

NEASC STANDARD THREE ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE

Introduction

This section describes the most recent phase in the evolution of Franklin Pierce University as it has matured from a small residential college with an active continuing educational unit into a small, comprehensive teaching university with two colleges, the original flagship College at Rindge for traditional residential undergraduates and the College of Graduate and Professional Studies accommodating a diverse catalogue of adult, professional, on-line and graduate programs.

Description

The transition to a University-based identity has prompted several changes in institutional organization and the forms of governance since the 1998 NEASC review. The University has taken great care to ensure that the new organizational and governance policies, reporting relationships and internal operating structures both at Rindge and within the College of Graduate and Professional Studies reflect the institution's evolving identity. Overall authority is retained by the Board of Trustees, and the University President continues to report to the Board. Several new administrative positions, however, have altered previously existing structures designed to meet the needs of the single-campus small college constituency. The new position of Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs was created in 2000 in an effort to designate the Chief Academic Officer as the second officer of the institution. The senior levels of the University administration have experienced significant change since 1998. The senior leadership is now comprised of the President, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Vice President for Strategic Initiatives, Vice President for Student Administrative Services, the Vice President/Athletics Director, and the Vice President for Institutional Advancement.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) defines the structure and process of faculty governance and organization at Rindge. The most recent contract negotiations were successfully completed in 2006-2007. CGPS faculty and governance is guided by the CGPS Faculty Protocol, which is routinely updated to reflect organizational and programming changes. (Exhibits 3.1, 3.2)

In March of 1999, Franklin Pierce University was accorded full accreditation and degree-granting authority by NEASC for its undergraduate and Masters-level programming. This was followed by approval to establish academic programming through distance learning in 2003, authority to offer the Doctor of Physical Therapy degree in 2004, and authority to offer the Doctor of Arts in Leadership degree in 2006. The Doctor of Physical Therapy degree is nationally accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE).

The College was chartered by the State of New Hampshire on November 14, 1962, under the provisions of Chapter 292 R.S.A. In 1965, the New Hampshire Legislature granted the College

statutory authority to grant baccalaureate degrees. The University is approved by the New Hampshire Postsecondary Education Commission, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, the U.S. Department of Justice, and the U.S. Department of Education. Certification in elementary, secondary, general special education, and art teacher education is approved by the New Hampshire State Department of Education. The University is also approved by the Arizona Private Postsecondary Education Commission to offer both undergraduate and graduate degrees and is seeking approval from the Arizona Board of Nursing to offer an Associate of Science in Nursing degree. The University is approved for veterans.

At the October of 2005 Annual Meeting of the Trustees, the Board directed the management to undertake the necessary due diligence to consider a change in institutional status. A transition to university status was motivated primarily by the Board's recognition of the substantial transformation the institution has undergone over the past decade. The due diligence process included programmatic and financial analyses, studies of similarly situated institutions which have undergone such change, and consultations with the accrediting and approving agencies. The President brought his recommendation to the June 2006 Board meeting. As a result, the Trustees resolved unanimously on June 9, 2006, to accept this recommendation to proceed to university status, effective July 1, 2007.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Franklin Pierce University operates under the authority of a Board of Trustees. The Board retains ultimate control over "institutional affairs in accordance with the College's [now University's] charter, bylaws, mission statement, and institutional plans." As in 1998, the Board appoints the President. (Exhibits 3.3, 3.4)

The current Board consists of twenty-two members (including President Hagerty). The Board membership reflects a broad spectrum of civic, political, educational and business interests, including a Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Military Community & Family Policy and former senior advisor to the Iraqi Minister of Education; the Vice President of Legislative Affairs for BAE Systems, Inc.; a Realtor; a Director of the Federal Reserve; a former member of the United States House of Representatives for the second district of New Hampshire; a former Provost and Vice President at the University of Richmond; the President and Chief Executive Officer of The New England Council; a mutual fund Director; a former prosecuting attorney for the State of New Hampshire (now in private practice); a retired Vice President for the Bank of America; a non-profit fundraiser; the former press secretary to Presidents Reagan and George H. W. Bush; a former bank executive who graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree from Franklin Pierce in 1987; the President and Chief Executive Officer of Atlas Advanced Pyrotechnics in Jaffrey, New Hampshire; a former Dean and Professor of Philosophy at Stonehill College; a hotelier; and a 1980 graduate of Franklin Pierce College who served as President of the Franklin Pierce Alumni Association Board of Directors from 2000 to 2002 and received the Alumni Leader of Conscience Award in 2005.

The full Board customarily meets three times each year (October, February/March, and June). Standing Committees usually meet more frequently during the year to conduct their specialized work in preparation for consideration by the full Board. Minutes of the meeting of the full Board,

which also reflect Committee reports, are maintained as part of the permanent record of the College. (Exhibit 3.5) The BOT sets annual goals for itself and for the President. The Board is organized into six major committees: Executive Committee, with responsibility for Board composition and needs; Academic Affairs Committee, with responsibility for all policy and procedural matters relating to the educational mission and programs of the University, including all faculty appointments, promotions, sabbaticals, and change in contract status recommended by the President; Student Life Committee, responsible for the institution's co-curricular activities, student social life, spiritual programming, athletics and other extracurricular activities, as well as provisions and standards for housing, food service and discipline; Development Committee (Campaign Executive Committee), with responsibility for strategies related to annual funds, capital campaigns, deferred gifts and publications designed to improve relationships with alumni, parents, friends and benefactors of the University; Business Committee, with responsibility for general supervision over the finances, capital planning, and real estate of the University; and the Audit Committee, with responsibility for the annual audit of the accounts of the University as reflected in the institution's annual audited financial statements. Recently, the Board established the ad hoc Goodyear Oversight Committee to review progress on the establishment of the Goodyear, AZ programs.

THE PRESIDENT

George J. Hagerty of Keene, NH, has been the President of Franklin Pierce University since 1995. He is nationally recognized for his leadership in higher education, business, and government. Dr. Hagerty held a number of administrative positions for the U.S. Department of Education and was appointed Chief of Compliance and Enforcement for the Office of Special Education Programs. He has been a faculty member at Stonehill College and also served there as Director of Academic Development and Director of Corporate, Foundation, and Government Relations. He was a senior partner in a Washington, D.C.-based consulting firm providing counsel in education, legislation, and finance to state governments, national organizations, and institutions of higher education. He received his doctorate in educational administration, planning, and social policy from Harvard University where he also served on the faculty.

The President is the Chief Executive Officer and is responsible for administering the affairs of the University. As the Chief Executive Officer, the President is responsible to the Board for the operation of all departments and has—under the Board—final authority in the determination of policies, procedures, and practices. The President is also the official medium of communication between the Board and the officers, faculty, and students of the University. Annually, the Board of Trustees sets goals for the President which are communicated at the October Board meeting and reviewed at subsequent meetings.

ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY AND STUDENT GOVERNANCE

The University is led by the President with the assistance of seven Vice Presidents. In 2001 the University appointed its first Provost, a position that reflects the University's move toward a more traditional academic structure. The academic unit of the University is led by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and is divided into two Colleges, each headed by a Dean who reports to the Provost. The Library, the Registrar (curriculum and degree integrity),

and the Directors of the three University Institutes (the Fitzwater Center, the New England Center for Civic Life, and the Monadnock Institute of Nature, Place and Culture) also report to the Provost. Other areas managed by Vice Presidents include Student Affairs, Institutional Advancement, Student Administrative Services (including technology), Finance and Administration, Strategic Initiatives, Athletics and Facilities.

The single University-wide advisory committee is the Pierce Council. The Pierce Council was created in response to the recommendations of a 1997 College governance committee study, approved by the Board of Trustees in June 1997 for implementation in 1998. This Council, chaired by the President since its inception, serves as a campus-wide forum for the examination of institution-defining issues confronting the institution, and responds to a perceived need to involve the University community more directly in long-range planning and major decision-making. All University constituencies are represented on the Council through an annual election process. The Council meets monthly during the academic year. In addition to facilitating more diverse input on decision-making, the Council also keeps the President and the greater University community informed about how, why, and when major decisions are made.

The Provost reports directly to the President and stands in for the President as needed. The Provost is the Chief Academic Officer of the University and is responsible for all academic programs of the institution, including those at Rindge, the College of Graduate and Professional Studies (CGPS) and those planned for the Goodyear campus. The Dean of the College at Rindge, the Dean of CGPS, and the Directors of the Centers/Institutes report to the Provost's Office. The Provost leads the University's Planning and Assessment efforts, serves as staff liaison to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and is responsible for ensuring that the University meets its accreditation obligations. The Provost is responsible for overseeing budgets in all administrative areas for which this officer has direct responsibility, including Academic Affairs, the three academic Institutes and the Library. This officer also administers budgets for the divisions of the faculty, allocation of resources for academic programs and services, and the budgets for new programs and services. The Provost is a member of the Senior Staff.

The College at Rindge is organized into five academic divisions representing the principal areas of the College's curriculum: Behavioral Sciences, Business Administration, Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Visual and Performing Arts. Division Chair candidates from the faculty are selected by the Dean from at least two nominations submitted by the full-time faculty of the Division. The general responsibilities of the Division Chair are the management of all aspects of the divisional program of instruction, including staffing, the evaluation of the teaching effectiveness, curriculum and teaching development, the coordination of the divisional budgets, and the management of undergraduate programming and faculty at CGPS education centers.

As defined by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), the faculty at the College at Rindge maintains two standing academic committees and three standing governance committees which act as recommending bodies to the Dean of the College. Significant issues may be referred to the Faculty as a whole which may, in turn, make a recommendation to the Dean. Where appropriate, chairs of the academic committees give progress reports at scheduled Faculty meetings. At present, the academic committees are: the Academic Standards Committee, which develops academic policies concerning the establishment and maintenance of academic standards; and the

Student Appeals Committee, which hears appeals of the student disciplinary process, in accordance with the procedures established in the Student Handbook. At present, the faculty governance committees are: the Curriculum Committee, which considers matters concerning the curriculum and makes recommendations to the faculty and to the Dean; the Faculty Affairs Committee, which consults with the Dean about developing criteria used in evaluation of Faculty and makes recommendations on faculty re-appointment and non-re-appointment, rolling and non-rolling contracts, sabbatical leaves, and promotions; and the Faculty Development Committee, which is responsible for recommending activities and programs which support and enhance the professional and personal development of faculty members.

Additional long-standing committees include the Core Steering Committee, which reviews proposed changes in the Integrated Core Curriculum, evaluates their impact, and makes recommendations to the Curriculum Committee; University Computer Advisory Committee (UCAC), and the First-Year Coordinating Committee. Other committees have formed and were disbanded once their work was done, such as the Faculty Evaluation Committee that over the last three years explored and recommended new ways for Faculty to be evaluated and promoted.

The faculty of the College at Rindge meets monthly, September through April of the academic year, to conduct its official business. There are also monthly Division and Rindge Faculty Federation meetings. Those persons eligible to attend and to participate in faculty meetings are full-time teaching faculty, part-time teaching faculty, administrators with faculty rank, librarians with faculty status, other administrative officers, and others, by invitation of the faculty. Persons eligible to vote in faculty elections are full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and professional librarians with faculty status. The Graduate Faculty in CGPS meet at least monthly within their programs to transact institutional business.

In the summer of 2007, the Office of Academic Affairs completed a restructuring that included hiring an administrative assistant, creating a new Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs to assist the Associate Dean and Dean, each with areas of primary responsibility. The Associate Dean has primary responsibility for overseeing the Academic Services Center, the Core Curriculum, the Core Steering Committee, and the First-Year Coordinating Committee. The Assistant Dean is in charge of managing special projects such as the NEASC self-study and oversight of the administration of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA).

The primary responsibilities of the Academic Dean of the College at Rindge include supervising each of the five academic divisions and all of the governance and ad hoc committees that are part of the academic structure of the College and associated undergraduate CGPS programs. The Dean meets twice monthly with Division Chairs and the Library Director. He also sets the agenda and chairs the monthly faculty meeting where information sharing, faculty-wide discussion and decision-making occur. The Dean may also attend the biweekly Senior Staff meetings, which are chaired by the President, to represent Academic Affairs and to coordinate activities with other areas of the University, such as the Offices of Student Affairs, Enrollment and Admissions, and the Registrar.

The College of Graduate and Professional Studies is comprised of five centers located in Concord, Keene, Lebanon, Manchester and Portsmouth, offering programs designed for adult

and graduate students. A sixth center is being developed in Goodyear, AZ. CGPS offers accelerated and on-line degree programs at the Master's, Bachelor's and Associate's levels. Undergraduate programs are scheduled in eight-week terms; graduate programs in twelve-week terms. The University also offers full-time doctoral programs in Physical Therapy (D.P.T.) and Leadership (D.A.).

CGPS is led by a Dean who is assisted by two Associate Deans, one for Undergraduate Study and one for Graduate Study and Health Professions. Graduate programs are organized by academic discipline, with an Academic Director in charge of each discipline. Each graduate program conducts its own faculty meetings to make decisions within the discipline. CGPS organizational and governance standing committees are described in the Faculty Protocol. These committees include Assessment, Curriculum, Library and Technology, Professional Development, Academic Standards, and the Institutional Review Board. The committees meet regularly and deliberations are recorded in formal minutes. In addition, the following councils are in place: the Graduate Council, which meets on an ad hoc basis to advise the Dean, and the Interdisciplinary Doctor of Arts Academic Council recently created to discuss matters pertaining to the D.A. program collaboration between Franklin Pierce University and Plymouth State University.

The main changes in organization and governance that CGPS experienced over the past five years are due to programmatic expansion. In 2002, there were three graduate programs (M.B.A., M.S. in I.T.M. and M.P.T.), today there are six. The CGPS undergraduate studies program has also recently expanded to include a B.S. in Nursing completion program. In 2007, to reflect the expansion of the University into doctoral programs, the Office of the Dean of CGPS was moved to the Concord Center. The College is in the process of revising the Faculty Protocol to more appropriately reflect these changes.

Appraisal

The University has throughout its history suffered from the regular turnover of our Chief Academic Officer. The average tenure of the Provost, Vice President for Academic Affairs, or Dean (title depending on the moment in history) is three and one half years. At present, an Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs is serving as the CAO, after having served on the University's Board of Trustees for several years.

For the most part, our basic organizational structure and systems of governance outlined above are working effectively. The last five years, however, have been a time of extensive change in the way the governance structures have worked, and some of the strains produced by those changes remain. For some Rindge faculty, this strain is most apparent in their continued reactions to the changes emanating from the prioritization process (2001-2003) and to the process of developing new Faculty Standards for Promotion (2005-2008). Recent efforts have been made to define and enhance the traditional faculty governance committee system, as well as to create a far more transparent administrative structure, providing clearer role definition and protocols for the Academic Division's administrative operation.

The role of Division Chair deserves reconsideration. The position description is very broad, given that Chairs are expected to teach a two/two schedule during the academic year. New

guidelines are needed, including the possibility of reduced workloads and clarification of the relationship between the roles of faculty and administrator.

The shift toward a more shared governance model at Rindge, with more responsibility invested in the faculty governance committees, also supports the University's goal of less reliance on ad hoc committees and expanding the roles and number, if needed, of standing faculty committees to do the academic work of the College at Rindge. Additionally, an effort is being made to bring more important decisions to the faculty as a whole in the monthly faculty meetings. A recent example (fall 2007) of both of these new approaches can be seen in how the Faculty Affairs Committee took the work of an ad hoc Faculty Evaluation committee and re-formulated it into a recommendation for changes in the faculty promotion process and presented their draft recommendations for discussion and amendment in a faculty meeting-of-the-whole. The Faculty Affairs Committee subsequently revised the document and solicited additional faculty input through electronic discussion boards, then brought another draft before the faculty-as-a-whole. The final proposal passed with minor amendments.

Entrusting a greater share of the academic work of the College to the faculty has resulted in a different attitude on the Rindge campus. Five years ago, the ad hoc committee's recommendations would likely have been made directly to the administration and would have omitted opportunities for more faculty-wide discussion and voting. This new process is seen by many Rindge faculty members as addressing some of the underlying institutional culture problems that led to the governance issues of the past. Creating, presenting and voting on important proposals in this way is seen as more inclusive and, ultimately, more efficient and beneficial because proposals shaped in this way have the input of more people and are subsequently better understood and supported, once passed.

As more policy-making is entrusted to faculty governance committees, however, their workload has increased, and there may be a need to expand and add new standing committees. Currently, Faculty Affairs has presented a proposal to divide into two committees--one that does the traditional work of reviewing contract status, promotion and sabbatical cases, and one that focuses more on academic policy issues. Other committees may have to divide their workloads accordingly as they take on more policy-making roles. Since some, but not all, current governance committees are part of the CBA and committee service is a contractual obligation of all faculty, it will be necessary to review contractual language to clarify governance structures and faculty obligations. By giving committees more policy responsibility, we expect to establish a shared governance system that relies more heavily on established structures of faculty governance that are clearly understood and routinely used.

Faculty meetings have also been reformatted to address faculty concerns about control of the agenda and limited opportunities for all-faculty discussion. These meetings are now divided into a traditional "business" session, governed by Robert's Rules, and a discussion-oriented "deliberative" session. While the latter has so far seen only limited use, this opportunity has improved the tone and level of discourse in these meetings and there is hope that steady progress will continue to be made.

As a two-way communication process, the Pierce Council has served to help foster the practices

of shared governance at Franklin Pierce for close to a decade. There is a general awareness that the Pierce Council offers the opportunity to bring concerns to the President through elected representatives. Some representatives are better than others at communicating the substance of the Council meetings to their constituencies, and this is an area where improvement is needed. From the faculty perspective, the Council seems more oriented toward communicating administrative decisions and initiatives than deliberating about institution-wide issues.

Most areas in CGPS governance work smoothly. Graduate Academic Directors have a good relationship with the faculty, meet regularly with them, and record the results in the faculty minutes. Whenever a faculty decision affects other academic disciplines or the curriculum, the requests are submitted by the Academic Director to the respective committee for consideration. Graduate committees are comprised of members of the faculty of the different disciplines. These committees meet regularly, and their decisions are recorded in minutes, and communicated to the interested constituencies within the institution. Center Directors, Academic Directors, the Dean, and Rindge staff meet every two months to discuss administrative and academic matters that affect CGPS. These meetings serve as a venue for communicating news and raising issues and ensure that the mission of the University is carried out uniformly. Communication between constituencies at CGPS and the College at Rindge has become a formal process, aided mainly by the regular meetings usually held at the Concord Center. Policies and procedures to ensure smooth operations have derived from these meetings. As new issues arise, they are addressed and solved either during the meeting, or by appointed ad hoc committees.

Underlying these changes is the clear sense that the faculty and the Trustees have full confidence in the President's leadership and integrity. Each recognizes that the President has a clear entrepreneurial vision for the University essential to the present growth and success of the institution. Still, both communities recognize that the institution is flourishing but fragile, successful because its enrollment is at an all-time high and the President has been an excellent fundraiser, and yet fragile because it is dependent on tuition income, has a modest endowment, and is at the mercy of forces it cannot control, including the demographics of New England and the current economic environment.

The Board of Trustees, like the institution as a whole, has evolved under the leadership of this President. It has become very much engaged in issues facing the University and in every major decision. Board agendas are focused on strategic issues, with wide Board participation in the discussions. To assess its effectiveness, the Board evaluates each meeting as well as the performance of the Board Chair and the Committee Chairs and asks each individual Trustee to evaluate his or her own performance.

While the Board is authorized for 30 members, it has consistently had 18-22, with four or five unable to attend meetings regularly. The work of the Board and its committees is thus spread over a small number of Trustees. The Board of Trustees' goals of the last few years have included the recruiting of additional new Trustees. While five new trustees were elected over the past 18 months, two others finished their second four-year term and were required to stand down and one Trustee passed away unexpectedly, resulting in a net increase of only two. The Board recognizes and is committed to several more years of similar recruiting success to reach a healthy size. The recruitment of four-to-six new Trustees this year (2008) is a component both of

the Trustees' and the President's goals.

An additional consequence of low membership is that a small number of Trustees bear the burden of the work of the Board. Some Trustees serve on as many as three committees, including the current ad hoc committee used to vet potential new Trustees and present them to the Board. The Board and the President are developing a formal process by which Trustees eligible for reappointment are evaluated by the Executive Committee or a special Committee on Trustees. Currently, this is accomplished by the full Board on a more informal basis. Similarly, the Chair appoints an ad hoc committee each year to evaluate the President. This process has worked well. The Board recognizes that these processes could be more formalized.

The Board recently enacted several changes in the By-laws aimed at lengthening the time a Trustee can serve before having to step down for a year. One provision allows a second term to be extended for an additional two years with the agreement of the incumbent and the Board. This is intended to ensure better staggering of those leaving the Board to allow for necessary balance and experience during the transition period. The Board also codified an annual process for the evaluation of the President (June 2008) that starts in October with the Board setting specific goals for the President for the year. The following September, an ad hoc committee of Trustees reviews the President's self-evaluation, seeks feedback from all Trustees and interviews members of the staff and faculty. That committee then makes a report and recommendation to the full Board on the President's performance on the general responsibilities of the President and on the goals set by the Board.

Projection

Of particular concern to the Board at the time of the University's decennial review is the transition in Presidential and Board leadership. George Hagerty is now in his fourteenth year as President and has made it known to the Board and the community that he does not intend to remain as the Chief Executive Officer beyond June 30, 2010 (at the close of the University's current Capital Campaign). The Board has already begun discussions on the importance of this transition in leadership and intends to define and begin the search process prior to its October 2008 Annual Meeting.

The Board has enjoyed stable leadership at the Board and Committee Chair levels over the course of the past five years. Even with the new By-law provisions allowing for extended second terms for Trustees, the current Board leadership (the Board Chair and several key Committee Chairs) must leave the Board in the next two-to-three years. At its June 2008 meeting, the Board charged the Vice Chair (who will not stand for Chair, at his request) to establish an ad hoc committee to 1) define a process by which new Board leadership can be selected, and 2) identify potential candidates for the various leadership vacancies that will occur over the next several years. This activity will be accomplished by March 2009.

During the 2008-2009 academic year, the Provost and the Deans will meet with faculty to develop a proposal for the Board's consideration to address the manner by which the current academic administrative governance structure might be organized to ensure the effective implementation and communication of policy, the lack of which has possibly contributed to

much of the historic turnover of Chief Academic Officers.

Consistent with the renewed emphasis on shared governance, the University will establish a “Summit Committee” with the explicit purpose of planning for the future of our traditional campus, the College at Rindge, developing a vision and plan for the next fifteen-to-twenty years. The intent here is to create a vital residential learning community that can serve well students in a changing demographic climate. The Vice President for Strategic Initiatives will be charged with organizing this initiative in the Fall of 2008. The Committee will be comprised of faculty, administrators, and Trustees. It is the expectation that this plan will be vetted by the entire College at Rindge in the Fall of 2009.

At the College at Rindge, the Faculty Affairs Committee will work with the academic administration to develop a more formal procedure for soliciting and scheduling appropriate deliberative sessions for faculty meetings. The committee will complete its work in fall 2008, with expected implementation by spring 2009. Likewise, the Office of Academic Affairs, working with the Faculty Affairs Committee, will continue to ensure that important academic matters and policies are brought to the faculty-as-a-whole for discussion, debate, and voting.

The Dean of the College at Rindge will work with the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) to develop a proposal for reorganization of FAC into a personnel committee and a policy committee. This work will be completed for presentation to the faculty in spring 2009.

The University will continue to support the use of faculty governance committees for policy development, review and decision-making. The College at Rindge will continue to minimize the use of ad hoc committees and work to clarify committees roles and faculty responsibilities as they relate to contractual obligations and standards for faculty contract status and promotion.

Finally, the Provost’s Office, working with the Pierce Council, will undertake to develop a clear plan and communication structure to ensure that CGPS and the academic institutes and centers are more formally incorporated into the academic life of the institution.