

In no enterprise is atmosphere more important than a college or university. I'm convinced that the long-term effects on people are fully as attributable to atmosphere as they are to "program." Atmosphere is more than physical surroundings; it's also people and what they do. Once an atmosphere is created, it seems more than the sum of the three. Atmosphere builds up over time. We should begin right away (as we have) with a determined eye on goals, quality of people, and a consistent level of taste. There's an aspect of building atmosphere which must be put negatively: the avoiding of erosive ingredients. One of the chief destroyers of academic atmosphere is a busyness about administration, a visibility of administration, from which people get the idea (administrators not the least among them) that that's what the college is all about. Such a pre-occupation leads to the overstress on governance mentioned in Joe Shoben's November 4 memo (the whole of which I subscribe to, and which could be inserted anywhere here). This busyness seems nowhere more evident than in a line organization where people begin worrying more about enlargening their rung on the ladder or tightening their grip on it than they do furthering the mission of the place. The mission of the place is learning. The atmosphere in which learning flourishes is one in which the service to it occurs in a seemingly casual way, a way whereby the people served don't become reporters to the service.

I wonder if the requirement of accountability to the state has fostered line organization. Let me think out loud about accountability and its relation to organization. For we must have accountability, and not only to the state, in the sense of budgeting, accounting, and reporting of money. We have moral and intellectual accountability, too, to our clients the students and our supporters the taxpayers (and I hope donors) as to how we're coming through toward our stated goals. We're accountable to a level of culture, also, which includes but is not limited by, the "scholarly community." And there are accountabilities within the organization to people in the organization about

whom decisions are made: to faculty and others with regard to salary, promotion, tenure; the student ought to expect certain things from his advisor and from faculty members and others who have taken responsibility for helping him with a unit.

Some of these lines of accountability go direct from the individual within *to an outer constituency; some go "horizontal," within the* the college. Indeed, the line organization may cut or obscure many of these *latter* accountabilities, even to the point of building defenses against them.

Accountability is principally thought of in connection with budget request and allocation. The extent to which accountabilities have been met should become part of the evaluation process: How well has someone spent a portion of the budget for which he might have been made responsible? Also (I think this is at least as important and too often forgotten) how was the goal of the institution furthered? Here Dave Barry's current thinking about budget control may prove fruitful. (How about thinking of deans, etc., as chief switchers or dispatchers rather than as sole dispensers?) In matters of vital personal and professional interest, for students with regard to their stay at the college, and for faculty members' retention and pay, ~~other~~ accountabilities come into play: A specific group of people ought to be responsible for making that decision and at least one person responsible for explaining the decision. There ought to be an appeal route. ~~These~~ lines need to be spelled out carefully. In other words, in some cases, clear lines of accountability must be laid out for the individual's protection, but a line organization is not necessary for this. I'm far from convinced that we need line organization to support the reward system. (I hope, too, that we don't begin at the deplorable level of making plans to accommodate the absolutely minimal case. The sort of thing, for example, that leads to the more ludicrous aspects of civil service.)

Accountability cannot mean always accounting to someone, or always waiting to see what someone will say, or not being able to move without permission. It means, rather, that a person has accepted and has been given responsibility, within a class of actions, for success and is prepared occasionally to account for that activity to perhaps many people, even though one person is his "superior," in the sense of having final recommending responsibility for hiring-firing, and all that implies.

I intend the vice presidents to be vice presidents. They weren't given those titles, as in a railroad, as simply designating rank in the organization. On the contrary, within the areas designated on the organization chart, they have presidential authority. This will not happen in fact, unless they exercise their authority in the way a prudent president would <sup>put the other way: ... VP would be using his immediate authority</sup> if the vice-president did not consult <sup>/1\</sup> fully with other aspects of the organization. I don't mean consult "as required"; I mean consult continually, always. Each vice president should spend as much time talking to the other two as he does with people in the areas for which he's responsible. The extent to which I have to become a referee indicates the extent to which the vice presidents are not acting as vice presidents but merely as glorified section heads. I don't expect the vice presidents to wait for me to suggest what to do. They should take responsibility for talking with each other and for getting the action going. I shall feel free to point out to each where things might change for the better and to make suggestions on matters for improvement, once I overcome the embarrassment in my talking so with men whose talents I admire. I expect that each will always reciprocate with regard to the way I conduct the President's office. Incidentally, each vice president has a certain kind of personality and talent that is not duplicated by the others. I intend to call upon these talents as they can help the institution and me personally in things that only I can do as President. These ad hoc staff calls should in no way confuse the regular operating arrangements.

I must spend a good deal of time off campus as soon as recruiting and initial stages of academic planning are further under way. I also intend to spend much time on campus walking around and talking to people. When we have more people, the vice presidents should do the same. They should help me look to the future and then help me lead the institution that way. I do not want desk-bound, paper-logged vice presidents (which is what they will be if deans and directors aren't operating the right way). Paper work can always be done at night. If there's too much of it, it's probably the wrong kind, about which something ought to be done anyhow.

Just as I shouldn't be doing vice presidents' jobs by remote control, neither should they for the deans and major directors, who should be allowed to bring their personalities to building Evergreen, within Evergreen's parameters. The vice presidents' main job is to imbue new people with those parameters, our philosophy and goals, and to keep all more or less consistently working toward those goals. This allows deans and directors a good deal of operating latitude providing the vice presidents have made sure about agreement on our constitutional understandings.

The next step--and a critical one--is that the deans and principal directors act in the same way by consulting widely with their counterparts. It will take great tact, diplomacy, and obstinacy on the part of the vice presidents to make sure that barriers are overcome so that cross-college consulting becomes a matter of fact. It must not be necessary for these deans and directors, before they go consulting, to check with their respective vice presidents. That would destroy the whole object. So long as basic understandings are kept strong and consistent, I don't think we need worry.

By understandings I mean a relatively small set of statements of the college goals, and a few of the means by which it will achieve those goals, means which will give the college its distinctive character: Individualized

programs, no all-college requirements for degree, beyond 36 units accumulating work-study option, flat organization, etc.

If people get in the habit of personally taking the responsibility to consult, then a whole list of strictly administrative committees can be done away with (where people get together just to do the things they should have been doing all week as a matter of course by phone or by getting up off their seats to go see a few people). This does away with the morale problem that results when these committees who are made up of people <sup>sitting</sup> actually involved in administration get into making policy over the heads of faculty and students. It also will make it clear that, by and large, the only committees that sit down as committees are policy-making.

Every person in the college has a valid expectation to have his business done promptly with no bureaucratic nonsense, in a workmanlike way, and in good taste. Principal administrators should be responsible for all of these concerns. On the other hand, we're committed to involving all in their legitimate concerns. We must find a way to resolve the two modes since they're certainly not mutually inclusive. Great address should be brought to problems. It shouldn't take so long to develop policy that it's obsolete by the time it's decided upon. This suggests that committees should be large enough to represent faculty and students but yet kept as small as possible; and standing committees should be kept to a minimum, other committees ad hoc as necessary. Since the college council, the principal advisory committee to the president, should be, I suggest, a 2:2:1 ratio (faculty, students and others), perhaps every committee in the college should have an analogous makeup. Each of these committees might review operations and establish policy for smaller groups within the parameters of the purpose of the group and also within the college understandings.

List of further considerations:

- 1) Where ought committees to be: 'at each key budget turnoff?
- 2) Who chairs if the chairman accountable is absent?
- 3) I would like to avoid a separate set of student business and a separate set of faculty business.
- 4) We **still** need to resolve questions about residence hall policies.
- 5) Where does a student with a beef against the prof go?
- 6) How do people get appointed to committees?
- 7) Can this kind of list be developed through a general election and the council name from that list?
- 8) Name a list from which chairmen pick?

Another thing that will decrease the time wasted in committee is the before-the-fact evaluation of student-faculty contacts--the before-the-fact approval; really. If this can become an extremely meaningful and toothsome part of evaluation after the fact, it will cut down on red tape. If faculty member and students develop a course, they offer it. A faculty member's effectiveness and professional sense is evaluated, as well as his teaching ability, afterwards, when evaluation counts.