree award data, faculty and administrative staff information, revenue, sponsored funding, technology transfer and commercialization, and UA's nationwide and worldwide rankings. In order to protect the confidentiality of UA, no base data cited from its website is revealed.

III. Shared Governance and Faculty Research

Faculty research is the first area affected by C&C and the consequential decrease in shared governance. Today's American universities are witnessing "changes in academic attitudes and structure related to economic development," which "could set the stage for as great a transformation as was precipitated by the assumption of a research function by universities at the beginning of this century" (Peters, 1990:427). To be sure, the Uniform Patent Act of 1981 has changed university behavior with respect to intellectual property rights. For faculty and administrators, this law "has heightened their interest in commercialization of the results of university research" (Peters, 1990:432). The companies established by MIT faculty and students in 1990, for instance, had combined annual sales of $39 billion--about one-third the gross annual product of Massachusetts State (Peters, 1990:433).

It is vital to use measurable indicators when evaluating the academic research under the influence of C&C. First, technology transfer and commercialization have clearly represented some notable commercial efforts at American universities. Following the national trend since the beginning of the 21st century, UA, for instance, created a position of Vice President for Research, replacing the previous Vice Provost for Research. One of UA's regional campuses also created a new position of Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Professional Development in 2005. After reallocating financial resources and human capital, UA achieved a 666% growth in the number of patent applications from 2001 to 2006, and another 940% growth from 2006 to 2011. Its royalty income has also increased by 158% in 2006 and 139% in 2011 (see Table 1 below).

Table 1 UA Technology Transfer and Commercialization (2000-2013)
(Unit: $million)

Year	Patent Applications Worldwide	Royalty Income
2000-01	35	1.63
2012-13	344	5.8
Percent change	+882.86%	+255.83%

Therefore, in light of technology transfer and commercialization, professors began to focus on "patenting and licensing in order to garner market-based rewards for selling privatized knowledge" (Hong and Walsh, 2009:15). Interestingly, in some scholars' view (Reingand&Osten, 2010:1), "it is too late to complain about the university research commercialization, since it is an existing reality and plays a growing role for ranking and reputation." Also, money really matters because "when it comes to commercialization of the technology or material or process or device disclosed in the patent, then the inventor has a right to request a monetary reward for using the patented invention" (Reingand&Osten, 2009:2). Now, "academic entrepreneurs are encouraged to secure formal rights on their intellectual property as a key step towards the successful commercialization of their research" (Etzkowitz, 2000:360).

Furthermore, the factor of external grants and contracts also reflects the effects of C&C in academic research, with serious impact on faculty morale and shared governance. To develop university-industrial relations and secure more external funding in support of the university research enterprise, more and more American universities have to go the extra mile in expanding sponsored research programs. Demonstrated by Table 2, UA's sponsored funding increased by 220.44% from 2000 to 2012.

Table 2 UA Sponsored Funding Awarded Information (2000-2013)

Year	Amount (million)
2000-01	190.3
2011-12	345
Percent Change	+81.29%

Noticeably, focusing on external grant and university-industrial collaboration has devaluated the research, mainly in the areas of humanities and social sciences. While emphasizing practicality and economic development, many humanities and social sciences faculty members have found their morale diminished and their voice marginalized when it comes to university governance. Meanwhile, academic commercialization has revised the definition of faculty research. It now focuses on applied research, which can display measurable outcomes on the university's revenue sheet. Besides, the university has to emphasize the measurable quantity of publications instead of the quality of scholarship. In reality, a faculty member may be tenured with books and articles published by some commercial publishers and non-refereed journals.

IV. Shared Governance and Faculty Teaching
In light of powerful C&C, a decrease in shared governance in teaching is demonstrated in five

situations. First, more professional degrees were awarded by UA. While UA's student enrollment increased by 20.96% from 1982 to 2012 (see Table 3), the Baccalaureate, Master's and Doctorate degrees it conferred increased by 22.44%, 15.73%, and 44.82%, respectively, from 2000 to 2012 (see Table 4). By contrast, the professional degrees that UA (a main campus) awarded increased dramatically by 178.65% during the same period, although its total number of degrees (248) in 2013 was not significant (see Table 4). Such an increase is indicative of the impact of commercialization on the academic expectations and outcomes, as holders of professional degrees presumably have a better chance of finding employment.

Table 3. UA Student Enrollment Information (1982-2012)

Year	Student Numbers
1982-83	32,455
2011-12	39,256
Percent Change	+20.96%

Table 4. UA Student Degree Awarded Information, 2000-2012

Year	Baccalaureate Degrees	Master's Degrees	Doctorate Degrees	Professional Degrees
2000-01	5,579	1,284	464	89
2012-13	6,831	1,486	672	248
Percent Change	+22.44%	+15.73%	+44.82%	+178.65%

Driven largely by commercialization, the focus on professional degree programs has affected the university's curriculum, which "serves to further ensure that industry- relevant skills, rather than critical reflections, are the focus of delivery" (Molesworth, 2009:283). The decisions on experiential education and professional degree programs are made in a top-down fashion without intensive or extensive faculty involvement. Consequently, UA has placed its curricular priority on its students' vocational needs, experiential education and professional career development. As a result, UA is becoming more of a professional school at the expense of humanities, social sciences and competence training. As ZhidongHao mentions, "When politics, money, and other utilitarian goals advance, the teaching of humanities and social sciences and the fostering of critical thinking abilities retreat" (Hao, 2015:118). Similarly, one faculty member pointed out during the UAR Survey II in January 2014 that there is "decline in academically challenging courses offered. Department has a preference for skill and job preparation courses. There is decline in liberal arts education and a move to job preparation to maximize enrollment and justify programs. It is dumbing down higher education."

The dramatic growth of the number of adjunct professors has reduced the instructional cost, but affected the morale and generated strain for part-time faculty because it has created a "caste system" in higher education institutions. For instance, while the positions of full-time faculty and lecturers

increased by 16.5% from 2000 to 2013 at UA, the number of adjunct faculty increased by 54.7% during the same period (see Table 5).

Table 5 UA Faculty and Staff Information (2000-2013)

Year	Full-time Faculty and Lecturers	Adjunct Faculty	Administrative and Professional Staff
2000-01	2,302	234	2,938
2012-13	2,682	362	3,975
Percent Change	+16.5%	+54.7%	+35.3%

The large income gap between full-time and adjunct professors is what creates a faculty caste system. To some part-time professors, full-time faculty is boss and part-time professor is slave, and full-time faculty is teaching with respect, but part-time faculty has no dignity. On the other hand, tenured professors have also complained about the lower morale of adjunct faculty because some adjunct professors have "checked out," and rely on things such as old, outdated syllabi and videos." Similarly, some adjunct faculty may use more multiple choice questions, as their commitment to the students is less. UAR Survey II supports the findings drawn from the interviews in January 2014. One faculty member added, "I think the overall faculty morale in my department is not high given the number of adjuncts we hired to replace faculty who have left the institution. I have never in my experience seen more student turmoil due to low faculty morale and incompetence."

Lower faculty morale is also related to the drastic tuition increase, which is a general trend in American higher education. Currently, students are becoming "cash cows" and customers, faculty is treated as salesmen, and the university is being transformed into a commercialized vendor. As a public university, UA is not a tuition-driven institution, compared to most private universities. Traditionally, the more students enrolled in public universities, the more revenue allocations these universities would receive from the state government. However, the budget crisis in recent years has reduced the percentages of state revenues for the public universities. As indicated in Table 6, the state revenue allocation in dollar amount increased by 5.5% from 2000 to 2013, yet UA's percentage of the state revenue allocation was reduced from 28.6% to 14.6% in the past 13 years. Arguably, UA is no longer treated as a state university. Consequently, UA has been forced to increase student tuition and fees by 219.81% in the past 13 years and its percentage of the total revenue increased from 20.89% to 33.3%.

Table 6. UA Budgeted Revenue Information, 2000-2013 (unit: $million)

Year	Student Fees	State Appropriation	Federal Appropriation	Total
2000-01 (Percentage of Total Revenue)	$197.9 (20.89%)	$271 (28.6%)	$15 (1.58%)	$947.1
2012-13 (Percentage of Total Revenue)	$632.9 (33.3%)	$285.9 (14.6%)	$17.1 (0.87%)	$1,957.7
Percentage Change of Revenue in dollar amount	+219.81%	+5.5%	+14%	

To render effective service to these "customers" whose tuition makes up one-third of the university's revenue, the relationship between faculty and students is directly impacted. Professors act as salesmen while students perform as conscious customers who are always right. They want good grades for the dollars they pay. Given that student evaluations play an important role in the tenure and promotion processes, and students' opinions are often influenced by their satisfaction of the grades they received, some professors are discouraged to experiment with new pedagogical methods and strategies for fear that they will not be able to give students good grades and thus not get good student evaluations. Furthermore, most students do not really use evaluations to judge how a professor performs. Some faculty would buy students pizzas to boost the evaluation scores. Similarly, some of the students who cannot get their expected grades would lower the rating for their professors. The results of student evaluations highly depend on the toughness of his/her professor.

As a result, grade inflation has become a troubling trend. At present, the "university administration is increasingly keen on the retention rate. They want students to be happy" (Hao, 2013:12). In doing so, grade inflation is inevitable. Weakened academic rigor was reported in the second survey conducted by UA's regional campus AAUP in January 2014. It indicated that 13% of faculty had made their exams easier while 32% made their homework assignments easier in fall 2013, as compared to the previous semester (see Table 7).

Table 7. UAR Survey II: Changing Teaching Rigor

Item: During the fall 2013 semester, please rate how (if at all) you changed your behavior in each of the following areas:	Easier	No Change	Harder
The rigor of my exams	13%	84%	3%
The rigor of my homework assignments	32%	66%	2%

In this regard, several faculty members expressed concerns in their open-ended comments during the UAR survey II. "I made them [assign/assessments] easier to grade for my benefit. Because of this, I had to change the format, so I feel I was not able to reach the depth of learning I think is necessary for a graduate degree." Others shared similar opinions and experiences: 1) "The increased class size has really put a strain on me in terms of grading. I included fewer written assignments and more exams, which I believe diminished the class experience;" 2) "I provided fewer assignments to grade;" and 3) "Since my classes were so large, I gave fewer tests." Similarly, since students are customers, once conflicts occur, professors have to adjust course work load so that students do not feel burdened.

Freedom of speech in the classroom has also been affected by this customer-centered environment and student consumerism. To adhere to the idea of political correctness, some faculty members try to avoid any sensitive topics in the classroom. The commercialization of higher education has directly or indirectly given rise to high tuition, influenced student evaluations, caused grade inflation and weakened faculty's freedom of speech in the classroom, all of which have in turn contributed to decreased faculty morale, increased faculty strain and, ultimately, eroded faculty governance.

The dramatic growth of international students is another index of the commercialization of higher education, and another source of strain and stress for faculty members. Given that international

students typically pay out-of-state tuition, the university has a strong incentive to recruit international students who may be not as academically competent as other American students. For instance, as of 2013, UA had 9,509 international students, which is the second-largest international student population among U.S. public universities (Institute of International Education, 2013). By contrast, there were only 1,500 international students at UA in 1982. While the total number of students at UA increased by only 20.96% from 1982 to 2013, the international student population rose dramatically by 533.93%, and its percentage of the total student population increased from 4.62% to 24.22% during the same period (see Table 8). In addition to charging out-of-state tuition, UA charges an additional $1,000 for each international student as processing and orientation fees.

Table 8. UA International Students and Total Students, 1982-2013

Year	Number of International Students	Number of Total Students
1982-83 (Percentage of the Total Students)	1,500 (4.62%)	32,455
2012-13 (Percentage of the Total Students)	9,509 (24.22%)	39,256
Percentage Change	533.93%	20.96%

Given the lack of English language capabilities on the part of many international students, faculty members have to serve as language instructors to help them improve their English, in addition to classroom instruction on the specific subject and any other advising duties. It has added burden and responsibility to faculty members' workloads because many international students have problems writing papers and delivering presentations. Sometimes, professors have to compromise the quality of English essays in order to let some international students pass the class. One regional campus at UA offers provisional admissions to those international students who did not pass their TOEFL. In such cases, the university can charge extra tuition for them to take the English training program on campus. As one faculty member pointed out, in reality, it was nearly impossible for some international students to improve their language ability to a satisfactory level that would enable them to engage in meaningful academic studies. Some international students had to withdraw from the university and go back to their home countries after paying the expensive English learning tuition for one or more years.

It needs to be pointed out that the decision to waive the requirement for TOEFL in order to increase the enrollment of international students did not get approval by the faculty senate. Instead, the decision was made by university administration. The faculty never knew about the decision-making process concerning the aggressive recruitment of international students until they witnessed a massive number of foreign students talking in their native languages on campus.

Shrinking shared governance, low faculty morale and serious faculty strain are also attributable to the growth of online teaching, another product of the commercialization of higher education. As Table 9 shows, the number of UA distance learning courses increased by 633.33% from 2000 to 2013.

Table 9 UA Distance Learning Courses (2000-2013)

Year	Number of Distance Learning Courses
2000-01[1]	132
2012-13[2]	968
Percentage Change	+633.33%

At present, professors are in no position to stop or even slow the trend of online teaching--one of the outcomes of academic commercialization and a change that is generally supported by university administrations. Many professors have serious reservations regarding on-line teaching but budgetary factors will continue this drive in the future. Thus, students are also limited in their learning efforts. As one faculty stated during the UAR Survey II, the university has "become an educational enterprise that is focused on the production of billable hours, establishing a student as customer model, and diminishing and marginalizing the faculty." Some senior faculty lamented that the steep learning curve made it very difficult for him/her to teach online courses, though there was little choice but to learn to use Blackboard in order to survive in a commercialized academic environment.

Similarly, UA's faculty body never had a chance to discuss and approve the distance-learning course curricula. The fact is that, given the current administrative policy, once one faculty member develops a regular on-site course approved by the faculty senate, he or she is free to make it into an online version, thus raising the issue about its quality and accreditation. Therefore, the key issue is shared governance regarding developing distance education because nobody can ensure the quality of online courses without faculty's input and professional program review.

Finally, another reason for faculty's strain and low morale is the fact that full-time faculty are compelled to increase their teaching loads, which involves more course preparations and larger class sizes. As demonstrated by UAR Survey II in January 2014, 39% of the faculty now teach more courses and 56% taught larger class sizes (more than 40 students) in Fall 2013 compared to the previous semesters (see Table 10). As one faculty commented in the survey, "The class sizes are increasing substantially. As an example, the size of our freshman experience sections has increased more than 50%, making the student/faulty interaction less personal and this is not helpful in terms of retention efforts." Another faculty member also made it clear that "I think my students are feeling the strain from larger classes because I don't have enough time to be responsive to students."

Table 10. UAR Survey II: Increasing Teaching Loads

Item	Fewer/Smaller	About the Same	More/Larger
Compared to previous semesters, how many course (i.e., preps) did you have for fall 2013?	5%	56%	39%
Compared to previous semesters, how large were your class sizes in fall 2013?	3%	40%	56%

Due to the increased teaching loads, more than 75% of the faculty has reduced time devoted to scholarly activities (see Table 11). Accordingly, a significant percentage of the faculty members are dissatisfied with the quality of their teaching, research, service and professional development (see Table 12).

Table 11. UAR Survey II: Changing Faculty's Time Allocation

During the fall 2013 semester, when compared to the previous semesters, please rate how (if at all) you changed the amount of time you spent on each of the following activities:	Less Time	No Change	More Time
Teaching all my classes	5%	49%	46%
Work on scholarly activities	79%	15%	7%
Starting new scholarly projects	80%	13%	7%
Reading and reviewing scholarly journals	75%	20%	5%

Table 12. UAR Survey II: Changing Faculty's Job Satisfactions

Item: During the fall 2013 semester, when compared to previous semesters, please rate how (if at all) you felt about each of the following activities:	Declined	Same	Improved
The overall quality of my teaching	33%	60%	7%
The overall quality of my research work	63%	33%	3%
The overall quality of my service activities	40%	43%	17%
My personal growth	65%	27%	8%
My professional growth	70%	24%	7%
My overall job satisfaction	77%	15%	8%

Hence, faculty morale has decreased significantly. In the open-ended comment section in the UAR Survey II, one faculty member admitted that he/she had changed "in belief system about what education means." Naturally, heavier teaching loads have led to increased stress for faculty. Several faculty voiced the following concerns: 1) "I found myself being more irritable than usual with my students' when they were off-task;" 2) "I was less patient with my students than usual;" 3) "Pressure, stress, and anxiety;" and 4) "I had to seek medical help and was prescribed medications to help me cope with the situation. Needless to say, this added to the pressure and burden."

Apparently, increased teaching loads and class sizes have resulted in the decline of scholarship, the rigor and effectiveness of teaching, instructional quality and faculty dissatisfaction with their job as well as their personal and professional growth. Consequently, faculty morale is low, stress is high and burnout symptoms are reported frequently. Overworked and under-appreciated faculty members have reacted by exerting less effort in teaching, research and scholarship, including less interest in seeking research grants. Faculty members have expressed little or no confidence in the aims and actions of the administration, whether in the past or the future.

V. Shared Governance on Professorial Services
The rights and responsibilities of professorial service are mainly reflected in faculty governance in conducting university affairs. Several factors have contributed to the erosion of the faculty's role in university service and governance.

First, the different growth rates of the number of university administrators and that of faculty reveal the changing role of faculty in university service. Naturally, both administrators and faculty want to see a respective increase in personnel. However, the control of political power and financial resources in the hands of the administrators has led to disproportionate increase in the number of

administrators. A national survey conducted by AAUP in 2014 shows that the explosive growth in administrative positions became evident because the number of full-time, non-faculty professional employees more than quadrupled. The number of full-time senior administrators also more than doubled during the same period, while tenured and tenure-track faculty employment grew only 23%. According to John Curtis, director of Research and Public Policy of AAUP, "while faculty and staff members were told there was no money for raises or continued benefits, presidents were scooping up double-digit percentage increases in salary. Suffering from a decades-old case of 'administrative bloat,' higher education is losing its focus" (Curtis & Thornton, 2014:4-5).

This national survey is strongly supported by UA's situation, where administrative and professional staff members increased by 140.04% from 1982 to 2013, while full-time faculty increased by only 51.72% during the same period. This disparity clearly demonstrates the personnel growth of administrative power at the expense of faculty interests. Indicated by Table 13, the size of the faculty was 7.2% (1,775 vs. 1,656) more than administrators in 1982, but 30 years later the number of administration was 42.43% more than faculty members (2,693 vs. 3,975) in 2013 (see Table 13).

Table 13. AU Faculty and Administrative Information (1982-2013)

Year	Faculty and Lecturers	Administrative and Professional Staff
1982-83	1,775	1,656
2012-13	2,693	3,975
Percentage Change	+51.72%	+140.04%

One faculty complained, "We have a large and growing administrative sector at UA. It is my sense that the administration does not have a great deal of faith in the faculty--as a whole--to contribute to the running of the University, which is why administrators have been hired. We do not have a union and the Faculty Senate seems to be a plodding bureaucratic organization that does not focus on important issues."

Specifically, once the university hires more administrators, the limited budget restricts the hiring of tenure-track faculty members. In the past five years, UAR has almost frozen all unfilled positions for tenure-track faculty when others retired or left the university. However, it has kept hiring various administrative staff and even created many new positions for the senior administration. Meanwhile, UAR hasn't had any salary increases for its faculty in the past three years.

The second indicator of the impact of commercialization and corporatization on shared governance is the arbitrary leadership of the university administration. Various interviews with UA faculty and administrators clearly demonstrate that the university administration has dominated all decision-making processes except for curriculum development. Given that UA is not a unionized campus, the role of faculty governance, such as the faculty senate, is significantly limited. For instance, facing a $1 million shortfall due to lower enrollment, a UA's regional campus decided to terminate six tenure-track faculty positions on August 9, 2013, while still hiring and expanding administrative positions. This decision had no meaningful faculty involvement and generated serious complaints. Based on its AAUP chapter's survey (URA survey I) in September 2013, 80% of the faculty either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the administrative decision to terminate faculty positions using

budgetary reasons (see item 1, Table 11). It is worth noting that the American system of higher learning is widely perceived in the rest of the world as rather liberal, but 30% of faculty respondents in the survey either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that the "university adheres to the principles of academic freedom" (see item 4, Table 14).

Table 14. URA Survey I: University Governance A

Item	Number of respondents	Strongly agree and agree (%)	Undecided (%)	Strongly disagree and disagree (%)
1. University budget cuts that resulted in termination letters to faculty in Summer, 2013	78	8	13	80
2. University faculty and staff can expect equitable treatment regardless of gender, sexual orientation, disability, religious, and racial/ethnic differences	78	45	10	45
3. University has a strong due process system in place for faculty and staff	78	28	18	54
4. University adheres to the principles of academic freedom	86	54	16	30

Another case also illustrates the shrinking shared governance at UAR. Currently, it has been proposed that two UA's regional campuses merge into one entity. One UA senior administrator stated, "After the consolidation has been worked out, faculty input will be sought and given great weight." The UAR AAUP chapter president mounted a strong opposition: "Consulting with faculty after decisions are made is not shared governance" because "unilateral administration decisions do not include faculty or student participation and do not serve the public interest. Shared governance is essential to a quality university" (Staff, 2014). Consequently, AAUP at UAR conducted its third survey in June 2014, gathering the opinions of faculty and staff on the process and decision of campus merger (Table 15-17).

Table 15. UAR Survey III: Competence and Input on the Unification (83 Respondents)

Item	%Strongly Agree/Agree	Mean
The unification process has been handled competently.	26	1.95
The reasons for the unification have been adequately explained.	20	1.93
The naming process for the new, combined institution has been handled competently.	16	1.58
Sufficient input was sought before the unification process was begun.	5	1.36

Selection of faculty representatives on the unification committee was through an open and transparent process.	26	1.88

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree

Table 16. UAR Survey III: Representation for the Unification (83 Respondents)

Item: The unification committee adequately represents the interests of…	%SA/A	Mean
Administrators.	88	3.36
Faculty.	21	1.84
Staff.	36	2.14
Students.	21	1.82
Alumni.	15	1.83

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = strongly agree

Table 17. UAR Survey III: Campus Atmosphere on the Unification

Item (negative option of two statements presented)	% Chosen
Solutions are pre-determined by the ruling elite.	77
Authority is used to induce acceptance of a predetermined solution.	81
Leader behavior is not constrained by rules or other group members.	86
There is a single source or colluding sources of information on campus.	69
Communication structures on campus are centralized.	60
There are rigid group boundaries and roles that limit discussion and options.	79
Minority opinion is censored via neglect, ridicule, social pressure, or persecution.	74
Feedback is discouraged on campus.	54
The agenda, objectives, and work tasks are set by a small, select group.	86
Rewards are used to maintain group structure and leaders' status and power.	82
Persuasion on campus is based on simple images, prejudices, and the playing on emotions.	75
Scale (Cronbach's alpha = .92)	

The survey III above concludes that UAR's merger process, presumed to be instigated by the president of UA and Board of Trustees, has not been handled well. The information on the process was scant and not well-received. Furthermore, the merger is believed to benefit administrators, rather than faculty, staff, students or alumni. The majority of the respondents believe that the decision-making process, rather than deliberative and persuasive, was centralized and restrictive, with minimum input from the rest of the campus population. To put this event in a broader context, it reflects the crisis of confidence in shared governance as a result of the corporatization and commercialization of higher education.

Commenting on the trend of university corporatization, one faculty interviewee conceded, "Immediate future of this university will involve increased focus on revenue generation, customer satisfaction and cost cutting measures. I suppose this could be considered increased commercialization and/or corporatization. Faculty governance will not be on the increase--at least not on this campus." Additional URA survey results also strongly reflect the scholars' concerns and the interviewees' opinions related to the lack of administrative transparency and shared governance (see Tables 18 & 19). In particular, 69% of faculty respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed that "university has a strong faculty governance system" (Item 6, Table 19).

Table 18. URA Survey I: University Governance B

Item	Number of respondents	Strongly agree and agree (%)	Undecided (%)	Strongly disagree and disagree (%)
1. University conducts university business in a transparent manner	87	16	14	60
2. University openly shares budget information with faculty, staff, and administrators	84	25	8	67
3. University is responsive to the needs of its student body	85	32	28	40
4. University is responsive to the needs of the local community	76	32	32	37

Table 19. URA Survey I: University Governance C

Item	Number of respondents	Strongly agree and agree (%)	Undecided (%)	Strongly disagree and disagree (%)
1. I believe that my input is considered and acted upon at the University level.	78	20	9	70
2. I have many opportunities for input about important matters at the College level.	82	43	20	38
3. I believe that my input is considered and acted upon at the	83	34	16	51

College level.				
4. I have many opportunities for input about important matters at the Department level.	78	73	8	19
5. I believe that my input is considered and acted upon at the Department level.	78	62	13	26
6. University has a strong faculty governance system.	80	18	14	69

As a result, the commercialization and corporatization of academia have changed the roles of faculty in university service. The growth of the university corporation has taken place at the expense of shared governance, hence the reduced power and influence of faculty in the institution's decision-making process. One UA faculty opined that "faculty are intimately involved in determining tenure and promotion, and selecting new faculty. Faculty have little say in governance issues concerning funding." Not surprisingly, many faculty interviewees repeatedly brought up this issue, expressing their dissatisfaction with the fact that "top-down direction precludes faculty participation," i.e., except in faculty recruitment and tenure at the initial stages. Some pointed out that in terms of faculty recruitment, "the final hiring decision is made by the administrator. Normally, the administrator follows the recommendations from the search committee." Recently, the positions of provost, vice chancellor, associate vice chancellors and department heads have been directly appointed without nationwide searches. Others believed that "faculty has contributed to the university governance, but not necessarily the selections of administrators." According to established practice, the selection of senior university administrators has to result from a nationwide search and the search committee must have more than 50% of faculty representation. However, this conventional rule and practice have not been followed at UA and/or UAR.

Other similar complaints were voiced: "promotion and tenure is a peer review process, and while faculty have strong advisory powers, the final promotion decisions are made by administrative offices." Therefore, "faculty governance is tolerated in purely advisory roles (except in curricular and calendar matters). The administration pays lip service to involving the faculty senate in all decision-making processes, but in reality the faculty have very little influence."

As for the role of faculty senate, as a key body for shared governance, it is functional but UA is not unionized. Therefore, relatively, their power is not strong. It is worth noting that chapters of AAUP can be divided into two types: one is the advocacy chapter, which doesn't give faculty collective bargaining power in negotiating annual contracts with the administration. Another one is the collective bargaining congress (CBC), which is similar to the faculty union. Since UA has the former, its faculty members don't have the power to negotiate their contracts in order to protect their interests. One faculty member mentioned that it is "useless in my opinion--mostly figureheads for faculty senate. They do not have power over real, substantial issues," such as the selection and evaluation of the administrators, the design and implementation of educational policy, and university budgeting. "Many [faculty senators] are useless," in one faculty member's view, because "in many cases, the university administration will decide the direction of the university, and all faculty's

inputs are ignored," such as timely filling faculty positions when vacancies are available and restricting the number of adjunct instructors.

The faculty interviewees' individual opinions are supported by the following URA survey (see Table 20). Interestingly, while 52% of faculty felt negative about the role of the faculty senate in effectively advancing faculty interests, only 18% of them entered negative evaluations on the AAUP which is totally independent organization (see Item 3, Table 20).

Table 20. URA Survey I: University Governance D

Item	Number of respondents	Strongly agree and agree (%)	Undecided (%)	Strongly disagree and disagree (%)
1. The University Faculty Senate effectively advances faculty interests.	73	20	27	52
2. The University Senior Leadership Team effectively advances staff and faculty interests.	79	8	22	71
3. The University AAUP Chapter effectively advances faculty interests.	45	42	40	18

All in all, UA's regional campus surveys have yielded several key findings: One is the pervasive sense of deep mistrust, unhappiness and lack of pride. Another is the lack of administrative transparency and responsiveness, especially above the departmental level. Finally, AAUP is seen as a better advocate of faculty interests than the Faculty Senate.

Interestingly, the widespread faculty discontent is contrasted with the administration's expectations of increased faculty service in promoting university marketization through the recruitment efforts. One university administrator argued, "From my perspective annual faculty reviews should include a section on service. If faculty performs next-to-no service, their annual raises should be impacted." He stressed, "Faculty need to understand that the academic world has changed. We need to do more to sell our product to perspective students and families." This administrator also addressed that "this service should be praised and acknowledged, but, at this time of budget crisis and low enrollments, service to UA should be prioritized." Furthermore, he stated, "UA, like many universities, is encountering serious financial issues and falling enrollment. Most faculty do not view these issues as matters for direct personal concern and involvement. They are wrong." Therefore, in his view, "Faculty must now be required to play an active role in the fundamental survival of their universities. In my opinion, UA needs to adopt a formal post-tenure review system. Such a system would reward the faculty who are significant contributors to the university's mission. It would also assist faculty who are under-performing and facilitate the retirement or termination of faculty who are hindering the university's mission." In addition, some administrators felt it was particularly inappropriate for some faculty to "serve for too many paid positions, such as external advisors, consultants, and executive positions" because "there are some conflicts of time and financial

interests" affecting their service obligations on campus which are their priority. These concerns are helpful in understanding the administrators' viewpoints regarding shared governance.

VI. Conclusion

Based on extensive empirical studies, this chapter discusses the wide-ranging impact of commercialization and corporatization on shared governance, academic freedom, faculty morale and faculty strain related to the three pillars of American higher education, including university professors' research, teaching and service. While the C&C have adversely affected the quality of faculty work in all three areas, they have concurrently increased faculty strain, reduced their morale, weakened their instructional rigor, and decreased their job satisfaction. In particular, marginalized faculty voice and power in university governance have significantly limited their academic freedom in sponsored research, classroom teaching, and community service. Indeed, C&C have threatened the collective academic freedom in addition to individual rights. As Nancy Thomas asserts, "we need to shift the conversation from academic freedom as an individual right to academic freedom as a collective duty, a responsibility implicit in the social contract between American higher education and democracy" (Thomas, 2010:85).

Arguably, crises are invariably accompanied with opportunities. The unprecedented development of C&C in the past 30 years calls for fundamental reforms and reconstruction of higher education. A "university renaissance" that aims to accentuate the traditional values of respecting teachers and teaching is in order. The crucial issue, as Steck (2003) has pointed out, is to reclaim the traditional roles of academic institutions. "The core values and mission of the university must be sustained if the university is to fulfill its traditional role of learning, scholarship, and service." Corporatized universities, in Steck's view," is only the shell of a university, and the task facing the academic community is to ensure that the inner core as well as the outer shell are preserved" (p. 81). To protect the "inner core," it is vital to heed the concerns and interests of professors. As indispensable human capital in the noble undertaking of higher education, professors deserve their rights to shared governance, societal respect, economic rewards, and, more importantly, academic freedom.

REFERENCES

American Association of University Professors.(2001). Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities (1967).In Policy Documents and Reports, ninth edition (pp. 217-223). Washington, D. C.: Author.

Birnbaum, Robert. (2004). The End of Shared Governance: Looking Ahead and Looking Back. New Direction of Higher Education (127) (Fall): 5-22.

Breznitz, S. M., R.P. O'Shea, & T.J. Allen.(2008). University Commercialization Strategies in the Development of Regional Bioclusters. The Journal of Product Innovation Management 25 (2): 129–142.

Dreyfuss, Simeon. (2014). Making a Tangible Difference in Campus Culture in One Year: Chapter Building at a Small Catholic University with no Tenure-track Faculty. Academe 100 (5). (http://www.aaup.org/reports-and-publications/academe).

Curtis, John, & Thornton, Saranna. (2014). Losing Focus: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2013-2014. Academe 100 (2): 4-38.

Enders, Jurgen. (2001). Between State Control and Academic Capitalism: A Comparative Perspective on Academic Staff in Europe. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Etzkowitz, Henry. (2000). The Future of the University and the University of the Future: Evolution of Ivory Tower to Entrepreneurial Paradigm. Research Policy 29(2):313–330.

Giroux, Henry. (2002). The Corporate War against Higher Education. Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor (9):103-117.

Hao, Zhidong.(2011). 2015."Commercialization and Corporatization Versus Professorial Roles and Academic freedom in the United States and Greater China," Chinese Sociological Review, 47(2)103-127.

Hong, W., & J. P. Walsh. (2009). For Money or Glory?: Secrecy, Competition and Commercialization in the Entrepreneurial University. The Sociological Quarterly 50(1):145-171.

Institute of International Education. (2013). Open Doors 2013: International Students in the United States and Study Abroad by American Students are at All-Time High. Institute of International Education.Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/Who-We-Are/News-and-Events/Press-Center/Press-Releases/2013/2013-11-11-Open-Doors-Data#.UuyHN5FR8k.

Jain, S., G. George, & M. Maltarich.(2009). Academics or Entrepreneurs? Investigating Role Identity Modification of University Scientists Involved in Commercialization Activity. Research Policy 38(6):922–935.

Kezar, Adrianna. (2004). What is More Important to Effective Governance: Relationships, Trust, and Leadership, or Structures and Formal Processes? New Direction of Higher Education (127) (Fall): 35-46.

Kumar, M. N. (2010). Ethical Conflicts in Commercialization of University Research in the Post–Bayh–Dole Era. Ethics & Behavior 20(5):324–351.

M, D. (2013) An Open Letter to the People of UA. Office of the President.Retrieved from http://www.ua.edu/president/email/2014/1401-med-openletter.html.

Mirowski, P., & R. V. Horn. (2005). The Contract Research Organization and the Commercialization of Scientific Research. Social Studies of Science 35(4):503-548.

Molesworth, M., E. Nixon, & R. Scullion. (2009). Having, Being and Higher Education: The Marketisation of the University and the Transformation of the Student into Consumer. Teaching in Higher Education14(3):277-287.

Nancy, L.T. (2010). The Politics of Academic Freedom. New Directions for Higher Education 24(4):83-90.

Nicolaus, Mills. (2012). The Corporatization of Higher Education. The College Issue 54(4), 6-9.

Parker, Lee,. (2011). University Corporatisation: Driving Redefinition. Critical Perspectives on Accounting 22(4):434–450.

Peters, L.S., & H. Etzkowitz.(1990). University-Industry Connections and Academic Values. Technology in Society 12(4):427-440.

Pope Myron. (2004). A Conceptual Framework of Faculty Trust and Participation in Governance. New Direction of Higher Education (127) (Fall): 75-84.

Powers, J.B., & E.G. Campbell.(2011). Technology Commercialization Effects on the Conduct of Research in Higher Education. Higher Education 52(3):245–260.

Reingand, N., &Osten, W. (2010).Bringing University Invention to the Market. Optical Metrology 7387 (9):1-12.

Research Institute for Higher Education at Hiroshima University. (2009). The Changing Academic Profession over 1992-2007: International, Comparative, and Quantitative Perspectives. Higashi-Hiroshima: Hiroshima University Press.

Schrecker, Ellen. (2010). Academic Freedom in the Corporate University. Radical Teacher 93(1):38-

45.

Staff Reports. (2014). AAUP Insists on Shared Governance in XXX Merger. The Michigan City News-Dispatch, September 7.

Steck, H. (2003). Corporatization of the University: Seeking Conceptual Clarity. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 585(1):66-83.

Teichler, Ulrich, Akira Arimoto, and William K. Cummings. 2013. The Changing Academic Profession: Major Findings of a Comparative Survey. Dordrecht Heidelberg, New York, London: Springer.

Thomas, Nancy. (2010). The Politics of Academic Freedom. New Directions for Higher Education 152 (4):83-90.