

SHARED GOVERNANCE OR MIXED GOVERNMENT?
CONTEMPORARY UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE AND THE
CLASSICAL REPUBLICAN TRADITION

Barker Center, 110 - Thompson Room
12 Quincy St. St, Cambridge, MA 02138

8-9 September 2017

DAY 1, September 8.

10:00-10:30am Opening Remarks: A Moderate Set of Tasks of this
Workshop

Oleg Kharkhordin, Homi Bhabha

The organizers' purpose is two-fold: first, to let sophisticated practitioners of university governance see their experience in a new light, and second, to enable scholars well-versed in the classical republican tradition to stimulate their own thinking by testing their theoretical concerns against patterns of life they themselves know best in practice—i.e., university governance, in which all of them are almost always inexorably involved. However, apart from recasting the familiar experiences in novel terms (which might have an eye-opening effect sometimes), the workshop also intends to contribute to our thinking on how to improve the university governance in top research universities across the world.

10:30am -12:30pm Session 1.

THE UNIVERSITY AS A REPUBLIC

Introductory Remarks (10:30-11:00):

Philip Pettit (Princeton), author of *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government* (Oxford UP, 1997)

The core idea in a republic is that members should enjoy the sort of equality that enables them to look one another in the eye without reason for fear or deference; no one should be subject to the arbitrary will of another in a manner that is liable to jeopardize this forthrightness. How to realize this condition in a University where there are marked differences of role and power between students and faculty, untenured and tenured professors, academics and administrators? How to organize things so that, despite the hierarchy in these relationships, each member of the university enjoys freedom of thought and speech, and does so as of personal right and mutual recognition? The civic republican tradition of political theory offers some clues as to how this may be done.

Discussants (11:00-12:00pm):

Eric Nelson, Harvard, Government

Patricia Graham, former Dean, Graduate School of Education

Oleg Kharkhordin, former Rector, European U at St. Petersburg

General Discussion (12:00pm-12:30pm)

12:30- 2:00pm Lunch

2:00 – 4:00pm Session 2.

LEADERSHIP IN THE MODERN UNIVERSITY: MORE POWER TO THE PRESIDENT?

Introductory Remarks: (2:00 - 2:30pm)

Nannerl Keohane

Reflecting on the role of university leaders in various offices, Nan Keohane considers multiple possible power configurations on campus. Drawing on Hamiltonian, Madisonian and Jeffersonian approaches to campus governance, she will ask whether the role of university presidents should be strengthened in light of the daunting challenges we face today. In whatever fashion the presidency may be structured, however, the essential contributions of the faculty and the board of trustees, as well as students, staff, alumni and public governments must also be kept in mind if a university is to be true to its basic purposes and character.

Background reading: Nannerl Keohane, "More Power to the President?" in her book *Higher Ground: Ethics and Leadership in the Modern University*, Duke University Press 2006, pp. 112-119.

Discussants (2:30 – 3:30pm):

Jonathan Fanton, former President, the New School for Social Research

Leah Rosovsky, Vice-President, Harvard

Philip Pettit, Politics, Philosophy, Princeton

Henry Rosovsky, former Dean, FAS, Harvard

General Discussion (3:30-4:00pm)

4:00 -4:30pm Coffee Break

4:30-6:30pm Session 3.

Introductory Remarks (4:30-5:00pm):

DO NEW DEANS AND CHAIRS NEED TO TAKE CIVICS CLASSES?

John D. DeGioia, President, Georgetown U

A call for introductory civics classes for new deans might seem as a strange idea. However, scholars familiar with the classical republican tradition could help the university administrators reassess their past experiences in a new light—and administrators unfamiliar with political theory might discover they had been following that tradition's precepts unwittingly.

Discussants (5:00 - 6:00pm):

Derek Bok, former President, Harvard U

Nannerl Keohane, former President, Duke U

Bob Millard, Chair of the MIT Corporation

Henry Rosovsky, former Dean, FAS, Harvard

General Discussion 6:00 – 6:30pm

7:30pm Dinner at the house of Prof. Homi Bhabha

DAY 2, September 9.

9:00am-11:00am Session 4.

HOW PROFESSORS THINK: SOME RULES OF ACADEMIC VIRTUE (REFLECTIONS ON THE BOOK ALMOST 10 YEARS AFTER)

Introductory Remarks (9:00-9:30am):

Michele Lamont, Weatherhead Center, Harvard

Prof. Lamont's 2009 book, *How Professors Think*, was a path-breaking work based on empirical data about peer review, and thus a genuine source of new thinking on professorial mores.

As many theorists of republicanism would claim, Machiavelli considered both "structure" (a governance mode) and "culture" (mores) as two important factors determining the success of a self-governing community. In contemporary studies of faculty governance, culture is often understudied. Concentrating on this very topic can reveal what ideals are inspiring virtuous academic behavior and what implications such ideals might have for university governance.

Discussants (9:30-10:15am):

Timothy Colton, Government, Harvard

Frank Lovett, Washington University in St. Louis

Homi Bhabha, Mahindra Center, Harvard

General Discussion 10:15 – 11:00am

Coffee break/light snacks 11:00-11:30am

11:30am-1:15pm Session 5

MIXED GOVERNMENT AND THE STRUCTURAL ORIGINS OF ACADEMIC VIRTUE

Introductory Remarks (11:30am-12:00pm)

Mikhail Sokolov, Sociology of Science, European University at St. Petersburg

This presentation will restate the classical dictum of the republican theory of self-government - successful polities should combine three good forms of government, rather than rely on one form alone, because this mixed form of government proves to be the most resistant against institutional decline. These three good forms are: the rule of the one (educated or benign monarchy), the rule of the few best (aristocracy) and the rule of all (democracy).

Applied to the university governance, and given Albert Hirschman's famous distinction between voice and exit sources of organizational power, this idea entails a universally accepted practice of granting voice to various groups – i.e. administrators, professors, students and trustees (frequently recruited from the alumni). Yet, there is a lack of agreement about the proper distribution of rights to participate in institutional decision-making - for example, it is not entirely clear, should presidents be given more powers. These debates, however, usually take into consideration voice opportunities ignoring exit ones, which serve as a "dark matter" of organizational

context of various exit options that are shaped by the general economic situation, a specificity of academic labor markets, and prevailing student culture. It argues that, in accordance with classical republican thought, various political structures prove to be more efficient in fostering republican virtues in different environments.

Discussants (12:00 - 12:45pm):

Michele Lamont, Weatherhead Center, Harvard

Kamal Ahmad, Vice-Chancellor, The Asian University for Women
(2010-2011)

Loren Graham, MIT, former Director, Center for Russian Studies,
Harvard

General Discussion 12:45 – 1:15pm

Concluding Remarks and a Wrap-Up (1:15-1:45pm):

Henry Rosovsky, Oleg Kharkhordin, Homi Bhabha