

September 22, 1994

Report From the  
Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Faculty Governance

Awi Federgruen	Frank Lichtenberg
Don Hambrick (Chair)	Jace Schinderman (ex officio)
Geoffrey Heal (ex officio)	Jake Thomas
Mac Hulbert	

At its initial meeting in July 1993, the Strategic Planning Committee concluded that an examination of faculty governance procedures was a high priority and designated us as a subcommittee to conduct such an inquiry. Our recommendations for new governance processes are attached.

The proposals have been reviewed by the Provost's Office, in accord with University requirements. They have also been endorsed by the full Strategic Planning Committee and the current Committee on Instruction. We now seek faculty approval of the proposals at a faculty meeting scheduled for October 3, 1994, 5:30 p.m.

It may be useful to review the process that led to our recommendations. Last fall, we focused on analysis and diagnosis. The subcommittee interviewed almost all tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty with over two years of service at Columbia, and all Deans in the School. We also met with Stephen Rittenberg, Associate Provost. And, of course, the SPC had considerable discussions about the strengths and weaknesses of our current governance processes. The diagnostic phase of our work culminated with the report distributed and discussed at the December 1993 faculty meeting. Copies of that report are still available in the Dean's Office.

In January, our efforts turned to developing proposals for improved governance. We solicited inputs from all faculty and deans, in turn receiving suggestions from over 50 individuals. We interviewed colleagues at 15 other major business schools in the United States and Europe to learn about their governance processes. An initial set of proposals was discussed extensively by the SPC, yielding a revised version which was presented and discussed at five informal faculty gatherings in late April. On the basis of these discussions, the proposals were revised again, discussed and modified by SPC, yielding preliminary recommendations that were discussed at a well-attended faculty meeting in May. The subcommittee modified the proposals again, finally resulting in the recommendations attached here. In short, we have sought to engage in a very comprehensive, careful, and inclusive process.

\* \* \*

The School's current governance processes are an amalgamation of policies, customs, and norms that have accreted over decades. Tracing the origins of our current approaches is a near impossibility, both because so much of what we do has emerged through various avenues over the years and our official archives are very incomplete. In short, the School's current governance processes have no particular deliberateness, coherence, or currency. Judging from the interviews conducted throughout the School, these shortcomings are widely felt.

Yet, we exist in a world that imposes on us an unprecedented

need for high quality strategic and operational capabilities. Our marketplace is shifting, our stakeholders are very demanding, competition is keener than ever, and resources are tight and getting tighter. All this, while we aspire to be among the top five business schools in the world.

Improved governance processes are not all that will be required of us in the years ahead, but they will greatly enable our other advances. For governance processes ultimately affect adaptiveness, integration, productivity, morale, and sense of community.

There is no straightforward formula for superior governance processes in a business school. Inevitably, delicate balances have to be achieved, tradeoffs made. The very nature of a collegial enterprise is such that sleek, efficient, corporate-type decision making will not and should not occur. Every leading business school has its own procedures for handling its affairs; in fact, the diversity of approaches is remarkable. Our own approach must fit our aspirations, values, strategic situation, and culture.

#### The Importance of Culture and Individual Behavior

We all believe in the critical importance of sound governance processes. However, the formal elements of governance -- structures, systems, committees, reports, and so on -- pale in significance compared to the effects of our culture and the day-in, day-out behaviors of us as individuals. An academic enterprise will not rise or fall on the basis of its formal procedures, but

rather on the basis of how individual faculty members conduct themselves in the governance endeavor.

We have been impressed by how many colleagues have made this point to us over the past year. Sometimes they would cite egregious examples of behaviors which subvert the collegium, such as personal attacks on colleagues in meetings or chronic absences from faculty meetings. Other instances mentioned were seemingly minor but clearly contributing to an unhealthy tone -- senior faculty not knowing the names of junior faculty in their divisions or the unwillingness to greet a colleague while waiting for the elevator. These examples, particularly the latter, may strike some as trivial. But, multiplied many times, over many fronts, these small behaviors greatly affect the attitudes of faculty members, their willingness to contribute to governance, and the way they conduct themselves in governance activities.

Our School's strategic thrusts of globalization and integration require extraordinary collaboration, both in our research and teaching. The only way we can execute on our intentions is through a culture of respect, teamwork, mutual support, tolerance for diverse perspectives, and simply responsible citizenship. It is a fallacy to think that these qualities are at odds with high intellectual standards or research productivity within our respective disciplines. If anything, they are symbiotic. Also, it would be wrong to think that sound governance processes can compensate for, or overcome, an unhealthy culture. They cannot. Both are essential.

Overview

Our proposals are presented in three major sections:

- School Structure and Process
- Divisions and Divisional Chairpersons
- Faculty Responsibility and Accountability.

The three sets of proposals are meant to form a coherent whole and are even operationally interdependent. We conceive of them as a package and present them to the faculty as such.

**Proposals from the  
SPC Subcommittee on Faculty Governance**

**September, 1994**

## School Structure and Process

The complexity of the School -- in terms of size, array of programs, and rate of external change -- has outstripped the capacity of the School's fundamental governance procedures. The proposals presented in this section are intended particularly to achieve the following ends: 1) active and strategically-oriented faculty oversight of academic affairs, 2) enhanced integration between the thrusts of the School and its chief academic components, the divisions, 3) greater faculty voice and involvement, and 4) better multi-way communication among administrative offices, the faculty, and the divisions. We specifically propose the creation of a new executive committee, academic program committees, and a set of new processes for communication, faculty involvement, and deliberation.

Executive Committee: This will be the major policy and oversight committee of the School.

Composition: Dean (chair)

Senior Vice Dean (vice chair)

Vice Dean

Divisional Chairpersons (to be elected, as described below)

2 at-large (elected) members

- Vote will be by all full-time officers of instruction, using same nomination and election processes as currently for COI.
- The 2 at-large members cannot be from the same division.

- As long as the School has a large Finance and Economics Division (currently about twice the size of any other division), one of the at-large positions would be filled by a member of that division, but voted on by the full faculty.

Scope of responsibilities:

stimulating and evaluating strategic initiatives

reserves the right to create special committees and to review other committees' initiatives

advice to dean on:

- major resource allocation and budget
- faculty staffing and development

Process:

The committee will meet once a month, or more if needed, including summer.

Its agenda will be distributed to faculty in advance.

Any faculty member can propose an agenda item. (There may be a need for an agenda subcommittee.)

Minutes will be distributed within one week after a committee meeting.

The committee's proposals on significant academic issues shall be placed before the full faculty for discussion and/or vote.

On less significant issues, the committee may propose to take action on its own.

Upon receiving minutes, faculty members may formally indicate (for public record) a desire to have a faculty discussion of an executive committee decision or recommendation, prior to implementation. (Minutes will be formatted to make this convenient.) If at least 30% of faculty do so, within two weeks of distribution of the minutes, the item will become an agenda item at the next faculty meeting.

### Program Committees and Program Directors

These committees are responsible for academic integrity, adaptiveness and quality delivery of the School's educational programs.

#### MBA Committee

Composition: Vice Dean for MBA Program (chair)

EMBA Program Director

core course coordinators (designated by divisions)

theme coordinators (appointed by Dean)

[SFAAC, student groups, concentration advisors, administrators would be invited to participate as appropriate.]

[It is expected that much of this committee's work would be done through subcommittees.]

#### Responsibilities:

curriculum implementation (e.g., course integration and sequencing)

sponsor/administer development of course materials

systematically stay abreast of marketplace and competitive trends

systematically stay abreast of student and faculty perceptions and needs

propose curriculum changes (for faculty vote)

review of proposals for new electives

### Ph.D. Program Committee

Composition: Ph.D. Program Director (chair)  
 representatives designated by divisions

Responsible for oversight of Ph.D. program  
 [no significant changes from current practices]

### Executive Program Committee

Composition: Associate Dean for Executive Programs  
 (chair)

3-5 faculty members, appointed by Dean

Responsible for strategic oversight of non-degree executive  
 programs

### Committee Processes

All program committees will operate under the same "open"  
 processes as the Executive Committee (i.e, distributed  
 agenda and minutes, receive agenda items from the faculty,  
 "check-off" for faculty discussion)

\* \* \*

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will be unchanged

There will be no Committee on Instruction.

\* \* \*

Faculty Meetings and Communications

The School should have a standard governance time slot.  
(e.g., Tuesdays 4 - 7 p.m.)

6 faculty meetings per year should be scheduled.  
(They can be cancelled, if not needed)

There should be at least one non-tenured faculty meeting per year.

We propose a day-long faculty retreat each year (agenda to be set by Executive Committee).

We strongly encourage monthly "Notes from the Deans".

\* \* \*

(Illustrative Monthly Governance Schedule)

1st Tuesday	4:00 - 5:30 p.m.	Executive Committee
	5:30 - 7:00 p.m.	Other Committees
2nd Tuesday	4:00 - 6:00 p.m.	Faculty Meeting
	6:00 - 7:00 p.m.	Reception/Refreshments
3rd Tuesday	4:00 - 5:30 p.m.	Divisional Meetings
	5:30 - 7:00 p.m.	Open/miscellaneous
4th Tuesday	4:00 - 5:30 p.m.	Program Committees
	5:30 - 7:00 p.m.	Open/miscellaneous

## Divisions and Divisional Chairpersons

The divisions are the chief academic components of the School. They must have vitality, strategies which cohere with the School's strategy, and internal governance processes which ensure intellectual development and effective, fair operations. Currently, there is widespread belief that the divisions are not achieving their potential as our key academic building blocks. Our proposals center on the roles and responsibilities of the division chair; however, we set forth additional ideas as well.

### Divisional Chairpersons

**Selection:** Elected by all full-time faculty in division  
(subject to veto by the Dean)

Must be tenured

The election process will be as follows: At the appropriate time, the Dean's Office will determine who, among the tenured members of a division, is eligible and willing to stand for election. The Dean's Office then will administer a confidential balloting process; if no candidate receives a majority of the votes cast, the two individuals receiving the most votes will be entered into a second and final confidential vote. Whoever wins the most votes in that round will be the new divisional chairperson. In the event of a tie in the second round of balloting, the dean will select among the two candidates after consulting with members of the division and the Executive Committee.

**Term:** Three-year term; can be re-elected to one additional two-year term

**Responsibilities:** Responsible for catalyzing strategic development of the division

Member of Executive Committee; communicates Division perspective to Committee and vice versa

Responsible, in conjunction with the Vice Dean, for staffing of all of the division's courses

Recommends to the Vice Dean candidates for adjuncts and visitors

Oversees evaluation and development of junior faculty by senior faculty

Nominates divisional members for search committees (subject to Senior Vice Dean approval)

Designates concentration advisors

Chairs regular divisional meetings (at least two per year); prepares agenda, with input from all members

Coordinates preparation for a quinquennial internal and external review of the division, articulating goals and plans of the division and reviewing past performance

Allocates divisional budget for faculty searches, faculty development, and seminars (under School guidelines). (Faculty salaries, off-term research support, and COSTAR budgets will be determined by Dean's Office.)

Special  
Circumstances:

In the event of major governance problems arising in a division, the Dean, or the Executive Committee by majority vote, may initiate a special interim review of the division, and may, in turn, possibly require a new election.

A division may request, by two-thirds vote, that it be allowed to hold an emergency, interim election of a new chairperson.

Incentives:

Divisional chairpersons will receive teaching load reductions and/or salary supplements, commensurate with the scale and complexity of their responsibilities. For a typical division, a two-course teaching reduction is warranted.

\* \* \*

### Administrative Departments

Like divisions, administrative departments (e.g., computer services) should be regularly and systematically evaluated. Heads of departments should prepare annual reports, reviewing past performance and articulating goals for the next year. In conjunction with these reports, the Dean's Office will administer periodic evaluations of administrative departments by faculty and other constituencies (via surveys and other means, at least once a year), to be reviewed by the Executive Committee.

## **Faculty Responsibility and Accountability**

Faculty members represent the core, essential resources of any academic enterprise. Their responsibilities are substantial, involving contributions on multiple fronts. As professionals, faculty members are accorded certain rights and allowed freedom in many matters. However, as members of a collegium, faculty members are accountable to each other. To lose sight of this precept is to court decay, cynicism, and waste.

In this section, we set forth guiding principles for faculty responsibility and accountability. We discuss the various forms of contribution that faculty members can make, emphasizing that differing portfolios, particularly for tenured faculty members, should be expected and accommodated. We then propose means for keeping the full faculty abreast of each other's accomplishments and activities. Finally, we recommend new processes for providing feedback to individual faculty members.

### **Guiding Principles**

#### **1. Individual and Collective Responsibility**

Faculty members have a responsibility toward the welfare of the School, as well as to themselves and their professional disciplines. In particular, every faculty member is expected to contribute significantly to the health, vitality, and stature of the School. Faculty members are accountable to their internal peers as well as to external peers.

#### **2. Unified Strategy with Different Forms of Contribution**

It is desirable that the faculty as a whole endorse and support a common vision and strategy for the School. However, we should accommodate and even encourage diversity in the ways that faculty members contribute to the School.

### 3. Resource Allocation and Comparative Advantage

In a resource-constrained environment, efficient resource allocation is very important. In order to use our faculty resources wisely, we must recognize that interests, preferences, and competences vary.

### 4. Communication About Faculty Contributions

It is exceedingly important that faculty members stay abreast of the contributions and accomplishments of their colleagues. Information and communication processes are needed to support this aim.

## Areas of Contribution

In the spirit of the above principles, a faculty member's range of contribution to the School should be viewed broadly. Every faculty member will have a portfolio of activities, and portfolios may differ.

### 1. Research and Scholarship

In order to remain current for our students, to advance knowledge in our fields, and to contribute to the lustre of the School and University, it is extremely desirable that each faculty member maintain some type of research program.

Scholarly contributions can take varying forms:

- refereed articles
- other articles and chapters
- supervision of Ph.D. research
- creating/leading research centers
- books
- journal editorships and editorial boards

Publication records, citation indices and peer reviews are important for evaluating research impact; however other criteria may be relevant, as well.

### 2. Teaching

The typical teaching load will be 4 courses for faculty who are active in research and/or contributing significantly to the governance of the School.

However, faculty who contribute to the School primarily through teaching, not through research and/or service, might be encouraged to teach 5-6 courses. Similarly, faculty with highly productive, prominent research programs might teach 3 courses.

The average teaching load for all tenure-track professors will not rise above 4 courses.

Teaching can be fulfilled through MBA, EMBA, and Ph.D. programs.

In deciding on teaching loads, we need to give some attention to core vs. non-core, size of section, and number of preparations. The operationalization of this concept should be a high priority for the new Executive Committee.

Another early task of the Executive Committee should be to consider "mainstreaming" executive program instruction, possibly allowing the faculty member the option of extra compensation (as at present) or teaching-load credit. We may wish to put a maximum on the amount of executive education that can be done as part of the regular teaching load.

### 3. Service

- Service to the school can take various forms, including committee work, faculty meeting attendance, participation in faculty searches, and participation in divisional meetings and seminars. Every faculty member is expected at a minimum to attend faculty meetings, attend divisional meetings and seminars, and participate in faculty searches. When asked to contribute beyond this minimum, faculty who do so, particularly effectively, need to be explicitly acknowledged.
- Because the positions of divisional chairperson, program director, and vice dean are very demanding and not easily divisible, they warrant special incentives.
- We do not advocate any rigid quota or allocation system for service work; interests and competences vary too much.

### Information About Faculty Contributions

Each faculty member should develop annually a brief (1-2 page) statement of recent accomplishments and plans for the next 1-3 years. This will be distributed, along with his or her updated C.V. and activity report, to the Senior Vice Dean and divisional colleagues.

Each year, all updated faculty C.V.s and activity reports will be available on the Columbia Business School electronic network.

We recommend that the Dean annually report descriptive statistics regarding salary raises, including the minimum, maximum, and quartile dividers. These statistics should be broken out for tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, and administrative staff.

### Analysis of Faculty Contributions

#### 1. Non-tenured faculty (tenure-track)

Every year, non-tenured faculty should receive careful, constructive reviews from tenured colleagues in their divisions. All tenured members of a division should meet to discuss the progress and prospects of each non-tenured member; an evaluation letter should be written (with a copy to the Dean's office), and one or more tenured faculty should meet with each non-tenured member to discuss the letter and answer questions or concerns. As noted earlier, the divisional chairperson should coordinate this process, but it will be done most effectively with broad involvement of all tenured faculty.

In keeping with our emphasis on more careful reviews, we encourage the Promotion and Tenure Committee to consider developing new, more careful and explicit procedures for considering promotion to Associate Professor. A limited external review may be appropriate at that stage.

There will be no change in the process of evaluation for tenure.

#### 2. Tenured faculty

Every three years, the Senior Vice Dean, in collaboration with the divisional chairperson, will draft a constructive feedback letter to each tenured faculty member. The Senior Vice Dean and division chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss the letter; they also will forward the letter to the Dean, along with a recommendation regarding an appropriate portfolio of activities for the faculty member. The Dean will then meet with the faculty member to discuss plans and priorities for contributing to the School.

As faculty members, division chairpersons also will receive in-depth feedback on the scheduled three-year cycle, from the Senior Vice Dean and Dean.

Every five years, as part of the external review of a division, reviewers will be asked to assess the productivity, contributions, and progress of tenured members of the division.

3. Non-tenured faculty (contract)

Same process as for tenured faculty.

\* \* \*