

I believe that the faculty are in real danger of losing all positive forms of influence over the life of this college. With the decision to define the budget dean in such a way as to virtually preclude faculty candidates, with the hiring of our second external president, with the selection of external vice presidents, provosts, and curricular deans, it becomes clear that the administration of the college will not--as the planning faculty intended--be perpetuated in the hands of the faculty. None of this is intended as a criticism of the people holding these positions: We love them all. It just recognizes that the institution's administrative personnel will not be drawn from the faculty as we had once thought might be the case.

The procedures for meaningful participation by faculty (and students) in the governance of the college are a farce. The consequence of a genuine and well-intended desire to avoid factionalism and rigid bureaucratic structures has been the creation of a non-governance apparatus. Administrators should not be blamed for the seemingly endless parade of memos offering one or another proposal, ceremonially brought before the faculty for "approval" or simply distributed as policy. Having been an administrator here I sympathize with their position: COG X is unworkable for a whole constellation of reasons, not the least of which is that faculty are too busy teaching to devote the time necessary to make it work. Meanwhile reality intrudes: Decisions must be made. Actions must be taken.

I think it's time for the faculty to decide what parts of the business of the college we really want to control and then struggle to gain such control. For me there are three things that seem to matter the most and in which it would probably be feasible to establish some sort of real faculty power.

The first of these is the curriculum. Beyond anything else, Evergreen will be defined by what is taught and by how it is taught. I think we need to get acceptance of the idea that the faculty (through the retreat and specialty areas, but also through smaller gatherings) have the power to decide what will be taught and how it will be taught. We cannot have this right without also accepting a duty; namely one to create a timely and effective way to establish priorities and make hard choices when such choices must be made. We owe the many very dedicated staff here a predictable curriculum expressed coherently so that they can do their work too. One possible way to approach this task would be to vest such power in the council of convenors. There are others.

The second necessary concern of the faculty is its perpetuation. I wasn't here at the creation, but part of our creation mythology is that the planning faculty substituted peer evaluation for tenure. When fully half of the faculty are being evaluated by deans who have never taught in our major curricular mode and may well never do so, one must question whether we have peer evaluation. If we are going to have an administrative structure which makes it very likely that senior deans will not be drawn from the ranks of the faculty, then we should rethink the tenure/peer-evaluation trade-off. My personal preference would be that all of the faculty evaluation/retention decision work be done by two or more deans who are explicitly designated as being drawn from the ranks of the faculty (perhaps by election). There are obviously other procedures which could achieve

the same purpose: insuring that continuation in the faculty is a faculty decision.

The third necessary concern of the faculty is its replenishment. The reason is obvious: if we want the institution's teaching to reflect our goals and values, then we must insure that the faculty hired in the future share those goals and values. In large measure, faculty hiring is already in the hands of the faculty, but there are a few loose ends. One of these is decisions about which positions to fill and in what specialties. These should grow out of faculty curricular planning, but with less attention to specific program needs and more attention to long-range perpetuation of the basic strengths of the faculty. Mostly what's needed is not that we DO faculty hiring in a different way, but rather that we recognize what's at stake and act accordingly.

There may be other aspects of institutional life which are equally vital to faculty. (Clark Kerr once said that a university faculty is a group of people united by a common concern about parking.) These three, however, seem to me to be the most critical ones. If the faculty had clear control over curriculum and our own ranks, we'd be in much the same position as the Catholic Church. And that, after all, has lasted nearly 2000 years.

John Aikin