

RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNIVERSITIES FOR EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE

M. E. Troyer

Citizens of a democratic society deserve the kind of government they get. If they eschew formal and informal education they will be unenlightened voters. Legislators and administrators put in office by such voters have no mandate for resisting forces of sharply focused pressure groups. What is good for vested interest becomes synonymous with the general welfare.

To get re-elected, they do what unenlightened voters will vote for. The results tends strongly toward crisis government — crisis legislation and crisis administration. Major landmarks in legislation concerning social security, equitable taxation, inflation, pollution, military spending, discrimination against minorities, minimum wage laws and monopolies in restraint of trade are seldom enacted until there is consensus demand from crises of inescapable proportions.

It isn't that legislators are necessarily unenlightened. Actually numerous legislative bills of great promise are introduced. But with no visible mandate from an enlightened electorate bills are compromised by political power plays with pressures from other sources . . . the power of numbers, money, muscle, decibels and position.

What does this have to do with the purposes, climate, structure and processes of administration in higher education? On-campus constituencies — students and faculty, and off-campus constituencies deserve the kind of administration they get.

Faculty and students do not want authoritarian administration. They are not satisfied to be means to ends and too bright to be ignored in the making of policies that affect their activities and well being. But frequently they fail to provide a consensus policy basis needed for democratic administration.

It is the basic hypothesis of this paper that the university should be a continuing laboratory in which all of its constituencies and its administration are studying and trying to clarify the value presuppositions, purposes, climate, structure and processes of its governance. A secondary or supportive hypothesis is that an educational institution for its own credibility ought visibly to attempt to maximize educational processes and minimize political processes in making and administering policy. A third and ultimate hypothesis is that governments in our society generally should benefit from quality of governance alumni have learned to respect on campus and to expect in society.

Is that too much to expect from our institutions of higher education? Rationally, the answer must be no. Rationalism is the stock-in-trade of a university. We need not expect perfection. But we may expect a visible degree of effort and accomplishment. Actually we have no clear picture of the difficulty of this task. We are prone to over-estimate the futility of these objectives because of power plays that rendered campuses impotent for varying periods of time during the last decade. We are likely to under-estimate the potential of these theses because equal visibility was not given methods of governance on other campuses.

This does not mean that universities that had no interruptions from power plays were dealing effectively with issues. But it leaves the possibility that some did. This is a topic worthy of as many funded research studies as have been made and reported on power campus politics at Columbia, Harvard, Wisconsin, Stanford, Berkeley, San Francisco State, Tokyo University, ICU and others where mass media and campus reports gave wide visibility to tyrannies of minorities. This is not to denigrate their causes. We are concerned here with means that better serve causes.

Historically, colleges and universities were not expected to be examples of good governance. Early universities in Italy were communities of

scholars and students with no classrooms, buildings, offices, libraries, budgets or administration. Students paid professors directly or they did not attend class. Students hired and fired professors in the same way we hire our lawyers and doctors. Student organization pre-dated university organization. They organized first to protect themselves from exploiting landlords, second to defend a more liberal life for students than would ordinarily be permitted by the police and to set standards of expectancy from teachers.

Dormitories were the hub of early French universities. *In loco parentis* under church supervision was the beginning of university administration there. Universities in Germany emerged where there was a confluence of scholars; each with a small number of disciples (students) who lived, thought, studied, ate, drank and socialized with their master. Out of their freedom emerged a concept that has tended to prevail in Europe — the least university administration is the best. University education in England developed to prepare leaders in the culture, education, government and business of the British Commonwealth. From the beginning they reflected more of the atmosphere and kind of responsibilities that post-campus life would expect of this elite group.

From the founding of Harvard to the Morrill Act, more than two centuries later, ninety percent of the colleges in the United States were founded by religious agencies or individuals with religious motivation. Responsibility for purposes, structure and program were delegated to a board of trustees who in turn appointed a president to whom they delegated many responsibilities. Preparation of teachers and ministers were their original objective. This called for transmitting the culture uncontaminated and for skills with language, rhetoric and logic.

Paradoxically, in relatively structured nations of Europe, universities developed with little governance. While in the emerging representative democracy of the United States most universities developed with strong central administration. This accounts for the eventual emergence of the American Association of University Professors to protect academic freedom.

We must not leave this brief historical account without noting that the

function of colleges until the middle of the 19th century was “uncontaminated” by applied research and community service. This was the university apart from society — the ivory tower. An institution apart from society need not and perhaps should not be an example to society in its governance.

Then came professional schools and applied science. They put colleges and universities into society. To the educational function, research and service were added. Universities could no longer remain institutions apart from society.

Beginning about 1885 Japanese universities were patterned mainly after German universities in concepts of education and governance but were nurtured and at times regimented to help Japan catch up with Western industrial nations. Faculty and central government operated in parallel but with overlapping role perception. In case of conflict, central government tended to prevail.

The first hypothesis of this paper is that the university should be a laboratory in which all constituencies, with the administration, study and experience the processes and development of its governance. The university is no longer an ivory tower. It is in the community. It serves and influences the community. To do this creatively and effectively it must have the guidance, tolerance and criticism of all *on-* and *off-*campus constituencies.

Earlier introduction of pure science into the curriculum did not challenge its ivory tower status, but perpetuated fictional dichotomy between pure and applied science. During the last half of century however pure and applied science not only put the university in society, it put man over nature in some very important ways. Examples are: Pollution, control of genetic determinants, indefinitely prolonged induced human hibernation and exponential rates of technological change that threaten to deplete irreversibly crucial natural resources.

So long as man was simply under nature or in nature the limits of man's achievements and his welfare were determined within the balance of his macrocosm and immediate microcosm. The science that put man over nature now requires even more genius to hold or restore a necessary

balance, more wisdom in choosing directions and more commitment to values in the general welfare.

Since the university has been the fountainhead of pure and applied science, of both hard ware and soft ware and the training of scientific personnel and indeed, of the scientism that has pervaded the social disciplines and much of the humanities it can no longer maintain that it is only a reflection of society in its purposes and processes.

The university has become a largely non-responsible or non-planned agent of technological change so rapid that man may not have sufficient lead time to build in correctives. The same scientism that produced this technology led many professors to be consciously non-responsible agents of ideological change. The university is thus also responsible for a values vacuum that leaves society unprepared for constructive use and control of technology. Technology is a ready tool for a society dominated by materialistic values. History records with clarity that dominance of materialistic values is not synonymous with the broad reaches of human welfare.

This adds a new dimension to problems of campus governance. Minorities of faculty and students sensing this vacuum have unilaterally decided what kind of values are important in creating the kind of society they believe worth reaching for. Some of these minorities tried to force their university to conform to their values and programs. To trustees representing segments of off-campus constituencies this was taxation without representation. They responded by setting boundaries to activities related to change and thus infringed freedoms necessary to creative and innovative teaching research and service. Majorities of students and faculty remained disinterested or confused and impotent to cope with the power plays.

Confrontations between on-and-off-campus constituencies on these issues caught administrators in a devastating cross-fire without consensus based policy to administer. Some found it necessary to resign. Others called in the police, in most cases admitting impotence of the university to solve problems by educational processes. Use of police may have solved some visible aspects of the problem but it eroded credibility of the

university as an educational institution and left the basic issues unsolved in a deteriorated climate.

An educational institution must maximize educational processes of policy making if it is to protect and extend its credibility. Obstacles to testing this second hypothesis, maximizing educational over political processes, exist in typical structures of campus governance and in traditions of the academic profession and administration.

First is the problem of traditional role definition. Confusion among constituencies of the academic community in the throes of struggle, is aided and abetted by organizational structures that make some sense within constituencies but show little rationale between constituencies. Dr. Dwight Waldo* described the condition vividly in his session with the 1968 Syracuse summer seminar on "Perceived Roles and Supporting Values of Trustees, Administration, Faculty and Students in University Policy and Decision Making." Using the metaphor of the scenario as a vehicle for analysis he shows:

"that every part of our metaphor is problematic, and even the metaphor itself is problematic . . . It is a dispute about what the play shall concern, who shall write the play, who shall do the casting, who shall design the setting and costumes. It is even a dispute about who shall be allowed into the dispute; that is, the questions do not simply concern a closed circle of "university" people but open out into wide but indefinite reaches of the whole society . . . Everything depends upon everything else."

Roles and responsibilities of "boards of control" are defined in articles of incorporation and subsequent by-laws for institutions usually sponsored by agencies of religion or state and filed with the ministry of Education.

Administrative roles derive mainly from responsibilities delegated and defined by boards of control and from structure and processes administrators perceive as necessary to serve effectively the needs of the several constituencies.

* Albert Schweitzer Professor of Public Administration at Syracuse University

Roles and responsibilities of faculty are defined in the constitution and by-laws of the faculty senate and in manuals of relatively untraceable origin.

Roles of students are defined in constitutions and by-laws of student governments and clubs and in student handbooks which carry rules of relatively invisible origin for behavior in residence halls and at social functions.

More recently roles of non-academic staff in formulating policies and decisions are being defined through local and national labor regulations.

Alumni, cherished as abiding members of the university family, watched as living testimony to the *raison d'être* of the alma mater and increasingly needed for their loyalty and support find their roles not specifically defined except as represented on boards of trustees.

Universal opportunity for higher education is now making the larger public of the immediate and remote community a constituency to be recognized in policy and decisions of the college and university. How and in what ways it is to be represented appropriately, has not been clarified.

Constituencies of the academic community thus defined tend to operate in parallel but with overlapping role perceptions. They do not tend to interact as a system because university governance has not developed as a system.

Overlapping role perceptions against mixed value orientations is evident in the confrontations between local chapters of the AAUP and boards of trustees on matters of academic freedom. Trustees maximizing responsibilities of faculty and minimizing freedom have moved to censor or dismiss professors. Faculty through the AAUP and more recently the AFT maximize freedom and minimize responsibilities.

Published and confidential reports on violent confrontation at Cornell, San Francisco State and Stanford reveal minorities of students and faculties using their freedom to tyrannize majorities that were satisfied to be a conglomerate of fragile anarchies, impotent in ability to provide a consensus policy base necessary for effective democratic administration. Stated succinctly, faculties and students do not want authoritarian administration but they make high level authoritarianism necessary by

their unwillingness through student government and faculty senate to blend their needs and aspirations into a policy that the president could stand on with confidence of consensus support. This exercise of freedom without responsibility is an operational definition of anarchy, and it became visible in campus struggles of the past decade.

Stanford's AAUP chapter was the first (so reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education) to join responsibilities that go with academic freedom for a consensus policy supporting administration. In summary, their action was as follows: we continue our commitment to protect the rights of individuals and minorities to think, believe and speak out in their teaching, research and writing. But we now also commit ourselves to support administration in disciplining those who appropriate these freedoms to tyrannize and disrupt the activities of others on the campus entitled to academic freedom. Determination of guilt shall be by due process.

This is a hazardous step as Meiklejohn¹ pointed out. Any limitation on freedom tends to be only the first step toward further eroding of freedom. But it is equally true that abdication of responsibility that goes with freedom breeds anarchy. Educators ought to be among the best qualified to seek balance between freedoms and corresponding responsibilities.

Among professors, however, there is a tendency to be less careful about the validity of facts presumed to be relevant to the campus welfare and to administrative policy than they are about the validity of facts in their fields of scholarship.

Example 1. A professor of *political science* told a group of students in a week-end leadership training conference "College administrators are invariably venal." He stopped and repeated it. His statement was copied verbatim. Later when asked if he had valid data to support that statement, he admitted that he did not, but he justified his statement by a current rather popular concept that conflict *per se* is good. Therefore data or conclusions calculated to arouse conflict do not need to be valid.

(1) Meiklejohn, Alexander *Political Freedom* New York; Harper and Brothers, 1960, pp 166

Thinking in many a class and seminar has been improved by students or faculty playing a "devil's advocate" role. But that does not justify conclusions without verified data that make adversaries of university constituencies. Making and administering university policy encounter enough valid conflict. No artificial exacerbation is needed.

Example 2. Much has been said about the campus generation gap. Daniels¹ et al, Welch² and Fralick, using modifications of the same inventory discovered differences between student, faculty and administration perceptions of appropriate roles in university policy and decision making reliable at the .001, .01, .05 levels. But the average overlap between distributions of constituency perceptions of appropriate roles was 80 percent on issues where there were reliable differences. This means that there is no generation gap between 80% of the constituencies. It means also that there was little to considerable gap between 20 percent of the students and faculty or administration. This is hardly justification for a generalized concept of an adversary stance between campus generations.

In part II of that same inventory students, faculty and administration were asked to check the five of twelve value orientations they regarded as most supportive to appropriate constituency roles in university policy and decision making. The five most frequently checked and the three least frequently checked were the same for all three constituencies. The value orientation most frequently checked by all three constituencies was "That students, faculty and administration need each other and can and should learn to think together and to share in policy making where appropriate and respect decisions made by others according to their unique responsibilities". The value orientation least frequently checked (2% of the administration, 3% of the faculty and 4% of the students) was, "There will always be an insurmountable barrier between the two generations and its a waste of time to try to bridge it." The Daniels et al data were collected at

- (1) Daniels, Kah-Hut, et al *Academic on the Line* San Francisco Gossey-Bass, 1970, Chapter 16
- (2) Welch, C. G. *Perceived Roles and Values of Constituencies in Policy Making in Five Western New York State Universities*, Unpublished Dissertations, Syracuse University, 1974

San Francisco State before and after the strike; Fralick's data were gathered in four New York State colleges and universities during the week following the Kent State incident. Data from these two studies are all the more significant because they were gathered during highly charged climates of campus confrontations.

Example 3. There is a tendency to assume that university administrators are authority and power oriented. The validity of this assumption for institutions of higher education (and possibly other organizations) is here challenged as neither inherent or necessary.

It would be naive to believe that organized groups of people have no political potential and that political power plays have no role in governance. It is just as naive to overlook potential for reducing hierarchies and the role of power in organizations. To do so, maximizes the political nature of the organization. Implementing the findings of Likert's^{1 2} et al research that — everyone in an organization should have the opportunity to have his ideas represented in the formation of policies that affect his activities and well being — makes administration more of a service function than an authority function. A long span of supportive personal experience and observation hopefully is relevant here.

After two years of teaching high-school biology and coaching of football, basketball and track I was elected superintendent of a township high school and consolidated grade school. This was in 1925. I was twenty-one years old and the youngest employee of the school system. With my youth and inexperience I knew it was hazardous to lead from an authority stance. So I set out to help the faculty, students and community get the best possible resources to meet their needs and objectives. When I resigned to pursue graduate work in 1929 that elementary and high-school district had the highest per student educational cost and the highest tax-rate in the state. This was before state equalization of school support. It wasn't easy for the local district. The tax question was never raised. The community was willing to pay for what it was getting. After observing

- (1) Likert, Rensis *New Patterns of Management* New York; McGraw-Hill, 1961
- (2) Likert, Rensis *The Human Organization* New York; McGraw-Hill, 1966

teachers in our elementary school for a day, the superintendent of the county seat schools offered appointments to two of our teachers only to discover that our teachers' salaries were as high as those of his elementary school principals.

I don't recall any incident during those four years when the question of authority or power occurred to me or was raised by anyone. This experience led me to have more than a layman's interest in philosophy of administration during a 50-year professional career of migration between teaching, research and administration.

As Associate in Evaluation with the American Council on Education Study of Teacher Education¹ 1940-43, we discovered that teachers resisted evaluation because they did not want someone to do to them what they were doing to their students. Traditional evaluation processes were undemocratic in so far as they threatened or destroyed the integrity and sense of worth of the evaluated. This creates and perpetuates a hierarchy. In this study evaluation emerged as something that should be done *with* people rather than *to* people to help them to discover their own strength and weakness so they can take meaningful next steps. The hierarchy is reduced when a teacher seeks the help of students, other teachers and administrators in evaluating his own strengths and weaknesses.

It was at about that time that Allee' started to publish reports of his research on the "Peck order" in the society of hens. This promoted me to try to discover whether or not a peck order was evident in staff and committee meetings I attended as a consultant to some thirty colleges and universities in the study. In some committees a peck order was clearly evident. In others it was clearly absent.

In the peck order committee no one disagreed with number one. He was usually the chairman and very conscious of his status. He answered questions, set the schedules and assigned responsibilities. It was "his" committee and it was "his" committee report. Number nine in the peck order disagreed with no one, asked questions, accepted assignments and

(1) Troyer, M. E., Pace, C.R. *Evaluation in Teacher Education* American Council on Education, 1944

did the chores. Number five asked questions toward 1, 2, 3 and 4 and answered questions toward 6, 7, 8 and 9. If number 2 had a potent idea, it didn't become operational until number 1 could modify and own it.

The committee without a peck order had no number 1. It had a service motivated chairman. He was a gate-opener for ideas from everyone. He helped the group discover their own resources and to find others. He facilitated the process of coming to a meeting of minds on purposes, processes, substance and conclusions. In the end they presented "our" report.

Example 4. When I returned to Syracuse from the American Council on Education study, the Chancellor asked if I would be interested in being university examiner. I was interested in the purpose but not the position. I proposed an evaluation service center that had no administrative prerogatives, but, would have to justify itself on its recognized value to those it served.

It was established. Its purposes were to help faculty improve ways and means of evaluating student achievement, courses, programs and teaching. A representative policy advisory council was appointed. The first policy it established was: the Evaluation Service Center (ESC) must not allow itself to become a Gestapo for the administration. This had inescapable meaning in 1945. And it has inescapable meaning for Watergate and when surveys of ventures with university centers for institutional research find their most serious hang-up over whom they are to be responsible to because of the potential power of the director of a university data bank. The second policy: The ESC shall report personally only to those who seek its service. Reports to the administration shall be limited to the nature and scope of services rendered and shall be impersonal about types of strengths and weaknesses discovered.

Interest grew by osmosis after the initial announcement of the services. Requests for services expanded and grew as rapidly as we could expand the service staff. By 1951 we were working with individual professors and with faculties on departmental courses in every college of the university.

In 1947 the trustees approved a recommendation of the Chancellor for a university-wide self-survey and appropriated \$15,000 for it. The director

of the ESC was asked to direct the survey. An inter-constituency policy council was set up. Inter-constituency committees were appointed to survey every aspect of university operation and service. Outside consultants advised on questions that needed asking, sources and processes of data gathering and kept us realistic in interpreting the data. Three off-campus, three-day work conferences dealt with these three phases of the survey. In between, committees and sub-committees met frequently for more than a year.

This was not a "head-hunting" survey. Syracuse University was in the midst of post World War II expansion. It needed to clarify its objectives and identify its strengths and weaknesses and its potential for long range planning. Nevertheless many professors and administrators took a jaundiced view of the venture. The first conference was dubbed in advance, "The Lost Weekend." Many committee members were wary.

The key note of the first conference was: Ask questions. Try to ask all the questions that need to be raised. Don't give or anticipate answers. Avoid pronouncements. Only one of the major committees forgot the process and got tied up in a power struggle. That was during the first session. In the second session they started over. This was the only committee where there was a highly visible hierarchy. And it persisted when another committee on Survey of the Administration forecast the need for a Vice-President for Student Affairs that left positions of Dean of Men and Dean of Women uncertain.

In the other seven major survey committees it is safe to conclude that the hierarchies became almost invisible or non-existent as the survey progressed. By the time the comprehensive reports were prepared over fifty percent of the recommendations were being implemented. By the time the general report was published in 1949 seventy percent had been implemented. With completion of the self-survey the ESC was on the threshold of being a full-blown center for university research and the director had accumulated much experience useful to a new assignment in Japan.

Example 5. During 1949-50 I served as consultant on plans for the new International Christian University in Japan. In 1951 Mrs. Troyer and I

went to Japan. I was invited to be Vice-President for Educational Affairs. This included both curriculum development and student affairs. My responsibility was to help develop a new university that had no *raison d'être* unless it made a fresh approach to important problems of education.

Japan was the most literate country. It had 434 colleges and universities. It was second only to the United States in the percent of its high school graduates that went to college. Both the constitution and the educational system in this hierarchical society had been re-developed along more democratic lines. There was a belief that existing institutions would tend to prepare actors for the old stage rather than the new stage. ICU had a mandate to provide its faculty, students and administration an opportunity to study and experience the values and processes of democracy.

This challenge had complex meaning that became evident in compelling ways. We registered our first students the day after the peace treaty was signed in April 1952. From that day on no faculty member from abroad made a significant contribution until Japanese colleagues were satisfied that they were speaking at "eye level." Our Japanese President, sensing this, insisted for the benefit of all that this international university "had no foreigners . . . just Japanese and overseas scholars and they all spoke at eye level."

It took an inordinate amount of time for faculty members from a variety of cultures and educational traditions to come to a meeting of minds in planning the general education and area programs. Tuesday afternoons from 2 o'clock were cleared of all classes for regular meetings of the faculty as a whole, divisions and standing committees.

Gradually, we drifted into administration of many details by committee. When it became evident that this was eroding time for teaching, research and writing, we could decide that standing committees (Curriculum, Student Personnel, Library and Religious Life) should shape policy, the faculty should legitimize policy and administration should serve policy.

The VPE had one vote as did other committee members. He elected not to use it when opinion seemed to be evenly divided over an issue. By virtue

of his position as an ex-officio member of four standing committees he had more opportunity to develop wide angle vision than others. He was obligated to share this education wherever relevant as committees shaped policy. His responsibility did not accrue from the power of position but from his "ability" to learn and his effectiveness as an educator-administrator.

The VPFA turned to the Senate, consisting of deans, directors and an elected representative from each division, in the shaping of fiscal and campus development policy, to be legitimized by the trustees.

Through these processes did the hierarchy at ICU become invisible? Somewhat. Ideological change in any society does not come readily. Change of a highly hierarchical society, where over the centuries the language has come to reflect and perpetuate the social distance between any two people, is a slow process.

We selected house mothers for dormitories competent to participate in policy making and to administer policy as issues arose in her relation with students. This was not readily understood where tradition would have her refer the issue up, up, up till it reached the level of "competent jurisdiction," the decision made and stamped down, down, down, until the house mother could report it to the students involved. Here we were maximizing the freedom that can (should) go with responsibility. It tends to reduce the hierarchy. House mothers get a full measure of attention from alumni who return to the campus.

Developing a program that made sense to international faculty and student; finding equitable ways of remunerating scholars from varying economies; planning and building housing facilities to reflect the differing cultures and accommodating a wide spectrum of beliefs in an ecumenical venture would be doomed to failure, if it was administered with traditional power play tactics. It was successful in so far as we were able to maximize educational processes within a set of values that recognized the integrity and sense of worth of all its individuals and constituencies.

Education that comes to committee members and administrators in the process of deriving such policies must be defused to all constituencies affected by them. And it must be continued into each new generation.

Such policies can not be delegated for administration to those who do not understand and accept them. Viewed in this light all major policy problems (and most minor ones) were reasons for the institution rather than an obstacle to its educational functions.

After fifteen years at ICU, the first ten as VPE, I returned to Syracuse University as chairman of the department of Higher Education Administration better prepared than I anticipated. There, studying purposes, programs and structure of higher education with some fifty graduate students and supervising some 20 dissertations, I have become increasingly convinced that all the problems of higher education are the reasons for higher education. I believe more progress will be made by trying to solve them by educational processes than by trying to deal with them through the distribution and "effective" exercise of power which so frequently ends by trying to control the fever instead of discovering and treating the infection.

While this kind of informed observation is not conclusive, it challenges the assumption of an inevitable hierarchy in organizations. The assumption of a hierarchy assures the hierarchy. This in turn, tends to prevent processes that minimize or possibly obviate a hierarchy.

These observations lead to still another discovery. In higher education most administrative positions seek the man. Bennis¹, *The Learning Ivory Tower*, perhaps represents the one exception in ten. A president, vice-president or dean is not ordinarily sought primarily for his ability to distribute or administer power or his expertise in the "chain of command." An administrator is usually invited to accept more responsibility "here" because of his success in helping develop the kind of climate, structure, processes and resources needed by faculty and students "there."

The fiction that university administrators today are predominantly authority and power motivated is based on an assumption of the inherent competitiveness of man that conceals his potential for the concept of "yoursness." And this fiction tends to be perpetuated by writers in

(1) Bennis, Warren *The Learning Ivory Tower* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973, pp. 154

professional research and literature in higher education, including books written on administration in higher education¹. The fiction is also fed by writers on public, industrial and business administration.

There seems to be an abiding meaning to all of this. Bias reduction should be high on the list of objectives in higher education and it should be built into the processes of university policy making and administration. Maximizing educational processes with behavior energized and directed by democratic values in the study and shaping of policy tends to widen the angle of vision, reduce bias, encourage trust, minimize hierarchies, raise the level of consensus and strengthen the credibility of an institution of higher education. This would be true education: an illusive goal but worthy of our continuing reach. Maximizing political power plays — the power of muscle, numbers, decibels and position — tends to narrow the angle of vision, nurture or freeze bias, emphasize hierarchies, create distrust, lower the level of consensus and erode the credibility of the university and its personnel.

This brings us to the final hypothesis that constituencies in a university should learn something about the purposes, climate and processes of university governance that would be relevant to governance in other agencies. Learning to maximize educational processes should be useful. A clear example is the Society of Friends at its best, where men and women, committed to respect for each other, try to raise all the questions that need to be raised about an issue; marshal all the information and ideas relative to the issue; and *then* try shape the answer. There is no reason why constituencies in the business of education should not approach policy making in this way. There is every reason why they should if they are going to be supportive to a democracy that cradles the freedom they cherish.

(1) As the third draft of this manuscript goes to the typist I am two thirds of the way through Epstein's new book, *Governing the University*. It is an extraordinarily clear description of what we are doing and where we are going with power. I keep wondering what the effect on the climate and consequences would be if he substituted the words "responsibility" and "service" for "power" and "authority" throughout the book.

How could a college or university venture to test these three hypotheses?

Administrative experience; study of the Ventures in Reconstructing University Governments at Toronto, Cornell and Syracuse¹, and studies of roles in policy making perceived to be appropriate by the several constituencies lead to the following proposal.

1. Organize a seminar to study the governance of your institution. If the climate is favorable, it could be a simulated or an official constitutional convention of the academic community. A seminar or simulated convention would be more conducive to educational processes.
2. In either instance participants should be recognized representatives of their constituencies and should include administrators.
3. Time should be provided for all due deliberation -- a two hour meeting once per week for an academic year.

The seminar has a service function for the governance of a community that may vary from 1,000 on-campus citizens + (n)n off-campus constituents, to 40,000 on-campus citizen + (n)n off-campus constituents. Give academic credit to student participants; load credit to faculty and administration; tuition credit or certificates to off-campus constituents. After all this is potentially a dignified and highly potent educational experience.

4. Launch the seminar as a genuine venture in the study of governance, not in response to a traumatic campus confrontation. The goal is not crisis solution. It is crisis prevention.
5. Start with development of a preamble, a statement of value orientation -- of the general welfare of the academic community to be served by its government. Many faculty members are apprehensive of this approach. They are values shy. All constituencies will be surprised at the congruency between values that serve the general welfare of academe and those that serve the welfare of specific constituencies.

(1) Toyer, M. E. Ventures in Reconstructing University Government: Toronto, Cornell, Syracuse. *Maxwell Review*, Syracuse University Press, Vol. 9 #1, winter 1973

6. Select a representative list of policy issues: evaluation of courses and teachers, campus newspapers, dormitory autonomy, selection of the university president, campus security, use of drugs, invitations to off-campus speakers, classified contracts with the military. Work toward a meeting of minds between constituencies concerning their appropriate roles – whether autonomous, determinant, participative, consultative or no role.
7. Progress on 5 and 6 will indicate the necessary structure of governance. Ventures in governance reform, assuming hierarchy and power needs, overlook these two basic steps and get stalemated by politicized procedural issues.
8. Solicit briefs and recommendations from every individual and group interested in campus governance.
9. Hold open hearings as preamble, role definitions and structure begin to take shape.
10. Distribute progress and “final” reports. If interest develops in recommendations, the stage is set for moving from deliberation to action.
11. If governance reform is thus achieved, provide for an annual seminar or commission on governance study and evaluation: a) to keep the governance in a process of self-renewal and b) to keep members of the academic community sensitive to high expectation in the quality of governance.

効果的管理のための大学の責任

〈要 約〉

M. E. トロイヤー

この問題を論じるに際し、次の三つの仮説を提示しておきたい。

第一に、大学とはたゆまず実験をしつづける場であり、そこでは大学の全関係者が、大学管理の価値、目的、構造、過程等を研究、試行しつづけていくのである。第二に、政策を策定し管理するにあたっては、大学は教育過程を最大化し、政治過程を最小化させていくべきだということである。最後に、卒業生はキャンパスにおいて尊重するように学んできた管理の質、および社会において当然期待すべきであると学んできた管理の質により社会の管理機構に資すべきである、ということである。

偏見の減少は高等教育の目的の中でも高位におかれるものであり、それは大学の政策策定および管理の過程に組みこまれるべきであろう。政策の形成および研究を行うに際しては、民主主義的諸価値によってなされる教育過程の最大化は、視野を拡げ、偏見をへらし、信頼を高め、合意のレベルを上げ、高等教育機関への信用を増すのである。これこそが真の教育というものであろう。これは幻想的な目標かもしれない、しかし我々が到達しようと努めるに価するものであろう。逆に、政治的な力の役割の増大は、視野を狭め、偏見を育み、不信を生み、合意のレベルを下げ、大学とその職員への信頼を侵すであろう。

かつて、トロント、コーネル、シラキューズの各大学で「大学管理の再建」に関して大胆な構想がなされ、そこで以下に述べるような諸提案がなされた。それらは、上述の三つの仮説の帰結でもある。

1. 当該機関の管理機構セミナーをつくる。それは、できれば模擬会議か公式の学問的共同体の集会であることが望ましい。セミナーとか模

擬会議とかは教育過程により資するものである。

2. どちらの場合にも、参加者は各々の部科の代表者たる資格をみとめられ、そのセミナーには管理職も加わるべきである。
3. しかるべき審議には十分に時間がかけられなければならない。たとえば、週一回二時間の会合というように。そのための負担については、学生参加者、教授、学外からの構成員に応じ各々措置がとられる。これこそが崇高でかつ有効な教育的経験を可能にするのである。
4. 大学問題に対する外科的な処置としてではなく、真の管理研究の大胆な試みとして、セミナーをはじめめる。このセミナーの目標は危機の解決ではなく、危機の予防である。
5. 学問共同体の一般的繁栄のための価値指向の声明を発展させることをはじめめる。多くの教授たちはこのアプローチに不安を抱いている。彼等は価値観の上では憶病なのである。しかし、やってみれば、学園の繁栄に供する諸価値と特定の構成員の繁栄に供する諸価値とが一致することがわかるだろう。
6. 政策問題の明確なリストを選びだす。たとえば、科目と教師の評価、キャンパスの新聞、寮の自治、学長の選出、キャンパスの保安、マリファナ等の使用、学外からの講演者の招待、軍との契約、などである。
7. 第5および第6項を発展させることによって、管理の必要な構造が示唆されよう。管理改革における大胆な試みはハイアラーキーと力の要請を仮定しているのであるが、それら二つの基本的手順を見落とし、政治的手続問題において手づまりに至ることになる。
8. キャンパス管理に関心をもつ諸氏に意見、勧告をもとめる。
9. まず公聴会を開き、そこで役割の明確化、構造などが形づくられていく。
10. 経過報告ならびに「最終」報告を回覧する。関心が勧告へと発展していくのであれば、討論から実施へと舞台は移る。

11. かくして、管理改革がなされるならば、管理研究と評価のための委員会あるいはセミナーを毎年行うべきである。これにより、管理自体が自ら蘇生しつづけるため、管理の質に対する高い期待の意識を学問的共同体のメンバーにうながすのである。

(春 具 訳)