

[This is a historical document upon which are based the principles of faculty governance at Calvin College; current policies and implementation are contained in the most recent version of the Handbook for Teaching Faculty. This digitized version was prepared in June 2010 and preserves the pagination and general format of the original, but silently corrects minor typographical errors.]

FINAL REPORT OF
The Faculty Organization Study Committee
to the faculty of Calvin College
January 20, 1973

The Faculty Organization Study Committee: Roelof Bijkerk (1968-69); Vernon Ehlers, chairman; George Harper (1968-69); Charles Miller, secretary (1969-); Carl Sinke; William Spoelhof; Earl Strikwerda (secretary, 1968-69); John Vanden Berg; Johan Westra (1969- ; chairman pro tem, 1971-72)

I. INTRODUCTION

A. HISTORY

At its April, 1968 meeting the faculty, in response to a petition signed by seven of its members, voted to create an ad hoc committee to study "the faculty's role as a governing and advisory body." The petition asked that the committee "study and make recommendations" with respect to three specific areas:

- faculty committees, their structure, function, and responsibility;
- departmental and divisional structure; and
- the nature and composition of faculty meetings.

The grounds for requesting such a study were that the existing structure had developed piecemeal and not as part of a consistent pattern, that the increased size of the faculty had affected the nature and extent of faculty involvement; and that it was therefore necessary to provide means and procedures "to make faculty meetings truly vital and deliberative" and "to insure faculty participation in significant educational policy matters."

As a result of this faculty action the Faculty Organization Study Committee (hereafter FOSCO) was appointed in July 1968. It began its work in September of that year, and now presents the results of this work to the faculty. This introductory section is intended to provide the background against which the faculty can judge the recommendations contained in Section II of the report.

This report does not attempt to summarize or review all the ground that the committee has covered in its deliberations. It does not argue the merits of any specific recommendation or argue against alternative plans or procedures which the committee considered and rejected. It does not even argue that the body of recommendations presented to the faculty constitutes the only good plan for faculty organization and the only way to insure faculty participation in the governing of Calvin College.

This Introduction has a more modest purpose. It (1) informs the faculty how FOSCO has construed its mandate; (2) outlines the approach taken by the committee; (3) points out what the committee regards as key issues; (4) states some important general principles which we have followed; and (5) summarizes our recommendations, calling attention especially to those which depart most sharply from present practice or which introduce something new.

B. THE COMMITTEE'S INTERPRETATION OF ITS MANDATE

The committee has construed its mandate broadly. It did so for two reasons. First, the language used in the grounds for the petition assumed that the purpose of faculty organization and procedures is to get "faculty participation in significant educational policy matters." The committee interpreted "significant educational policy matters" to mean more than those matters within the purview of the Educational Policy Committee (now E. P. Committee and Professional Status Committee) as it was constituted in 1968. Rather it understood those words to mean all those policy matters which have a significant impact upon Calvin College as an educational institution. This, we believe, was also the intent of the petitioners.

Second, the committee soon recognized that the governing of the college necessarily involves more than just faculty. However important the faculty is -- and we believe it is very important -- its role could not be studied in isolation. The Board, the President, administrators, and students are also involved in governing the college. If all are not equally involved or not all involved in the same way in policy-making, all are certainly interested parties and all are affected by the overall quality of the college's government. FOSCO's mandate obviously does not entitle it to make recommendations regarding Board or Student Senate organization or procedures, or on how administrative offices should be organized. Yet, FOSCO in its studies had to give attention to all of these and in fact was directly involved in rewriting the Student Senate Constitution in 1971. It could not study faculty organization in vacuo but had to see the faculty's role in relation to other agencies, officers, and interests. This is reflected in certain parts of the Report.

C. THE APPROACH TAKEN

Before we discuss certain key issues in more detail, we outline briefly the approach the committee took. We began by asking some basic questions: What is the basis for faculty participation in the governance of the college? Does the Christian character of the institution require a particular form or structure of government? What should be the role of the faculty in the governance of the college?

We spent most of the first year struggling with such questions. We reviewed the history of academic governance and examined the governance of a number of colleges similar to Calvin. We also examined the governance of ecclesiastical organizations. We then discussed our basic questions in the light of our findings. Our preliminary conclusions were that (1) a major basis for faculty participation in governing the college is the fact that Calvin College is primarily an educational institution, and (2) the Christian character of the institution does not entail a particular form or structure of government. We then prepared a preliminary statement outlining the role of the faculty as compared to the roles of the administration and the Board of Trustees.

Our preliminary findings were reported to the faculty in the spring of 1969. No vote was taken then, but from oral and written comment the committee concluded there was general faculty approval of the direction it was taking. Thus encouraged, we turned to a detailed examination of alternative forms or structures of college governance. Among the alternatives which the committee examined and discussed at length were:

1. Hierarchical or "Strong President" forms. Under such forms the president has great authority which is delegated through a hierarchy of administrative officials. The faculty's role is often limited to certain purely academic aspects of the college. Faculty and staff are regarded as employees, students as "customers."
2. Various forms of "Community Government." Community government is more a mode than a form or structure of government. It stresses the ideals of equality and sharing. When translated into structures it has expressed itself in various ways:
 - a) Making sharp distinctions between student and faculty concerns. Separate governing bodies are created to deal with each. Each body has virtual autonomy within its area of

concern. Matters of conflict or mutual concern are referred to a "community assembly" for decision. The President or Board of Trustees is given veto power over assembly decisions.

- b) Granting representation to all sectors of the community -- students, faculty, administration, staff personnel -- on an "all college assembly." Assembly decisions are again subject to veto by President or Board.
 - c) Incorporating student representatives on all bodies -- committees, assemblies, Board -- involved in the government of the institution.
3. Various forms of a Faculty Senate. Under such arrangements the governing functions of the faculty are not performed by the full faculty but by a smaller body drawn from the faculty. Of all these alternatives, this one received the most serious consideration.

Each of these alternatives was rejected after the committee carefully weighed its advantages and disadvantages against those of the collegial form of college government. The collegial form or model is one in which the whole faculty participates in governing the college and has major responsibility for policy-making. We have recommended this form for several reasons:

1. It is compatible with the Christian character of the college.
2. It can be modified so as to provide for real participation by students and other members of the community while retaining major responsibility in the hands of the faculty.
3. It directly engages and draws upon the insight and knowledge of the entire faculty in the governing process.
4. It enables the faculty to discharge its responsibility effectively.
5. It is the form that has been traditional at Calvin College and therefore its adoption will create fewer transitional problems.

After the committee adopted the collegial-government model, it proceeded to establish an organizational structure based upon this model. Throughout its discussions the committee found that an analysis of college government in terms of function and role is more helpful than an analysis in terms of power. Some of the implications of this functional approach will be outlined later. At this point we wish only to note that this approach was used to develop a flexible structure which would allow the faculty to participate in institutional governance efficiently and effectively.

Our preliminary proposals for restructuring the governance of the college were presented to the faculty in a document dated February 24, 1971. Again the committee judged that there was general faculty approval of its approach, and so proceeded to work out the final details of a modified collegial form of government; these details are presented in this report.

D. SOME KEY ISSUES

Our position on some key issues reflects the general approach we have outlined above. Some of the important questions we faced were the following:

1. Should the whole faculty be involved in governing the college? Our answer to this question is "Yes." The collegial form of government in which the faculty is primarily responsible for institutional policy-making was until fairly recently the prevailing mode in most higher educational institutions. It is also the form that has traditionally prevailed at Calvin College. The committee believes not only that this form is appropriate for Calvin College, but is the form that is particularly well-suited to express the character of Calvin College as a Christian liberal arts educational institution. Because the whole faculty is engaged in carrying out the educational function, the primary function of the college, so too the whole faculty should share in making the policies which govern the college and create the framework within which education can take place. As each faculty member makes his own contribution as an educator, so we believe each can and should contribute to the governance of the college. Despite differences in rank and emoluments, faculty members are essentially equal in their professional duties. That equality, we think, should apply in the governance of the college also.
2. Can the whole faculty be involved in governing the college? Our answer to this is a qualified "Yes." We believe the whole faculty can be involved if certain conditions are met. These conditions are partly organizational and partly procedural. Our recommendations, we believe, provide necessary tools -- structures, procedures, rules -- for faculty participation in governing. We assume that the faculty members are willing to use the tools. Individual faculty members will have to devote some of their knowledge, their skills, their time, and their energy to the governing task. We are confident that they will do so.
3. Where does power lie at Calvin College and where should power lie? To pose questions in these terms, as is often done, is to raise a false issue, FOSCO believes. To think in terms of faculty power versus Board power, faculty power versus administration power, or faculty power versus student power is to misjudge the nature of the institution and to place the problem of its government in a false light. Power relationships normally imply adversary relationships. We firmly believe the various agencies involved in the governing of the college are not adversaries and should not be. We do not wish to gloss over the legitimate differences in interests, aims, and opinions of these groups, but we recognize that Calvin College is a Christian academic community and that all parts of this community share a common purpose and a common commitment. The parts have different roles and different responsibilities but they do not lord it over one another, they do not coerce one another, they are not to be thought of as rival power groups. We find a beautiful analogy in Romans 12:4, 5:

For just as in a single human body there are many limbs and organs, all with different functions, so all of us, united with Christ, form one body, serving individually as limbs and organs to one another. (NEB)

If one looks at power in purely legal terms, as a question of sovereignty, it is the Board of Trustees which controls Calvin College. The Board, in turn, is a standing committee of the ruling Synod of the Christian Reformed Church which owns and operates the college.

In practical terms, the Board has formally and informally delegated primary responsibility for day-to-day operation of the college to the President of the college, to other administrators, and to the faculty. These together share the major responsibility for governing the college. But while they share responsibility, they do not have the same functional role and they do not all participate in all aspects of governing. Nor, obviously, do they all devote an equal share of their time and attention to their governing roles.

4. How are the respective roles of the President, the faculty, and administrators to be defined? There is no easy, simple answer. The committee struggled with this question at every stage of its study and deliberations and in connection with nearly every particular problem it confronted. It has concluded that there is no simple formula which can clarify the complex inter-relationships that exist, which can disentangle formal from informal relationships, and which can sharply distinguish roles in a way that applies in all situations. Rather than trying to discover simplicity and clarity where it does not exist, we confine ourselves to some observations which may help the faculty in its thinking about this question.
 - a. We repeat what was said earlier about power. Whatever their roles and functions, these three elements in college government -- the President, faculty, and administrators -- are not rivals or adversaries. They complement one another. Each is indispensable to the other.
 - b. The same person often fulfills more than one role. The President is the best example of this. We deal with his roles in more detail below, but we simply note here that he is not only the chief executive officer of the college (i.e. top administrator), he is also chairman of the faculty and ex officio a member of all faculty committees. Further, he is the link between the Board and faculty, between faculty and Board. Some other administrators are also faculty members although they have no teaching duties. Some teaching faculty members hold administrative positions at the same time that they have teaching duties.
 - c. The distinctions that must be kept in mind, then, are not those of persons or titles or ranks, but of functions and roles. We can distinguish between three kinds of functions, each of which is an essential part of any governing process:
 - 1) Policy-making: By this we mean establishing goals and laying down the rules, the guidelines, the standards which shall govern a group (in this case the Calvin College community) as it seeks to achieve its goals. These rules are related to goals and purposes in the way that means are related to ends. Goals are usually fixed or they change relatively slowly. The rules or policies, however, may change frequently in response to changing conditions, available resources, the size of the group, etc.

- 2) Administration: This means carrying out or implementing a policy, applying rules and standards to individual cases. If policy-making with respect to a given matter is occasional and sporadic, administration is an on-going, daily activity. Administration, furthermore, tends to be a more specialized activity. Administrators have or develop skills which policy-makers do not need, at least not in the same degree. Also, administrators usually develop an expertise which policy-makers rarely have. While policy-makers are generalists, many administrators are specialists.
- 3) Leadership: This is the function that is most difficult of all to define. It is a personal quality as much as it is a function or an office. Although it is difficult to describe, faculty members usually recognize it when they see it. In the context of an educational institution it is not to be thought of first of all as power to command. As a quality it subsumes the ability to inspire and energize a group; the ability to gain the loyalty and respect (if not always the affection) of group members; the ability to speak or to remain silent as the occasion requires; the ability to choose and decide; the ability to represent the group in its contacts and dealings with other groups and institutions. As a function it involves directing and coordinating the activities of other actors in the governing process; initiating or innovating change and encouraging others to do so; acting with vigor and dispatch when action is needed. Even these broad statements only suggest the leadership element in government, they do not define or exhaust it.
- d. Even at the level of abstract analysis the distinction between functions must not be drawn too sharply. One must not think of administration as being routine, mechanical application of rules with the administrator exercising no discretion or initiative. That is to reduce administrative functions to clerical duties. Administrators do and must have discretion. Administrators do and must make lower-level policy. So, too, one must not think of policy-making as only making broad, general rules of wide scope and for a long term. Some policies are of that sort, but other policies are very specific, quite limited in scope and application, and intended for a short term. Policy-making and administration at times become almost indistinguishable. So, too, the leadership function admits of different degrees and intensities and is effectively exercised by individuals drawn from the ranks of both the faculty and the administration.
- e. Although it is common to draw analogies between the governing process in the college and the governing process in a political community (state, city, etc.), such analogies can be misleading. They can be especially misleading if one concludes that because the functions described above are performed in both, therefore the same relationships must prevail between the bodies or persons who exercise these functions. One might then conclude that because the American political system is based upon a separation of powers (functions), therefore there must be a separation in the college. Not even in public government is there so sharp a

separation as is commonly supposed. Even if there were, this would hold no necessary implications for the governing of a Christian liberal arts college.

- f. With these considerations in mind, we go on to draw some conclusions as to how all of this applies to the governing of Calvin College. Again with the caveat that the faculty should avoid thinking in legalistic or power terms and avoid making too-strict deductions from our generalizations, we will try to relate what was said above about functions and roles to the familiar offices and agencies of the college.
- 1) The policy-making function, FOSCO believes, should be performed mainly by the faculty. The faculty includes in its voting ranks the President, some other administrators, and professional librarians. When these persons participate in faculty meetings, they do so in their role as faculty members. In that role they are the equals of other voting members, no more, no less. The scope or ambit of the faculty's policy-making authority extends to all matters on which the college can legally make policy. This is not to say that the faculty exercises all of its authority or that it exercises it alone. In some cases the Board, which has ultimate legal power and responsibility for the college, alone makes policy. In many cases the Board reviews and ratifies important faculty decisions. It may on occasion veto them. However, in many instances of faculty policy-making, the faculty's decisions are de facto final. This sweeping description of faculty authority is simply a consequence of the fact that the Board has delegated the major responsibility for policy-making to the faculty. And authority must be commensurate with responsibility.
 - 2) The administrative function is exercised mainly by administrators. It is not directly the faculty's concern how the President, who in one of his roles is chief administrator of the college, organizes his administrative subordinates and assistants. How these other administrators organize their offices and how they delegate their administrative duties to staff personnel is not the faculty's concern either. Nor is the faculty to concern itself with individual acts of administrators, with particular cases. The faculty's concern is with how faculty policies are being carried out, whether these policies are effective in achieving their intended purpose, whether policies are consistent and coherent. To make judgment on these matters the faculty needs "feedback" from administrators. Because major administrators are also faculty members, their presence at faculty meetings and especially their membership on faculty committees makes this feedback possible.
 - 3) The leadership function cannot and should not be concentrated in a single person or office. It is dispersed and diffused. It is, however, more often personal than collegial. The President of the college exercises this function pre-eminently. He supplies overall leadership, direction, coordination. He is, ideally, a leader of the whole college community and exercises leadership on several fronts. As chief administrator he leads and coordinates the administration of the college. He is chairman of the faculty,

ex officio a member of all its committees, chairman of some of its important committees, spokesman for the faculty in its relations with the Board. And it is he who most often speaks for the college in its contacts with persons and groups outside the immediate college community. But leadership is exercised by many persons other than the President. The Vice President for Academic Affairs provides leadership and direction in academic matters and has an important place on faculty committees in this area. The coordinating aspect of leadership is especially important in his case. All administrators provide leadership and direction for their divisions. They also supply leadership to the faculty in framing policy proposals dealing with matters in their area. Department chairmen and committee chairmen should be leaders. Furthermore, sometimes a leadership role is assumed by persons without any "leadership office." Any faculty member can become a leader within his department, on a committee, in a faculty meeting.

5. What is the role of students in the government of the college? What should their role be? There is widespread disagreement among students, among faculty members, and among administrators on these issues. These differences are not always differences between groups; there are sometimes sharp differences among members within each of these groups. The differences, we think, are greater than they need be. They result partly from the fact that we all -- students, faculty, administrators -- tend to see things from our own particular perspective. Also, subjective feelings and emotions sometimes control our thinking here. And, finally, these are questions where a "generation gap" is likely to show up strongly.

Once more we repeat the warning about thinking in power and adversary terms. Students are not adversaries and rivals of faculty and administrators, just as faculty and administrators are not rivals of each other. We are all member of a single, Christian academic community, sharing a common purpose, a common commitment, and a mutual trust. When the college flourishes, we are all increased; when the college languishes, we are all diminished.

Why then is there difficulty in getting agreement among all sectors of the community as to what the role of students is or should be? We think there are many reasons.

Some students do think in power terms. Their perceptions or subjective feelings of powerlessness are correct if one looks at the matter in legal terms. Students have little formal power. Such power (we prefer the term "authority") has been delegated to the President, the faculty, and the administrators. They in turn, have delegated some authority to student bodies, but the area of such authority is not large. Students see that they have been excluded from most policy-making bodies. They hear about decisions taken by the faculty, the administration, and the Board of Trustees. They are "outsiders" as far as these decision-making processes go.

But while their power in a legal sense is small and while they are outside many policy-making processes, this does not necessarily imply powerlessness. Influence is power in a very real sense and students do have a great deal of influence. They have influence because of the very

nature of the institution. The college exists to serve educational purposes and to meet educational needs. Students are the college's raison d'etre. Without students there would be no college. This automatically gives students influence and their influence is pervasive. The government of the college, even when it is not of and by the students, is for the students.

Faculty members, administrators, and especially observers outside the college community often differ from students in their perceptions and subjective feelings about these matters. They observe that students do have influence. If one looks at just the last few years, for example, there have been real changes in Calvin College's policies on films, on dormitory hours, and on compulsory chapel attendance, to name just three. Such changes were not primarily the result of faculty or administrative initiative, but of student influence. Persons who do not like the changes often conclude that students have too much power now, even though in a formal and legal sense their power has remained the same.

Some individuals concerned about student participation in governance are influenced by false analogies. They compare college government to public government; they assume the universal validity of public democracy with its stress on equality and participation. These persons believe that the government of the college must be like a town meeting or a representative democracy in which all members of the community are equal and have equal right to participate in all community decisions, directly or through elected representatives. Such an analogy is false. The government of a college is not and cannot be like the government of a city.

Other persons are influenced in their thinking by what they have seen happening elsewhere. They read and hear about successful "student power" movements on secular campuses; they hear about supposedly sweeping changes in the government of other institutions; they are conditioned to think and speak in terms of power.

Calvin students have been reasonable, responsible, and moderate. But Calvin students and faculty members may be influenced by the "spirit of the times," and may judge by standards and criteria which have no place in a Christian academic community. Calvin should no more follow blindly the trends of secular institutions in its government than it does in its curriculum policies, its admissions policies, or its housing policies. The government of the college, as well as every other aspect of the college's life, should reflect the fact that this is a Christian college. It is and must be different from secular institutions.

Does the Christian nature of our institution then require a particular pattern of governance? We think not. Although our Christian character does preclude certain forms of governance, it does not demand a particular form. It seems to us that our Christian commitment will be more apparent in the operation than in the structure of our system of government. The form we have chosen, we feel, is consistent with both our Christian commitment and our college traditions.

How then should we approach the problem of the students' role in governing the college? We frankly state at the outset that we believe students should not govern the college. That authority has been entrusted by the Board to the President, the faculty, and administrators. It is they who are responsible for the day-to-day operation of the college and it is they, not students, who must account to the Board. They cannot evade this responsibility; they cannot abdicate their authority.

Does this mean then that students have no role in governing the college? Not at all. The faculty and administration have delegated authority over certain matters to students. They can and will do so in the future. But the faculty cannot in this way divest itself of its responsibility. The President and the faculty are still held responsible. That is why the faculty has been reluctant to grant complete autonomy to any student group or organization. When it has delegated authority to student organizations, it has done so within circumscribed limits and subject to conditions. When it grants students freedom to publish without censorship, for example, it also lays down a policy of "responsible freedom" and creates a Communications Board which includes faculty members and whose constitution was approved by the faculty.

Such delegations of authority have not always been satisfactory, however. From some students' point of view too little authority is delegated and over too few matters. These students feel, quite understandably, that they have little voice in making some of the policies in which they are most interested and which affect them most. From the faculty's point of view delegations of authority have sometimes appeared to create bodies which, in effect if not intent, were not accountable to anyone.

For these reasons we believe it is necessary to try a different approach. Instead of carving out separate areas of policy-making jurisdiction, one area for students and another area for faculty, we believe it better to retain policy-making authority in the body which is responsible -- the faculty -- but to involve students much more closely in the policy-making processes at all levels: departmental committees, faculty committees, and (in a modest way) faculty meetings. Students can be and should be more closely involved in those processes. Furthermore, we believe that the degree of involvement of faculty members and students in the policy-making function should be related to the competence and interest they bring to bear upon the matter at hand. Several of our specific recommendations reflect this approach.

E. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Undergirding and informing the committee's answers to the questions raised in the previous section are a few central or basic principles. The committee did not begin by formulating these principles as explicitly as they are set forth below. But as the committee studied the history of the college, as it analyzed the various activities which take place on Calvin's campus or under college auspices, as it tried to get a clear picture of how these activities are presently directed and governed, and as it addressed itself to specific "problems" and "discontents," the principles emerged with greater clarity. We hesitate to label them a "philosophy," much less "the Christian philosophy" of college government. But these principles

do touch each part of our report. They are:

1. The primary purpose of Calvin College is to educate students within a Reformed, Christian framework.
2. This educational function is performed primarily by the faculty.
3. Other activities or functions of the college are subsidiary to this educational function. These other activities, however worthy or important they may be, exist at Calvin only because there is a college whose primary purpose is to educate students.
4. The primary responsibility for policy-making should rest with the faculty, except where policy-making authority is exercised by the Board or has been delegated by the Board to persons or agencies other than the faculty.

These principles are basic, but they are so broad and general that they offer little guidance as to the specifics of governing the college. Therefore the committee has formulated several "operating principles" or "guidelines." They are consistent, we believe, with the four basic principles, but they differ in that they offer more specific guidance in creating a governmental structure for the college. We have framed these guidelines in an effort to create a structure which will be open, coherent, and flexible and which will create opportunities for effective and responsible leadership on the part of all participants in the governing process. These guidelines are the following:

1. The faculty's function as a deliberative, policy-making body requires an organizational structure that will make deliberation possible.
2. This requires that the policy proposals on which the faculty is to deliberate and decide be carefully formulated, be presented in writing, and be available for faculty study for a reasonable time before they are acted upon.
3. The initiation and preparation of policy proposals cannot be performed by the faculty in plenum, but must be delegated to faculty committees.
4. The faculty must therefore have a committee structure which is as comprehensive as the faculty's policy-making authority. Every matter on which the faculty has authority to make or review policy should be within the scope of some faculty committee. Committee mandates and jurisdictions should therefore be defined as clearly as possible.
5. Because faculty committees are essential if the faculty is to perform its policy-making functions efficiently and responsibly, the faculty should be in control of its committees. This will require that the faculty have a larger share in determining the composition of its committees than it has had heretofore.
6. Participation in the faculty's governing functions is the privilege and the responsibility of all faculty members. Therefore, opportunities to participate (as well as the burdens of participation) should be distributed as widely and as equitably as possible.

7. Because the policies made by the faculty usually affect persons, interests, and groups outside the teaching faculty, those affected by the policies and those who administer them should be incorporated into the policy-making process, at least in its initial stages. Most faculty committees, therefore, should have at least one student member and one administrator member. In some cases, it will be desirable to have Board members or alumni members also.
8. Because committees remain faculty committees despite the presence of non-faculty members, the chairman of a committee should be a teaching faculty member, although exceptions to this general rule are possible.
9. The number of non-faculty members on a given committee should be determined by the character of the committee's mandate. Generally, the greater the extent and intensity of student interest, the larger the student representation on a committee should be.
10. There must be greater openness in the policy-making process.
11. The work of academic departments, insofar as it involves only one department, should not be the business of the whole faculty or of any of its committees. In order to segregate such departmental affairs from general faculty concerns, it is necessary to have a fairly detailed statement regarding departmental organization, responsibilities, and procedures.
12. It is desirable to have student participation in departmental policy-making as well as in the faculty policy-making processes.
13. Defining committee mandates and jurisdictions as precisely as possible will not eliminate all uncertainties and ambiguities. To resolve these and to secure coordination between committees working in the same broad area (e.g. Academic Affairs Committees), provision should be made for coordinating councils where necessary. Such coordinating councils should not be "super-committees" and should not have a policy-making role. Exceptions to this general rule may be necessary.
14. Faculty meetings, since they are the last and most important stage in the process of faculty policy-making, should be conducted in such a way that will serve their purpose. This will require that meetings follow well-defined procedures, that certain key officers be chosen by the faculty itself, and that meetings be open to more persons than have attended them in the past.
15. The meetings of the faculty as a deliberating, policy-making body should be distinct from other meetings at which policy-making is not the primary focus.

F. ANALYSIS OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

If these are the more important general principles FOSCO has tried to follow, what of the recommendations themselves?

Nineteen of the recommendations (1-19) deal with faculty assemblies: their format, composition, officers, procedures, etc. While not all of equal importance, these recommendations, the committee believes, do hang together. In some cases the recommendations codify existing practices. In other cases they introduce substantial changes. Those which propose something new and different are Recommendations 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, (3), 9 and 19. The faculty will want to pay particular attention to these, we believe.

Four of the recommendations (20-23) deal with reports to the faculty. Most of the details here are new, but the committee does not anticipate as much controversy in this area as in some others.

Ten of the recommendations deal with faculty committees. It is difficult to summarize these since one of them (Recommendation 33) covers the whole structure of committees FOSCO is proposing. Some of the committees are the same as some present committee, occasionally with a new name. Others are new committees. Of the latter, it is the Committee on Committees and the Priorities Committee which we regard as most innovative.

As for the other recommendations which deal with committees, all of them introduce some new element or procedure, but none of them proposes anything which FOSCO regards as a radical change. The most important changes proposed are contained in Recommendations 26, 30, and 32.

Recommendation 34, dealing with departments, is again an omnibus recommendation covering a long, detailed statement on departmental organization and functions. Most of this codifies what is (or should be) current practice. While there are portions of this statement that undoubtedly will produce controversy, FOSCO does not believe there are any radical changes proposed here, except perhaps in the suggestion that students be appointed to departmental committees.

Recommendation 35 on division does propose a significant change. It proposes to abolish divisions as we have known them. Some may regard this as a radical change, but FOSCO does not. We propose that instead of trying to revitalize existing divisions the faculty make it possible (but not mandatory) to create a new and different kind of division which would be organized quite differently and have limited special functions.

Recommendations 36-41 are implementing resolutions which will make it possible to have an orderly transition to the new faculty organization if the faculty chooses to adopt the other recommendations.

A. FACULTY ASSEMBLIES

RECOMMENDATION 1, Types of Assemblies: That there be two types of formal official faculty assemblies -- College Assembly meetings and Faculty meetings.

RECOMMENDATION 2, College Assembly Meetings: That College Assembly meetings normally should be held three times annually, with each meeting having a particular focus as suggested below.

- 1) The Fall meeting would be apprised of the financial and budgetary affairs of the college by means of reports from the Vice President for Business and Finance and the Vice President for Student Personnel Services. It would discuss enrollment, projections of enrollment, budget projections, fund raising, student recruitment, and problems in the financial future of the institution.
- 2) The Winter meeting would normally have a report from the Vice President for Academic Affairs dealing with the academic affairs of the college, including staffing or personnel needs and academic programs.
- 3) The Spring meeting would be devoted mainly to a discussion or review of student affairs by way of reports from the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Vice President for Student Personnel Services.

Although each meeting would primarily be the responsibility of one or more of the vice presidents of the college, the assembly would call upon personnel from other administrative divisions if the discussion so indicated. Ideas generated by the Assembly may be referred by the chairman to an appropriate faculty committee or council for further consideration.

RECOMMENDATION 3, Attendance at College Assemblies: That the privilege of attending the meetings of the College Assembly be extended to all librarians and members of the teaching staff. The president shall determine which members of the administration and staff shall also have this privilege. Members of the Student Senate, student members of faculty committees, and the Chimes editor or his reporter may also attend. Other students may request the privilege of attendance from the president. Attendance at College Assembly meetings shall be voluntary.

RECOMMENDATION 4, Faculty Meetings: That the essential function of the faculty meeting, as contrasted with College Assembly meetings, be deliberation and action on policy and review of policy implementation. The faculty normally shall act only upon the recommendations of its committees and of the appropriate administrators. The faculty may also at any time review the actions of any of the committees, officers, or members, although it is expected that this shall be rarely done.

RECOMMENDATION 5, Franchise: That the franchise for meetings of the faculty be extended to all full-time members of the teaching faculty with the rank of instructor or above, to the professional librarians, and to those members of the administrative staff whose enfranchisement is recommended by the President and approved by the faculty.

NOTE: This recommendation does not imply anything regarding the perquisites or prerogatives of the persons in these three categories. Such matters fall largely within the purview of the President and the Professional Status Committee.

RECOMMENDATION 6, Attendance at Faculty Meetings: That attendance of enfranchised members at meetings of the faculty be considered an integral part of the professional duties of a faculty member. Absenteeism on the part of a faculty member shall be noted in his personnel file.

RECOMMENDATION 7, Non-franchised Attendants: That the following members of the college community who are not enfranchised be invited to attend faculty meetings, except when in executive session, without the right to vote but with the privilege of the floor as granted at the discretion of the chair:

- 1) Members of the Board of Trustees.
- 2) Full-time members of the teaching staff who do not have the rank of instructor or above.
- 3) Administrators whose role in the academic activities of the community is enhanced by attendance at faculty meetings.
- 4) Members of the Executive Committee of the Student Senate.
- 5) Students serving on faculty committees when their committees are reporting and when their presence has been requested by the committee chairman.
- 6) A student appointed by the Communications Board.

RECOMMENDATION 8, Faculty Officers: That the following be the officers of the faculty:

- 1) The Chairman: The President of the College shall be the chairman of the Faculty meetings and of the College Assembly meetings.
- 2) The Vice Chairman: The Dean of the College (Vice President for Academic Affairs) shall be the vice-chairman of the faculty meeting.
- 3) The Secretary: The secretary shall be appointed for a two-year term by the faculty Committee on Committees, subject to the approval of the faculty. No person shall serve more than two successive terms. The secretary shall conduct official correspondence, record the

minutes of the faculty meetings, distribute a summary or transcript of the proceedings, maintain an agenda of unfinished faculty business, classify and distribute all reports to be considered by the faculty, and supervise the permanent files of all faculty committees.

RECOMMENDATION 9, Parliamentarian: That the parliamentarian shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees and shall serve as the authority to whom questions regarding parliamentary procedures may be referred by the chairman during meetings of the faculty.

RECOMMENDATION 10, Agenda for Faculty Meetings: That the chairman and secretary of the faculty be responsible for preparing a preliminary agenda for faculty meetings which will be distributed prior to the meeting. The chairman or secretary may, before the meeting, place additional items on the agenda, subject to the restriction outlined in Recommendation 21. The faculty at the beginning of the meeting shall have the opportunity to act on this agenda and propose changes in the order of business for that meeting. The agenda shall include an item called Question Period. During this period faculty members may arise to direct questions to any committee or official regarding his work or regarding a report for information which has been distributed to the faculty. The chairman shall rule on the propriety of such questions.

RECOMMENDATION 11, Proceedings: That the proceedings of the meetings of the faculty be recorded by the secretary and be read by the officers of the faculty before the first subsequent meeting. The secretary shall prepare and circulate to the faculty a summary of the proceedings or transcript of the proceedings. The faculty shall act on the proceedings as circulated unless the reading of a part or of the whole is formally requested.

RECOMMENDATION 12, Announcements: That matters which require no faculty action (certain announcements of administrators and committees, reports for information, etc.) normally be transmitted to the faculty through the campus mail rather than transmitted orally at faculty meetings.

RECOMMENDATION 13, Resumé on Appointees: That, before the faculty considers the appointment of new personnel, the faculty members be provided with a written resumé of each candidate's credentials and have the opportunity at the meeting to question the department chairman or administrator initiating the appointment.

RECOMMENDATION 14, Regular Faculty Meetings: That regular faculty meetings be held twice a month during the academic year (September-May), normally the first and third Wednesday of the month, from 3:30 to 5:15 P.M. Regular meetings may be rescheduled or cancelled by the officers of the faculty.

RECOMMENDATION 15, Special Faculty Meetings: That special faculty meetings may be called by the chairman or by the officers of the faculty. Special meetings shall be called when formally requested by at least 10 per cent of the enfranchised members of the faculty. Except in emergencies, three days' notice shall be required for special meetings.

RECOMMENDATION 16, Rules of Procedure: That Robert's Rules of Order be used to govern the procedures followed at meetings of the faculty except as modified by the action of the faculty. (See Appendix A for some procedures which are particularly applicable to faculty business.)

RECOMMENDATION 17, Quorum: That a quorum for transacting business at a faculty meeting be a majority of the enfranchised members.

RECOMMENDATION 18, Summer Meetings: That during the summer when the college is not in regular session special faculty meetings may be called but that ordinarily the committee responsible in a given area may act on urgent matters, subject to reporting to the faculty for information and review at the first regular faculty meeting in the fall.

RECOMMENDATION 19, Communications from Student Senate: That all communications from the Student Senate to the faculty shall be presented to all the secretary of the faculty who shall determine if they are properly the immediate business of a particular committee, of a council, or of the faculty meeting. Furthermore, whatever the recommendation of the faculty committee or council it shall be accompanied by the original communication from the Student Senate, unless officially withdrawn by that body. The Student Senate resolution shall have the status of a minority report if it differs from the faculty committee's recommendation.

B. REPORTS TO THE FACULTY

RECOMMENDATION 20, Format for Reports: That written reports to the faculty conform to a standard form prepared by the secretary of the faculty. This format shall include a short reference key (committee name, subject, sequence number, date, etc.), a descriptive title, the membership of the committee, the name of the reporter, a statement of the problem or explanation of the mandate, a justification for the action proposed, and the formal resolutions proposing action. The faculty secretary shall have the authority to return to any committee or administrator a report which the secretary believes does not meet standard requirements. (See Appendix B for suggested format.)

RECOMMENDATION 21, Distribution of Reports: That a report to be considered for action must be placed in faculty mailboxes not later than the third class day prior to the announced date of the faculty meeting. All committee reports shall be given to the secretary of the faculty who shall arrange for their reproduction and distribution.

RECOMMENDATION 22, Administrator's Reports: That reports of administrators calling for deliberation or decision shall conform to the general rules concerning committee reports, but need not be submitted to the secretary of the faculty for reproduction.

RECOMMENDATION 23, Reading of Reports: That all reports shall be read unless parts or the whole are exempt by vote of the faculty; in those cases a précis shall be read or an oral summary given as a substitute for the full report. When an oral report is made, a brief written digest shall be given to the secretary for inclusion in the minutes.

C. COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY

RECOMMENDATION 24, Terms of Committee Members: That the appointment of faculty members to committees be for a term of three years. Student members shall be appointed for one year and may be reappointed (See Recommendation 38.)

RECOMMENDATION 25, Committee Chairmen: That the appointment of committee chairmen be for a period of one year, and that chairmen be eligible for reappointment. Such chairmen normally shall not be administrators and should have prior experience on the committee.

RECOMMENDATION 26, Limited Committee Membership: That a faculty member normally be appointed to only one committee.

RECOMMENDATION 27, Administrators as Committee Members: That each administrator be a member ex officio of each committee dealing with his major area of responsibility and that the president be a member ex officio of all committees.

RECOMMENDATION 28, Committee Files: That a current file for each faculty committee be maintained by the faculty secretary in the academic office. At the end of each year the committee secretary shall deposit a signed copy of the official committee minutes in Heritage Hall.

RECOMMENDATION 29, Review of Committee Mandates: That each committee be apprised of its responsibilities by reading its mandate at the first meeting of each academic year.

RECOMMENDATION 30, Meetings of Committees: That faculty committees normally shall meet at least once a month at times announced to the faculty and that the faculty shall be informed of major matters under consideration. Inquiries and comments by members of the college community concerning the activities of any committee shall be directed to the chairman of that committee who shall, if requested, invite those concerned to present their point of view in person.

RECOMMENDATION 31, Quorum: That a quorum shall be a majority of the members of the committee.

RECOMENDATIONS C. Committees of the Faculty

RECOMMENDATION 32, Committee Hearings: That committees make regular use of hearing procedures when dealing with important issues or policy questions. Such hearings shall be open to all faculty members and to such other members of the college community as the committee wishes to invite. Such hearings may be used either when a committee wishes to get information at an early stage in its deliberations or when it wishes to get reactions to a preliminary report.

RECOMMENDATION 33, Establishment of Committees and Councils: That the committee and council mandates and compositions described on pages 15 through 49 be adopted.

D. DEPARTMENTAL AND DIVISIONAL STRUCTURE

Because departments and divisions are basically administrative units, the committee recognizes that the administration determines many aspects of their structure and operation. Portions of our recommendations deal with items normally considered to be administrative prerogatives. Our intent is not to impinge upon the authority of the administration but, rather, to present departmental and divisional structure in one package and to relate it to the activities of the faculty.

RECOMMENDATION 34, Departments: We recommend the adoption of the following statement of departmental structure, functions, and procedures.

1. Organization

a) Establishment and Termination

- (1) A department may be established by the President, upon the recommendation of the Academic Dean and the concurrence of the Educational Policy Committee, whenever six courses are offered in a given discipline or program or when there are at least three full-time persons teaching these courses.
- (2) The existence of a department may be terminated by the President, upon the recommendation of the Dean and the concurrence of the Educational Policy Committee, whenever there are fewer than six courses offered in a given discipline or program or when there are fewer than three full-time persons teaching these courses.

b) Membership and Franchise

- (1) All persons appointed to a full-time position with the rank of instructor or higher are members of the department to which they are appointed and are eligible to vote on all matters which shall be transmitted to faculty committees or the administration for action.
- (2) Full-time appointees with a rank lower than that of instructor as well as part-time teachers may attend departmental meetings at the discretion of the department chairman but they shall not be eligible to vote on matters which shall be transmitted to faculty committees or the administration for action.

c) Officers

(1) Chairman

Each department shall have a chairman appointed for a three-year term by the President in consultation with the Dean; the chairman shall be eligible for a second successive term of three years. Before the expiration of the chairman's term, and in the event of a vacancy, the President shall inform department members that an appointment is pending and shall solicit their comments and suggestions.

The department chairman shall give leadership in the development and implementation of the department program.

The chairman's duties shall be defined by the Dean and shall be listed in the Department Chairman's Handbook.

(2) Secretary

Each department shall have a secretary, appointed by the chairman of the department for a one-year term, subject to reappointment. The secretary shall, among other duties, be responsible for keeping records of the department and minutes of the department meetings.

The secretary shall send copies of the minutes to the President and the Dean and shall send separate communications to the appropriate administrators regarding any departmental decisions requiring their action.

d) Department Meetings

Department meetings shall be held on a regular basis, normally at least once a month, to transact departmental business. Meetings may be called by the chairman or, in his absence, by the secretary of the department. Meetings must be called by officers upon request of any two members of the department.

e) Committees

Each department shall appoint such departmental committees as are necessary to implement the responsibilities of the department. The following are illustrative of committees the department could appoint: Curriculum, Personnel, Library and College Store, Publicity, and Student Development and Services.

Departments are encouraged to appoint students to departmental committees as voting members.

2. Functions

The primary functions of a department are to develop and implement the curriculum of the department and to promote the professional teaching competence and Christian esprit de corps of the members of the department. All activities of the department should contribute to the achievement of these primary goals.

The department chairman shall give leadership in the development and implementation of the department program. However, members of the department are expected to take an active part in the formulation of the department's policies and in assisting the department chairman in the implementation of these policies.

The department chairman shall maintain contact with the appropriate administrators or committees in effecting the work of the department.

The major functions assigned to departments are:

- a) Review and Development of Department Curriculum and Programs
 - (1) Review the department's curriculum and take whatever steps are necessary to maintain a balanced roster of course offerings.
 - (2) Propose introduction of new courses to the Educational Policy Committee.
 - (3) Recommend elimination of courses and programs to the Educational Policy Committee
 - (4) Recommend the department's program(s) of concentration to the Educational Policy Committee.
 - (5) Consult with other departments about the possibility of establishing interdepartmental academic programs, and make appropriate recommendations to the Educational Policy Committee.
 - (6) Structure, supervise, and coordinate with the Teacher Education Committee and the Department of Education appropriate courses for those who are in the teacher education programs.
 - (7) Recommend to the Interim Program Committee the courses which it proposes to offer during the Interim term.

RECOMMENDATIONS D. Departmental and Divisional Structure

- (8) Recommend to the Educational Policy Committee the courses and programs which it proposes to offer during the summer sessions.
 - (9) Recommend to the Educational Policy Committee the courses it proposes as meeting the core requirements in the discipline taught by the department.
 - (10) Develop and supervise the departmental honors program subject to the supervision of the Educational Policy Committee.
 - (11) Recommend to the Teacher Education Committee the standards for admission to the professional semester of the teacher education program.
- b) Faculty Recruitment and Development
- (1) Make an annual assessment of staff needs, with appropriate recommendations to the dean of the college.
 - (2) Maintain a file of information on and cultivate professional and personal contacts with persons who might be potential candidates for positions in the department.
 - (3) Recommend candidate(s) for appointment to the department according to procedures established by the Professional Status Committee and participate in reappointment procedures as defined by that committee.
 - (4) Promote seminars and other professional meetings designed to increase the academic competence and teaching effectiveness of the departmental staff.
- c) Faculty Schedules and Assignments
- Recommend faculty schedules and teaching assignments through the department chairman, to the Academic Dean.
- d) Employment and Supervision of the Department's Non-Teaching Personnel
- (1) Employ and supervise student assistants in consultation with the Dean of the College and the Director of Student Financial Aids.
 - (2) Recommend to the Vice President for Business and Finance the employment of departmental technical assistants and secretaries. The department shall also supervise the work of these employees.

RECOMMENDATIONS D. Departmental and Divisional Structure

e) Student Development and Services

- (1) Prepare academic advising, including specific responsibility for advising students about programs of concentration, honors programs, and graduate school programs.
- (2) Admit students to the department's program(s) of concentration.
- (3) Recommend students in departmental and group major programs for admission to the teacher education programs, and subsequently, to the professional semester.
- (4) Prepare and administer exemption and credit examinations.
- (5) Promote student seminars and clubs.

f) Publicity

- (1) Prepare materials for the college catalogs and bulletins.
- (2) Prepare materials designed to promote the department and college and to recruit students.
- (3) Maintain and publicize a list of speakers from within the department, including the subjects of their talks.
- (4) Maintain contact with high school teachers and students interested in the academic discipline of the department.
- (5) Maintain contact with the alumni of the department.

g) Facilities and Resources

- (1) Recommend changes in and additions to existing facilities and equipment.
- (2) Develop and promote the use of library holdings.
- (3) Develop college store holdings of books appropriate to the discipline and programs of the department.

h) Budget

- (1) Recommend each fiscal year a departmental budget except for those items concerned with the salaries of the teaching personnel.

- (2) Be informed periodically by the department chairman of all expenditures and of the status of the current budget.

RECOMMENDATION 35, Divisions: We recommend the termination of divisions as they are now constituted, the reassignment of their present functions, but with the provision for the creation of new, limited-function administrative divisions in any specific area where common interdepartmental activity would benefit from them.

1. The Establishment of Administrative Divisions

Wherever and whenever feasible, naturally affiliated groups drawn together by common administrative concerns shall be constituted as administrative divisions. These would not form a fixed symmetrical pattern covering all the departments of the College. A grouping such as the Science Division or the Language Arts Division could be created in response to a need to coordinate the common interests of several departments and would be concerned with only those common interests. Whenever specific functions performed by departments independently could be coordinated and administered more economically and efficiently by such a division, the President, in consultation with the Dean and the departments concerned, may establish an administrative division.

In such a case the President in consultation with the Dean, after soliciting comments from members of the concerned departments, shall designate one faculty member from the departments involved as the director for a term of not more than three years, but the division itself shall organize its own affairs as to other officers, committees, and work assignments. The director shall be responsible to the Dean of the college for the performance of his tasks. The mandate establishing each administrative division shall describe its specific functions and the specific duties assigned to its director.

2. The Function of Administrative Divisions

The functions of divisions shall be administrative in the broad definition of the term. They may include initiation of requests for and suggestions for the appointment of technical assistants and also include the supervision of such assistants by the director.

Curricular proposals concerned with the nature of courses and course programs may be initiated by the division but, to be considered by the Educational Policy Committee, would require the sponsorship of a department or of the departments concerned.

The Educational Policy Committee or any other faculty committee or administrative officer may ask a division to serve in an advisory capacity.

Other functions of divisions as they are presently constituted, particularly those intended to provide broad faculty consideration in curricular and personnel areas, are specifically assigned to committees. The mandates of the Educational Policy and the Professional Status committees illustrate this.

E. IMPLEMENTING RESOLUTIONS

RECOMMENDATION 36, Two-Year Extension of FOSCO: That the Faculty Organization Study Committee be continued for a period of two years after the adoption of this report, so that any problems which may arise out of faculty reorganization may be submitted to it for study and recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 37, Election of the Committee on Committees: That elections for the faculty Committee on Committees be held within a month after the formation of the committee is approved, and that the members assume office and the committee begin work immediately after election.

RECOMMENDATION 38, Provision for Staggered Terms of Office: That in making its initial committee appointments the Committee on Committees shall appoint committee members to terms of one, two, or three years in such a way as to establish staggered terms of office.

RECOMMENDATION 39, Committee Review of Mandates: That during the year after adoption of this report, each faculty committee shall review its mandate and suggest modifications, if desired, to the Faculty Organization Study Committee.

RECOMMENDATION 40, Date of Implementation: That the provisions of this report shall go into effect on the September 1 following the adoption of the report unless otherwise indicated, and that these provisions supersede all previous regulations in conflict therewith.

RECOMMENDATION 41, Faculty By-laws: That the regulations governing the organization of the faculty and its committees constitute the by-laws of the faculty and shall be incorporated in the Faculty Handbook.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE AND DEFINITIONS

In recommendation 16 we urge that Robert's Rules of Order be used to govern the procedures followed at meetings of the faculty. We believe that efficient transaction of faculty business requires familiarity on the part of faculty members with the standard rules of procedure. Thus we present here a very brief digest of Robert's Rules, as well as a chart of the standard motions and their rank. We do so only for those who are not already familiar with the rudiments of parliamentary procedure.

Parliamentary procedure is simply a way of conducting meetings in an orderly manner. The rules of procedure should also help the body operate in a democratic and efficient manner. We recommend adoption of Robert's Rules of Order, the standard guide. We also recommend that the faculty appoint a parliamentarian to whom the chairman may refer questions which may arise.

The most important officers for a body are the president (or chairman) and secretary. Many organizations elect their officers; however, in smaller academic institutions it is customary for the President or Dean to serve as chairman of the faculty. In our case, we are recommending that the President and Dean of the college serve as chairman and vice-chairman of the faculty, with the secretary to be nominated by the faculty Committee on Committees and approved by the faculty.

Committees perform many duties; generally, they do those things which cannot be efficiently done by the entire body. It is customary to have two types of committees: (1) standing committees and (2) special or ad hoc committees. Standing committees deal with regular and continuing matters. They may initiate action and recommendations and dispose of certain matters when empowered to do so by the parent body. Such committees traditionally develop their own modes of operation and, to some extent, their rules of procedure. Special or ad hoc committees are appointed whenever necessary to deal with unusual matters or a specific problem. Such committees are generally appointed with a specific mandate and are dissolved as soon as that mandate is fulfilled. Both types of committees generally follow modified rules of procedure which allow for a great deal of informal discussion. It is desirable to develop a standing committee structure sufficiently open and flexible so that the need for special committees is minimized.

Frequently the chairman of the parent body is an ex-officio member of all standing and special committees, unless specifically excluded. We have followed that practice in recommending that the president be ex-officio a member of all faculty committees; we have also designated selected administrators as ex-officio members of committees dealing with the administrator's area of jurisdiction. An ex-officio member has the right, but not the obligation, to participate in the proceedings of the committee, and is not counted in the quorum. He is a full-fledged member with all the accompanying rights, and has all the privileges of membership, including the right to introduce motions and vote.

In a well-organized meeting, a standard order of business is used. First the minutes of the preceding meeting are read and approved by a majority vote. Following that, the standing and special committees give their reports. Then unfinished business from previous meetings is dealt with. New business may then be introduced by the members; next members may submit miscellaneous matters, such as announcements or requests, that require no formal action. The meeting is concluded by adjournment, approved by majority vote. Deviations from this order of business are permissible any time, for instance, if the body wishes to devote a large block of time to some special matter.

Occasionally a body may wish to go into executive session to consider matters which should not be communicated outside the membership of the body. Executive session is a meeting, or a portion of a meeting, of a deliberative assembly at which the proceedings are secret. A motion to go into executive session is adopted by a majority vote. Only members, special invitees, and such employees or staff members as the assembly or its rules may determine to be necessary are allowed to remain in the hall. A member may be punished under disciplinary procedure if he violates the secrecy of an executive session. Anyone else permitted to be present is honor-bound not to divulge anything that occurred. The minutes of an executive session must be read and acted upon only in executive session.

The standard method of initiating action in a meeting is by use of a motion. A motion is a brief, precise statement of a proposed action, and can be made only when the mover has the floor, i.e. has been given permission to speak by the presiding officer. Discussion is not permitted until the motion has been seconded, or supported, by another member of the body. The members then debate the motion. If anyone wishes to change the motion he must move an amendment, which must be supported and can be debated. No discussion on the main motion is allowed while an amendment is being considered. If the motion to amend is successful, then debate continues on the motion as amended. Debate on the main motion continues until every member who wishes to speak has done so; however, members of the body may end or limit debate at any time by a 2/3 majority. A motion must be disposed of before another item of business may be considered. If it is impossible to complete action or make a decision on a motion, it must be tabled, referred to a committee, or disposed of in some other way before new business is introduced.

Motions are of four types: privileged, subsidiary, incidental, and main. These various categories are explained in the attached table.

Voting on motions normally takes place when there are no more requests to speak, or after debate has been ended by a 2/3 majority vote. The chairman then restates the motion and asks for a voice vote; he then announces whether or not the motion has passed. Any member of the body questioning the chair's ruling may request a show of hands. The chairman normally votes only when his vote would change the result.

This brief summary touches only the major points of parliamentary procedure; Robert's Rules of Order should be consulted whenever questions arise.

We append a brief glossary and a table of the types of motions used in parliamentary procedure.

[A chart (not included in the pagination) listing motions used in parliamentary procedure appears on this page but has been omitted from the digitized version of this document.]

PREPARING REPORTS FOR THE FACULTY

While developing its recommendations regarding reports to the faculty, the committee identified a number of features which it considered if used in the preparation of reports would make them more useful to the faculty. The committee recognizes that certain of these guidelines may not be appropriate in all cases and that others in addition to these may well be developed by the secretary of the faculty from his experience. In this spirit, this list of recommendations is reproduced here.

Explanation

1. On the front of the report should be a reference code which, at a glance, indicates the committee source or subject of the report, the number in a series of reports from that committee or on that subject, and the year in which the report is made. The secretary of the faculty shall assign these reference code numbers. The date of the placement of the report on the agenda should be given under the code number.
2. The report should then reproduce the mandate and any interpretation of that mandate which has developed in the committee which is making the report.
3. The report should next describe the recommendations being proposed in order to alert the reader to the direction the report will take. In a long report these recommendations may be repeated at the conclusion of or throughout the report and then should be placed in the form of motions or a motion on which the assembly shall act. Omnibus and all-inclusive motions, and those which can be divided, should be avoided.
4. The report should next state, if pertinent, an analysis of the problem. This may be the history of the issue, the present status of the questions, and the objectives of the proposed change.
5. Thereupon should follow the argumentation and development of the proposal or proposals. Whenever optional proposals have been considered by the committee, the pros and cons of these options should be given, along with the rationale for the committee recommendation.
6. Committee members who do not concur in the report may submit minority views over their signatures. Such reports should be considered with the majority report unless there is an objection; in this event the matter of the objection should be submitted to the assembly for vote without debate. Proposals for action in minority reports may reach the floor only as amendments to or substitutions for the majority committee proposals.

7. All committee reports should be given to the secretary of the faculty who should use the services of the general academic office for their preparation, reproduction, and distribution. The office manager should train several typists to become familiar with the special features of faculty reports. Assignments to a typist should be done by the office manager. This office should also be charged with the responsibility of reproducing copies and distributing them to faculty boxes.
8. Faculty members should know clearly in advance of a meeting the issues on which they will be asked to make decisions or comments. Thus reports should be distributed early enough to allow thoughtful consideration. Reports from administrators should not be exempt from this principle.
9. Reports should be brief. The intent of the above guidelines is to reduce to a formula everything the faculty will need to know, eliminating the need for questions of information.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

A. Governance of American Academic Institutions

The form of academic governance which prevailed in much of American higher education during the 75 years preceding 1950 has come to be called "collegial governance." In this type of governance the faculty is considered to be primarily responsible for institutional decision-making. There were certain conditions which led to the development of collegial governance and nurtured its growth and improvement. However, recent rapid changes in academic institutions have generated conditions which are no longer conducive to collegial governance. W. David Zimmerman, vice-president of the Danforth Foundation, has analyzed the history of collegial governance. (Danforth News and Notes, Vol. 4, #1, November 1968, p. 5), and states the following were key factors in the development of this form of governance:

1. Colleges and universities were small in size; even as late as 1940 the average institution had 86 faculty members and 875 students.
2. Colleges and universities were simple organizations usually involving only a single unit. Even in the few cases where there was a division, it was usually in terms of a simple distinction between the undergraduate college, the graduate school, and the professional schools.
3. At most institutions the faculty was united in sharing the goals of the institution and subscribing to a common value system.
4. A faculty member was loyal to his institution and felt it to be an important part of his life. Usually he spent his career on only one or two campuses.
5. A faculty member received most of his professional recognition (and salary) from his institution.
6. Specialists were rare; most faculty members, even though excellent in one discipline, tried to remain generalists. Furthermore, only a rare individual was able to profitably engage in a great deal of research; the primary function of the faculty members was teaching.
7. The majority of the decisions affecting the institutions were made by persons within the institutions, with reasonably clear division of responsibility between faculty, administration, and the Board of Trustees.

All of these factors favored development of a strong sense of community, and this feeling of unity fostered the form of governance called "collegial governance." Faculty members considered the governance of their institution

to be one of their primary responsibilities and were willing to devote the time and energy required for the proper governance of the institution.

However, it is clear that the last 20 years have seen drastic changes. According to Zimmerman, each of the conditions listed above has been modified by recent developments in the following way:

1. There has been a tremendous increase in the size of the academic institutions. In 1966-67 the average institution had 277 faculty members and professional staff and some 2,858 students. A number of the large universities now have more than 30,000 students.
2. Large colleges and universities are no longer simple, unitary organizations, but rather have become complex organizations with programs of teaching, research, public service, and other auxiliary enterprises.
3. Faculty members no longer adhere to a single value system, but now have a wide divergence of opinion about the goals of their institution and the services it should perform.
4. Faculty members are loyal primarily to their discipline rather than to their institution. They quite freely shift from one institution to another.
5. Faculty members are increasingly independent of their institution so far as their professional recognition (and salary) is concerned. Sponsored research and consulting opportunities are primarily responsible for this development.
6. Faculty members in general tend to be specialists, both in teaching and research. They rarely engage in dialogue with other faculty members in different disciplines, and usually have little interest in other fields.
7. The locus of decision making is no longer clearly defined. An organization sponsoring research may make decisions having a major effect upon a particular institution, and these decisions are generally beyond the control of the institution itself. Furthermore, students and teaching assistants are demanding the right to participate in the governance of the institution; at this moment it is not clear how this is going to affect the responsibilities of the faculty, administration, and board of trustees.

In view of the drastic change in those conditions which originally fostered the development and growth of the collegial system of governance, many individuals and groups have questioned whether collegial governance in its traditional form is still suitable for academic institutions. The answers given can in general be divided into two categories: (1) The collegial form of governance must be modified to meet the changing conditions, or (2) The conditions and relationships must be modified so that the collegial form of governance is once again suitable. Rarely has anyone advocated complete overthrow of the collegial form of governance.

Among the groups favoring modification of the collegial system is the Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations of the American Association for Higher Education. [Report of the AAHE Task Force and Faculty]

Representation on Academic Negotiations, Campus Governance Program, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance, Washington, D.C. American Association for Higher Education, 1967, pp. 1-3, 14-26]. This task force recommends the institution of "shared authority" in which the faculty and the administration exercise effective influence in decision-making, but primarily in different areas. Most matters affecting the faculty as a whole would be decided by a Senate consisting of faculty and administrators. Areas directly affecting the academic program of the institution would be decided by the faculty alone, while other matters, such as fiscal affairs, would be directly under the control of the administration.

Several others have suggested that the collegial system be modified by the addition of some aspects of bureaucratization, with the bureaucrats to be given clearly defined responsibilities and authorities. The faculty would then remain responsible for the governance of the institution, but would delegate to certain individuals, particularly at the departmental level, responsibility and authority for certain areas of the governance of the institution. [Nicholas J. Demerath, Richard W. Stephens, and R. Robb Taylor, Power, Presidents, and Professors: New York Basic Books 1967.]

Roger Heyns, while Chancellor at the University of California, Berkeley, suggested yet another modification. He proposed that college and university administrators be given more power and responsibility for the day to day governance of the institution, with the faculty exercising its responsibility in a "post-audit" role. That is, the administrators would have greater authority to make day-by-day decisions, and the faculty would exercise its authority as it reviewed the actions of various administrators. [Roger W. Heyns, address at the 23rd Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, Ill., March 4, 1968.]

By contrast, the majority of those suggesting that present-day conditions be modified to make the collegial form of governance once again effective have in general proposed that each institution be subdivided into various autonomous or semi-autonomous units capable of developing a strong unitary identity. Hopefully then each small sub-unit of the institution would develop conditions conducive to the collegial form of governance. This approach is being tried, most notably at the University of California at Santa Cruz.

It is clear that traditional forms of academic governance are no longer suitable for the majority of present-day academic institutions. A delay in recognizing this has frequently led to turmoil on the campus. Far too many administrators have failed to recognize that the collegial form of governance was no longer operating; they assumed it was, while the faculty knew it was not. This breakdown of the standard form of governance, not to mention the breakdown of communication, resulted in a common spectacle of administrators, confronted by their first student uprising, charging fearlessly into battle only to discover that the troops they had assumed they were leading (the faculty) were in fact not following them but indeed had joined the foe. As a result, most major academic institutions today are closely examining their present form of governance, and are seeking to develop a new form more suitable for their present state.

B. Governance of Calvin College

Looking at the present situation at Calvin College, we can see that in many ways we fit the pattern of other institutions, while in other ways we assuredly do not. Certainly our institution has grown dramatically in size and complexity, with the addition of a number of functions (e.g., research, psychological testing, etc.) to our original function of teaching. However, we require that all faculty members at Calvin share a common set of beliefs; this tends to assure relative unity and unanimity regarding the goals of the institution. In general, Calvin faculty members remain intensely loyal to the institution; they also try to remain generalists, while still making a valuable contribution to their specialty. While there is some sponsored research on the campus, it has not yet become a dominant factor, and certainly few decisions affecting the institution are made by agencies external to the institution. The student demonstrations at Calvin have been mild, largely because the Calvin students have been willing to discuss their grievances and outline their suggestions rather than disrupt the institution. Thus one might conclude that the collegial form of governance is still the best and most suitable for Calvin College. However, the size of the institution alone should at least make us investigate this position. An examination of various historical and circumstantial factors which have influenced the operational patterns of Calvin College will give us a better understanding of the unique nature of Calvin College and the bearing this nature has on the system of governance it selects.

The fact that Calvin College is Christian and Reformed naturally determines the special character of the institution. This places a distinctive stamp on curriculum, pedagogy, and intra-faculty relations. But this fundamental Christian and Reformed profession does not completely explain the peculiarities of organizational structure and operational patterns which makes the college run from day to day. The organizational structure and operational patterns are related to the basic commitments, but the manner in which these are exercised is conditioned by a number of historical and circumstantial factors.

To understand and assess the origin and effectiveness of the operational forces in the college, we must consider the following facts:

1. Calvin College was established by, and is owned, maintained, and operated by the Christian Reformed Church. The Board of Trustees is a standing committee of synod and acts for synod.
2. The College is operated by the church in order to carry out an educational mission which is closely related to the general welfare of the church. The college is also expected to offer service to the organized church, and to the Kingdom of Christ of which the church is part.
3. The relation of Calvin Theological Seminary to the church is of a different kind from that of Calvin College to the church. This difference brings the Seminary into closer relationship to the church. Although the college is owned and operated by the church, those whom the church appoints to the college are not officials in the church. In the seminary, however, a faculty member, until very recently, was regarded as filling a special office in the church. Even now, because training in the seminary is almost wholly

a training for an office in the church, a direct line of immediate authority extends from the synod of the seminary. In the case of the college, the church has recognized on one hand that its best interests are served by a strong college, and has recognized on the other hand that the work of a church and of Christian higher-education are separate, though inter-dependent provinces. Hence the church, through the Board of Trustees, invests the college with a greater measure of autonomy than has been accorded the seminary. The church, which does not claim or assert a definitive competence in the area of general education, grants (through the Board of Trustees) its college-related administrative and teaching educational specialists a large amount of independence and responsibility in defining the direction and implementation of Reformed-Christian higher education. In turn, the church expects and demands that the performance of this function be consonant with the historical purposes, goals, and ideals of the institution as set by the church.

4. Unlike most American colleges founded by a church, Calvin College receives annually a substantial amount (about 25%) of its operating monies from the church through the quota system. One consequence of this is that the president of Calvin College spends much of his time in direct intra-college matters, whereas in most private colleges the president and a core of administrative officials spend a large fraction of their time in soliciting contributions for operating funds. This has affected the arrangement of duties of most of the administrative officials, and has also affected their relationship to the faculty. As the percentage of operating funds received through quotas decreases, one might well expect these relationships to change.
5. The faculty's close relationship to the Christian Reformed Church, reflected in the tasks we perform, in our socio-ecclesiastical relationship, and in our ethnic ties, tends to make the college staff a very close-knit body. This intra-mural closeness and direct tie with the denomination prompts in each one of us a sense of individual and communal responsibility, an expectation of direct participation in the affairs of the college, and a personal investment of our whole lives in maintaining the proper direction of the college and church.

The Christian Reformed Church and community have always disparaged an elaborate hierarchical (or dictatorial) structure and spirit. Even very recently, introduction of rank, special perquisites, and special offices in the seminary was greeted with the argument that no minister should lord it over another. That spirit, though never captured in a shibboleth, is present among the college faculty also. Our communal sense has influenced significantly the role of the administration and faculty in policy-making and policy-implementing functions. The function of the department heads, the policy relating to promotion and rank, the salary schedule, the appointment procedure, and many other operational affairs are influenced by the Christian communal character of Calvin College. This system has many strengths, but we should recognize that as the nature of the community changes the operational structures and patterns will also change.

In addition to these circumstantial factors, a number of historical developments have affected the operational characteristics of the College. Calvin College is an old institution when judged by its founding date (1876), yet young as a typical, four-year, co-educational, liberal arts college. It became a four-year college, granting its first baccalaureate degree, in 1921. The institution as a whole is almost 100 years old, yet the first president of the college is still alive. Several men regarded as members of the original college are alive, and some have only very recently retired from the staff. The eight members of the first graduating class are still living.

The history of Calvin College and Seminary is in reality two histories. A picture of present operating practice in the college appears, therefore, as a frame within a frame.

The Christian Reformed Church originally established Calvin for the very practical purpose of training ministers. Therefore, the school, centered around the seminary, came under the direct, immediate governance of the ruling body of the church. Its curriculum, faculty, and student body were the direct concern of the church.

The manner in which the Calvin Theological Seminary operates has changed greatly over the nearly 100 years, yet the direct relationship of the seminary to the governing body of the Church is still abundantly evident. The synod of the church appoints members to the seminary faculty from nominations presented by the board; these nominations are made after soliciting suggestions from consistories in the Christian Reformed churches. The members of the faculty as individuals have certain lines of privilege running directly to the synod and directly to the Board. The faculty as a faculty, by virtue of its small number and by virtue of position, is fully involved in the governance of the institution. Delegation of administrative authority to special administrators develops very slowly in the seminary. At the same time the Board, acting for synod, exercises a great deal of authority over the curriculum of the seminary, and it is the Board of Trustees which admits the majority of students since most of them are prospective candidates for the ministry.

In contrast, when the college became established as an entity, independent of the preparatory school below and the seminary above, it was allowed to develop its own unique operational patterns. These patterns developed rapidly but then changed slowly as the college soon reached a plateau in growth and retained a rather constant size in number of faculty and of students.

The small, original faculty became a very tight circle, which exerted a great deal of faculty control over the internal government of the institution. Within this tight circle, strong leadership of a very small number evolved rather naturally.

The Board of Trustees, with its strong, locally-functioning Educational Committee and Building and Grounds Committees, was involved in considerable direct governance of the college. The tight faculty circle in which strong personalities surfaced readily frequently came into conflict with the Board of Trustees under this arrangement. Furthermore, having only a small staff of administrators, the president and the dean were caught in between the pressures of the faculty and those of the Board of Trustees. Administration was further weakened by the extreme decentralization of administrative functions, making it difficult to determine the real locus of administrative responsibility and authority.

With the sudden enrollment surge immediately following World War II, two developments altered the situation. They were, first, the unification of administrative responsibility under a departmentalized administrative staff which produced a new relationship of administration to the Board of Trustees and to the faculty; second, the delegation, by faculty action, of the most important faculty concerns to committees for processing and, in some cases, decision. The most notable example of the latter is the abdication of the right to discuss all faculty appointments in general faculty session and make recommendations directly to the president, but instead assigning these responsibilities to the Educational Policy Committee. Accompanying this was the assignment to administrators of administrative and extra-academic matters which formerly engaged direct faculty attention. Dormitory committees and bookstore committees are a feature of faculty involvement of a not-too-distant past. The various offices of the division of Student Personnel Services and the functions of the Vice President of Business Affairs, and of the Director of College Relations were, until recently, direct faculty concerns. The evolution of these changes is traced through Board and faculty decisions and practices which have developed from circumstances. Our rapid student expansion, our phenomenal faculty growth, the young age-level of the faculty as a group, the split campus, coupled with recent events such as our involvement in community and state affairs and the advent of government interest in private college education, all of these have fashioned us as we are today. The faculty, board, and the administration have always wished to keep the faculty involved in making educational policy decision so that, despite the diminution of the faculty's direct involvement in many of the internal affairs of the college, it can still maintain a vital and important role in forming the educational policy of the institution.

Whereas the Board of Trustees, for synod, is ultimately responsible for fulfilling the church's broad expectations of the college, and the administration of the college provides incentive, opportunity, public acceptance, and internal machinery for arriving at these expectations, it is the opinion of the board, the administration, and your committee that the faculty as a whole must be responsible for the quality of the teaching and learning that goes on and for the Christian educational character and academic and spiritual discipline of the college as a whole. Your committee notes with regret some indications that the faculty individually and collectively no longer wishes to assume this responsibility.

The Board, administration, and faculty have closely related interests and responsibilities which are not wholly discreet. Divisions and intrusions can easily occur if there does not exist a Christian attitude and a mutual respect for each other's position and responsibility. Or, putting it in Pauline language, "doing nothing through faction or through vain glory, but in lowliness of mind each counting other better than himself." (Phil. 2:3)

In a very real sense the college administration, while an agent of the Board, is also an agent of the faculty. At Calvin College the principal administrators are also faculty members. The latter position they hold by virtue of previous faculty positions as well as by current status; these administrators have not lost their faculty competence merely by moving to another chair. This present practice held at Calvin College also holds implications for the future; if we wish to continue the practice of having principal administrators also be members of the faculty, we should seek to appoint to those positions only individuals who by training and experience qualify for appointment as faculty members.

This concept of administrators as faculty agents or coregents of educational policy and direction means that administration qua administration does not alone determine policy by speaking with a dictatorial, authoritative voice. Rather, the faculty, which includes administration, sets the course of policy.

We see that Calvin College has to a certain extent followed the trend of other American academic institutions. The college for many years functioned under a primarily collegial form of governance, although the Board of Trustees initially played a much stronger role than one normally associates with this form of governance. During the two decades since World War II, we have drifted into a form of governance which may perhaps best be classified as a modified collegial form. By this we mean that the faculty has formally and informally delegated responsibility for certain operations to various faculty committees and to individual administrators. The formal delegation has taken place through decisions of the faculty; the informal delegation has taken place in instances in which the faculty, its committees, or individual members have been derelict in performing their tasks or in assuming their responsibilities, and the dropped reins of authority have been picked up, by necessity, by an administrator. We consider it one of the duties of this committee to review this formal and informal delegation which has taken place and to modify it to fit the new organizational structure proposed.