Tape 1 Side 1

Bill Aldridge: (five) meetings that will have a list of books Dick [Jones] and I (unclear) and others (rustling) touched on and there’s no mystique involved in these at all. It’s just (unclear) getting books here. So since we aren’t going to meet next Monday because we thought there wouldn’t be some people around, for January 4th, and I’m going to put this up on the board and ask you to sign up for the ones you want. Aah, I have down on that paper that Dick handed around “On Authority in Education,” Is that the title?

Richard Jones: Something like that. “Authority In Education” [could be Nash, Paul. Authority and Freedom in Education, 1966]

Aldridge: “Authority in Education.” The idea being that we probably can’t get a book here by January 4th. That has some relevant issues it seems like. And on January 11th I have Meiklejohn [Alexander], [*Education*] *Between Two Worlds*, which should be here next week according to Chris so that we’ll have a week to read it. And January 18th I’ve got Shahn, [Ben], *The Shape of Content*. And on January 25th is Huxley’s book *Island*. And on February 1st a combination which really focuses on reinforcement theory. A combination of two books, one you’re familiar with and one you’re not likely. It’s *Walden II* and *A Clockwork Orange*, which are both very small books and read very rapidly and both focus on the issue of conditioning and reinforcement and what have you, which I think is relevant to our self learning program (unclear). And that’s as far as I went. And…

Robert Sluss?: What do you mean, sign up for?

Bill Aldridge: Well see the problem is like this last time I got stuck with 6 (unclear) books and books that weren’t bought. And so I’m going to ask you to sign… I’m going to put up a list with all of your names on it and I’m going to put the titles of these books across and draw some boxes and please just put your initials on it. I’m not going to be able to use this list. I’ll have to make a bigger one. But put your initials in there… Oh yeah, just check off if you want to buy the book and then I’ll only order the number of books that you say you’ll buy. Okay? I’ll put out a little announcement about this too in writing so that everybody will have it. And that way I’ll just order the number of books that you guys say you want. So that way I’ll have that. I don’t personally have the problem of being stuck with $38 dollars worth of books that may or may not get bought.

: Can you deduct (unclear) on your income tax?

Bill Aldridge: Well I think they’re probably take them back. Yeah, business law (everyone chuckling).

: You can have half of my bottle of scotch if I ever (unclear) (laughter).

Richard Brian (Moderator): Okay. Are there any other one second announcements…

Richard Alexander: Can we go on record as proposing the bottle of scotch be paid off by New Year’s or something? (laughter)

Bill Aldridge: If you have objections to this list because they aren’t in any order or anything. It was mainly the technicalities of getting them here (unclear). Let me know and then we can bring it up in the meeting when we have some more time to discuss across the table (unclear)…

: One question on this (unclear) (rustling). Has the Reich *The Greening of America* come out in paperback yet?

Dick Jones(?): No.

Richard Brian (Moderator): No but it’s (unclear) point of order. Jack?

Jack Webb: I want to announce that the meeting of the DTF on (unclear CS?) is at 2:00 o’clock (talking in the background).

Richard Brian: On What?

Webb: The DTF on (unclear) is 2 o’clock.

: 2 o’clock?

: Kill that man (laughter)

: (unclear) You said 3 before.

Richard Brian (Moderator): (unclear) the time. 2 o’clock? Today? Today. We’re in the middle of…

Sluss? Or Hitchens: Faculty meeting is scheduled till 3.

Jack Webb: Scheduled until 3?

: Yes

Webb: Well, I didn’t understand that, chairman.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Well we have… We’re going to reconvene at 2:30. There’s a slight interruption but it was originally scheduled at 3 o’clock. I assume that we are planning that time even if we have to go somewhere else if it’s in the middle of a heated discussion. (People talking at the same time).

: OK I will reschedule until (people talking at once) 3.

Beryl Crowe: That’s the kind of decision I like to see.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Okay. Any other announcements? First item on the agenda… (People talking at the same time).

: (unclear) put that out in a memo?

R. Alexander: (unclear) Just put it down Bill …as something to think about.

Aldridge?: Okay.

: Another announcement, (unclear) Craig Davis, Professor of Biology at San Diego State, was in the area visiting family and he’s come here to hear about us. So we’ve been bending his ear and invited him to come to the meeting, watch us do what we do.

Davis: I promise not to say anything.

Richard Brian (Moderator): We accept. (People talking at the same time) (laughter).

Larry Eickstaedt? or Fred Young?: Power trip, power trip.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Faculty meeting mode is the first item on the agenda. And it says that Item A is the agreement on specific means for making decisions and knowing when you’ve made them. There seems to be two parts to this, majority vote or question of consensus, and secondly, shall be on a trial basis or and until otherwise decided or how long the duration and so forth. I open this to discussion. Perhaps Sid will introduce this, making an introductory statement concerning this. You want to tell us anything about it?

Sid White: Okay I’ll go. There’s one person here. I think it’s obvious that we want to resolve, you know, implement (unclear) you know, continue a discussion about this. So, I would like to recommend that we use the following mode. A) That the moderator make every attempt to achieve consensus or a mode of consensus in this group. We can do this by or verify that a consensus exists by stating at some point in the discussion what he understands to be the consensus so that if there is any question as to whether there is a consensus or not that can be called to the attention of who the moderator is. In the event that a consensus is not established that then a vote can be called. Also that we choose this mode until decided otherwise.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Any discussion?

Fred Young: It’s important that we have a way of arriving at decisions.

Richard Brian (Moderator): May the chair ask for clarification on one point? How do you know when a consensus has been arrived at?

Sid White: The moderator as I… I’ll repeat what I said before… After sufficient discussion in order that everybody has expressed their thoughts on the matter, the moderator, if he feels, and its something I’m assuming that the discussion is to try to find consensus, deals with the consensus is there or periodically state what he thinks might be consensus if it is there. If that is so then that is so designated as a decision reached by consensus. When he states what he understands to be the consensus of the group, if any member of the group feels that that does not represent the consensus then we can vote to determine what is the exact, umm distribution of opinion in the group and that is recorded. Does that answer your question?

Richard Brian (Moderator): Then the moderator goes by feeling?

Sid White: By listening. (People talking at the same time.) And also by intending to promote.

Richard Brian (Moderator): When he thinks a consensus has been reached and anyone who does not feel that a specific consensus is there is to protest the moderator’s formulation. Any other discussion? Question of the majority vote. That was also in this same… Any comment?

: How do we… I hear no descention (?). Should I assume that there is a…?

Robert Sluss: I’m a little bothered. How does this solve problems? That is, suppose a consensus isn’t reached. Then what would we do?

Multiple voices: Then we vote.

: Oh then you vote. Oh, okay.

Willi Unsoeld: And then it’s a majority.

That’s right, yes.

: Minority recorded?

Richard Brian (Moderator): Okay. Then it’s consensus first and if consensus is not reached then a vote is taken. Are there any time limits or how does…at what point do you…?

Richard Alexander (Recorder) (or Fred Young): That has to be the role of the moderator.

R. Jones?: Yes.

: You need a moderator is going to try …(unclear)

Richard Brian (Moderator): (unclear) in discussion I think that for a reasonable length of time or whatever (people talking at once).

Willi Unsoeld? or Jack Webb?: If someone has something further to offer, you know, when it’s obviously blocked then that has to be up to the moderator. Then you take the vote that way.

Richard Brian (Moderator) Ah any… How about the second? Well, I sense a consensus that this is a reasonable mode of proceeding in faculty meetings, an acceptable mode that we track or arrive at consensus on the questions before us. That the moderator’s job is to try to sense a consensus and to state it and if there are any objections from any members who are present that they will voice this objection to what they think is the moderator’s sensing of the consensus. And if a impass (?) is reached then a vote be taken and a majority… And that really goes to the next question, the majority of the forum or whatever will be… Because in other words, the vote will be based on the majority of some forum as we have established in the moment. Is that more or less…?

Various voices: Yes

Richard Brian (Moderator): Okay. Is there any… The second part of this deals with how long this should be implemented.

Sid White: I recommend that it be until decided otherwise.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Any…yes. Agreed? That until this issue should arise again that this will be our trial mode. Item B asks the question, how - what constitutes a forum? Fred?

Fred Young: I suggest 12.

Richard Brian (Moderator): That the quorum be …

Bill Aldridge: So we can make decisions today (laughs).

(People talking at once.)

Richard Brian (Moderator): That it will be established by 12 people.

Beryl Crowe: I asked for this on the agenda so I’d like to speak to it. I’m opposed to seeing any specific number in a forum. It seems to me that you know we are always… Well, first of all, decisions that this body thought it had taken from time to time and have been questioned and validated because of people being present or not being present. It seems to me that we have, you know, an obligation to this body as a whole that we always make choices. We decide our priorities and consequently I don’t think we should set a quorum. You know, we call ourselves the uh…umm, “committee on what”? …committee of the whole and that the committee of the whole be composed of those members present and voting. We all have our own sets of priorities and we make your decisions as to where you place your choices. That you not be able to delay the ability of this body to make decisions by non attendance or that it not be delayed by non attendance. But you know we all make our choices on where we’re going to put our priorities and our time and the decision made to those present and voting constitutes a decision of this planning body.

Richard Brian (Moderator): In other words, just to paraphrase what I hear, that the word quorum is still usable but the quorum is the members of the faculty and deans who are present at the time when the issue is to be decided.

Beryl Crowe: Present and voting.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Present and voting. And that that takes care of consensus but then in the case of the majority, it’s the majority of the members who are present and voting.

Sid White: I would like to make one… If that’s what we did, I would want one qualification and that is that this… It should be understood that either we have regularly scheduled meetings. It might be Monday afternoon. So that everybody in the faculty knows that there’s a meeting. Or if there are any meetings that are called that are special meetings for any pending decisions that everybody has to be notified because certainly if you had meetings that were called spontaneously, then members of the faculty have no opportunity to participate. (People talking at the same time.)

Richard Brian (Moderator): Is that acceptable?

Beryl Crowe: Why don’t we just throw in a 24 hour call anyway? That speeds up the decision making process… 24 hour call in the presence of an agenda.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Is that agreeable to you in terms of your…? 24 hour call.

Sid White: Yes

Dave Hitchens: There is kind of a middle ground between you know an arbitrary number of 12 or two thirds. That’s just a simple… one more than 50% if you have 10 people.

Beryl Crowe: Well even there Dave. My feeling is that you make your choices. You select your priorities. All of our time is scarce and if you decide that you want to put your energy somewhere else, then you’ve made that choice and that shouldn’t interfere with the ability of this body to make decisions.

Richard Brian (Moderator): In other words, for example, if there were 7 people present, 4 could carry the decision if it came to a vote.

Various voices: sure – right

Sid White (or Beryl Crowe): As long as it’s 24 hours notice I don’t mind… (People talking at the same time.)

Larry Eickstaedt: Sometimes you don’t have a choice about being present or not. Many times you can’t help it. If one is (unclear) a broken leg… in traction it is really difficult to consider the other choices of the situation.

Beryl Crowe: By conversly, you know, can we inhibit and stop this decision making process of this body given the urgency in the press of decisions have to be made until your leg mends.

Jack Webb?: No, agreed. But there are situations where executive assignment that can take somebody off campus…

Beryl Crowe: Well that too is a decision of priority.

Richard Brian (Moderator): The moderator will all the names of people who are to speak and in an order for 3 in advance. Jack, you had your hand up a minute ago anyway I believe…

Jack Webb: I’ve already said what I was going to say.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Okay, then Bob and then Rudy.

Robert Sluss: I think that the body here would be willing to go along with Larry where you can make something that feels very strong about would notify us to postpone (someone interjecting)… You know, I think that this body would be very reasonable and responsive to somebody’s particular wish.

(People talking at the same time-Aldridge identifiable)

Robert Sluss: Beryls notion, anybody who’s here. And then if I couldn’t be here and I’d ask you well can you try to postpone the vote so I could be here. I feel pretty strong about it, I have a notion to do it.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Can the moderator would take that as essentially an addition to Sid’s request that somehow not only a 24 hour notice but also an agenda for that particular meeting also be published…is that agreeable with you Beryl?

Beryl Crowe: Yeah that is my addition to his remarks, 24 hours and then an agenda.

Rudy Martin: Well, I was simply going to support Beryl’s point. We’ve all come to meetings called at 1 o’clock and a quarter to 2, you know. And on the other hand (person coughing in background) some various kinds of reasons to miss meetings. It seems to me that the crux of getting our business done is such that we can’t afford to continue that. I think that this will be one way of eliciting support and response from faculty. Now in the same line, just as Bob [Sluss] says that the group is probably willing to postpone a particular item of business of great interest to some individual member. I think also we have enough trust in each other to abide by the decisions made by the rest of the group in our absence. So I support Beryl.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Someone over here …Jack and then Bill.

Jack Webb: Yeah, I think in keeping with that I think we all have a responsibility to each other to keep each other informed. Since we put it on the moderator that there are such things as telephones and leaving messages in people’s boxes about things. And I’ve missed a few things because I wasn’t informed about them. I had to leave and so forth. I’d certainly be willing to ask for responsibility to each other in getting these things expedited and fulfilled even to the extent of carrying somebody else’s statement (unclear) (rustling) into the meeting (unclear) or using long distance funds necessary for the telephone if somebody has to be off campus.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Is that acceptable, Beryl, as far as your concerned? To have people have some input if they make the effort through non present (methods)?

Beryl Crowe: Sure so long as it doesn’t inhibit the decision making process.

Sid White?: No, no that would not. It would only tend to increase it.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Okay. Bill?

Bill Aldridge: I simply wanted to support the notion of Beryl’s idea. And I would like to sort of firm it up a little and I’d like to have the moderator have the final say as to whether or not my reason for being absent is important enough that that item ought to be reserved.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Ok, Is that agreeable Beryl? In other words, you’re saying that the contingency is whether or not an input from the outside is valid defense (?) on some…

Beryl Crowe: Or to the group.

Bill Aldridge: Either way.

Beryl Crowe: Put it to the group whether the issue is so pressing that a decision has to be made. Those times are going to show up…with frequency. [said amongst exclamations of agreement].

Richard Brian (Moderator): At this point I’d like to attempt a consensus with a sense of consensus on the quality of… Oh, Larry?

Larry Eickstadt: I just wanted to clarify something. The 24 hour time period, will that be the time the notices go into the mailbox or…?

Richard Brian (Moderator): I’m sensing 24 hours, it must be in the mailbox 24 hours before the meeting is to be… the hour the meeting is to convene. That is to a 1 o’clock meeting, it must be in before 1 o’clock the previous day. The consensus which I seem to sense is that the meetings shall be conducted by the decisions being made by consensus. And if consensus is not possible by a majority vote of those people present and voting and that decisions will be made at that time will stand as faculty decisions. That there is a possibility of input from people who are not present. If they have someone carry the message or make some special effort and that the moderator will make a decision as to whether or not the input should be or the group consensus should be… Wait a minute, I have to rephrase that…

Richard Alexander: You sure do!

Everyone: (laughter)

Richard Brian (Moderator)… That the assembled body shall decide whether or not this input from non present members shall be accepted or not if there’s any question.

: That isn’t quite…

Sid White: I didn’t hear it that way because I would assume that we always would accept input. The question is whether, as I understood, that the group would determine whether the nature of the business was such that required…uh (people talking at once)… The people who should be there who weren’t there to participate. That would be the determination of this group.

Richard Brian (Moderator): I think that’s the consensus. Would you put that in a single sentence in terms of if the input from non present members…?

Sid White: The group will determine whether it is necessary to delay decisions or not.

Beryl Crowe: A little different word… I think possible, you know, rather than necessary. In some way indeed it is possible. There is some where Barry [Provost] is going to say I want something day after tomorrow and to defer that into a (unclear)…just impossible.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Alright, would you like to have the recorder read back the consensus or to pass onto the next issue?

Sid White: It would probably be good if you read it back.

Richard Alexander: Ahhh. There are some things missing from this. Meetings should be conducted… so as to reach decisions by consensus. Ahh, but if that isn’t possible, decisions should be arrived at by majority vote of those present and voting. Input from non present members is always welcome. Those present at the meeting can determine whether business should be postponed because of absences. You want a… I assume people want some mention of the 24 hours…?

Everyone: Yes

Richard Alexander: And is the meeting in agreement that 24 hours means 24 hours before the hour of the meeting?

Everyone: Yes.

Richard Alexander: And that’s 24 hours with a written agenda.

General Agreement: No agenda, no meeting.

Bill Aldridge: One possible weakness in the sense of it if it is necessary, 24 hours could mean Sunday afternoon at 1 o’clock, but ahh…

Richard Alexander: Well that’s at least 24 hours.

Richard Brian (Moderator): That’s 24 hours of working day time. In other words, if it’s to be at Monday noon then it would be Friday noon.

Bill Aldridge: I think the sense of that is clear though. (multiple voices)

Richard Brian (Moderator): I have 3, says agreement of specific elements be included in meeting mode. Selection to be made in the following suggestions plus any others which might be forthcoming. The first one says the faculty should elect a moderator and charge him to expedite discussions which lead to firm decisions. Is Bob Bernard here?

There was a written proposal from something… Has it been circulated or not?

: No

Richard Brian (Moderator) Where is… Is he in a meeting?

Sid White: Fred and can I also talk about it.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Alright, would someone please speak to Item 1 please?

Fred Young: I thought that this was to be distributed at the forum long before now. There is a proposed resolution (rustling) (unclear) (inaudible) And only a very small part of it has this Item 1 on here. Briefly, the resolution has to do with a request to the provost that he designate a Dean to essentially become part of the faculty, perhaps in a revolving status. But for someone who would be present and responsible to the… They have a number of responsibilities. One of these would be to (unclear) faculty with decisions that have to be made and deadlines associated with them. In other words, part 1 would be to convey actions of the faculty to the proper sources, to the proper levels of administration. Forgotten what else there was. There was one thing that was somewhat questionable. I’m not sure whether this is in Bob’s final memo or not. The recommendation was that this dean should act as moderator. In as much as later on, the moderator does not express personal views while conducting meetings as these things are accepted. But that he is present, that he is… participates not only in the general faculty meetings but in both sessions and meetings and to the extent he can, DTF’s. Essentially he’s our captive dean. The ideas that of a dean is one third faculty, then let’s have him here one third of his time to participate and work with the faculty directly. My own feeling, I’m departing from Bob in this, I have no strong feelings one way or the other about the moderator bit, whether the moderator comes from the faculty or (unclear)….

(inaudible) memo (unclear) did suggest that this dean would be the moderator.

Richard Brian (Moderator): May I try to phrase that to say that the suggestion is that one of the deans be designated to be essentially the faculty liaison between the faculty and the provost?

Fred Young: Yes. (Unclear) the experience of going to three deans and asking the same questions and getting three different answers.

Richard Brian (Moderator): That he also be the moderator of the group and at faculty meetings and that he be the first in charge with carrying our decisions to the provost.

Richard Alexander: I have the resolution. So there’s no reason for us to try to reconstruct it. I can read it or distribute it.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Why don’t you do both.

Richard Alexander: In as much as the faculty feel one that there is an adequate liaison between themselves and the administration, two the communication channels seem obscure and subject to unexpected clogging, and three that too frequently there is a dismal feeling of wheels spinning. We hereby resolve to request the provost to designate one of the Deans as a member of the faculty pro tem. The dean to participate in all faculty meetings and as many Disappearing Task Force sessions as he can stand, and to have two basic responsibilities: One, to acquaint the faculty with business that needs to be done, decisions that need to be reached and timetables for same; Two, to transmit to the etherial levels of administration the results of all faculty deliberation of action. Three, coordinate faculty Disappearing Task Forces, including generation of and distribution of agendas and reports. It is much as it is our understanding that a dean is the equivalent of one third of a faculty member, we suggest that the honored position of captive dean be rotated among the illustrious gentlemen in any way that is deemed suitable, convenient and least likely to disrupt the finely tuned machinery of (tuning fork sound) administration.

Dave Hitchens?: I think the tong is highly commendable.

Richard Brian (Moderator): The resolution does not include the having moderator position.

Richard Alexander: It certainly doesn’t.

Fred Young: That got removed (unclear)

Richard Brian (Moderator): Okay. Can we speak to the people addressed themselves to the resolution as it stands and modify afterwards? Bob?

Robert Sluss: I’m in favor of it as it stands.

Richard Brian (Moderator): And the question of moderator then should not be raised…

Robert Sluss: I think that should be… I’m against having the dean be the moderator.

Sid White: When we talked in the office, when we talked about what I think is closest (unclear) we talked about that the Dean and the moderator wouldwork closely in drawing up (unclear) faculty and administration making the conditions as to what should go on (unclear). The dean would be in a position to get the input sent to our agendas in terms of what was necessary. Also as I recall you were saying, (unclear) the secretary service would be available (people talking at once) the dean will be here to assure that the inputs go back out. So I feel that this will be (inaudible)…

Richard Alexander (Recorder): …understand what I’m supposed to write. Let me try to paraphrase.

Sid White: Now this is just by way of clarifying what some of our discussion was as to why…

Richard Alexander: (People talking at once)… because I’m not clear on your clarification so…

Sid White: The idea is that this dean will not be chairman, would work closely with the chairman and his… (End of Tape 1 Side 1)

Tape 1 Side 2

: …Concerning Martin’s earlier point… Why aren’t the deans and the faculty in effect the provost’s advisory council. One role of the deans is to convey the results of our deliberations to the provost. And isn’t this the present structure? Isn’t this not only in the faculty handbook but also the way we have operated so far? Wouldn’t charging the deans with the responsibility for reporting to the provost further define their role? I’m a little bit puzzled if this was a decision we made at one time, why we feel called upon now to specify one dean as our captive dean? It might be necessary to get him here at all.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Can I ask for a clarification… Fred?

Fred Young: We are agreed that this is discussed before. We feel that it is an important function and feel that it hasn’t been done. The purpose of this resolution is essentially to (unclear) according to the handbook and other (people talking in background)… a feeling of those of us in particular Sid (unclear) and I were discussing was that this could thus be accomplished by having an officially designated dean to bear this responsibility. The presence of this responsibility does not seem to be assumed by anyone.

Willi Unsoeld?: Well I wonder… I’m just looking for clarification. I don’t have any real strong stand but I sense that the resolution countermands at least part of the sense of our previous deliberation in that it affects the status of the other two deans. Or would it not? Would they still be considered faculty, although somewhat less so? Or rather not by command?

: Sid, did you want to respond to that?

Sid White: No what I would say is I would hope that (people talking in background) this would (unclear) not feel that all three deans should be here, yes so indicated. I don’t understand it or I myself would not advocate altering that. I agree with Fred and with Bob. If you designate one and given all the pressures that they are under, this is a way of facing up with reality of time and on the other hand I don’t feel we should in any way suggest the other deans are not also welcome.

Willi Unsoeld?: My suggestion would be that this resolution might be rewritten to make that clear.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Moderator would like to restate the resolution in one sentence. Essentially the resolution suggests that one of the deans be designated as the direct liaison between the faculty and the provost whose responsibility in these three lines is well defined. Even if this is rotated among the deans that at any one time only one of them be charged with this responsibility.

: Yeah I think this is necessary Willi because we have to have a person close to the…(unclear) we really know that it’s official going towards (unclear). Because if, you know, we leave it like it is we may get three different responses when we try to carry something from this body (unclear). If just one of them is responsible that gives us an official route into the administration that I think we are able to meet (unclear).

: Also I’ll add in that to suggest to the administration that they you know provide the necessary support to fulfill these functions that I well understand why the deans don’t attend. If the administration is providing no support in terms of their other commitments…

Richard Brian (Moderator): The moderator senses a consensus and would now like to restrict the discussion input be only by people who have not spoken to this question previously. Jack and then Bill.

: This deals with a different issue (unclear) resolution…

Richard Brian (Moderator): I sense a sense of consensus on the resolution that a single being be designated as our specially a liaison between the faculty and the provost to transmit to bring the problems to us and through which we may indicate the resolutions we’ve made. And that this be designated only one person at a time.

: My comments on the resolution (rustling) (unclear) what Willi has brought up (unclear) was what I meant.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Does it deal with this issue that I’m…?

: It deals with the sense of the resolution… (unclear)

Richard Brian (Moderator): The moderator senses that the resolution as such should not be forwarded per se but simply that statement the request of the provost that he designate or in some way a single being be designated, has received consensus here?

: I didn’t understand why… I don’t see why we shouldn’t.

Richard Brian (Moderator): My sense is that the… alright… (multiple voices)

: I added on this sentence. Could I bring that in? That’s a different thing that I really wanted to bring up but… Well let me ask Willi if this sentence…

Richard Brian (Moderator): The moderator senses that as this resolution stands, that it is the consensus is that as it stands should not be sent straight to the provost but some…

: Could I clarify this, Dick, just clarity? My objection in this, Sid, would be in that first sentence, we hereby resolve to request a provost to designate one of the deans as a member of the faculty pro ten. You see, the sense of that is that it’s only a temporary member of the faculty. And my sense is that they are permanent members, all three of them, and always have been. And what we want to do is mail one of them. So all you’d have to do is say to designate one of the deans as a special liaison, specialty faculty-provost liaison. Designate one of the deans as a specialty faculty-provost liaison as an official. Let’s make it official.

: As official faculty.

: Yeah, as official faculty hyphen provost.

: That we hereby resolve to request the provost to designate one of the deans as a special as official faculty-provost liaison.

: Yes. And then all the rest can ride it seems.

: Alright, Bill. Did you want to speak to the memo?

Bill Aldridge: Mine was just on the (unclear) memo which I think is very funny but of which I think would react very negatively to…

Richard Brian (Moderator): I see heads nodding. My consensus is that there is some objection to the memo, the tone of the memo. And probably a simpler statement to request should be sent, simply requesting what we’ve already had consensus on and that this resolution as it stands should not be sent.

: And that Bernard should receive a special award of commendation (laughter).

Richard Brian (Moderator): Alright fine. That the tone of the consensus should be enjoyed by all should not be forwarded. (multiple voices). Jack?

Jack Webb: I would like to register a very strong objection to two statements in the memo, both of which are (unclear)… The attendance of beings at the disciplinary taskforce sections. Some beings are assigned to these. They’re assigned by the vice president and provost. The committees report directly to the provost…

: Are you still speaking about the resolution? To this resolution?

Jack Webb: Indeed I am.

: The resolution as such has the consensus that is not going to be sent anyway. You still need to…

Jack Webb: Oh okay. Well I’d like to make clarification, an attempt. I’m sure the DTS will ask deans to participate in them but the function of the chairman of the DTF (?) is simply that of number three and this number three would in fact violate the vice president’s charge to the chairman, who has the responsibility to report both to (unclear)…

Richard Brian (Moderator): Okay, thank you. Is there any other comment on the resolution? (silence) Alright. Does that satisfy the conditions of (unclear) Item 1 under part C?

: It has nothing to do with that. (multiple voices)

: It somehow came up but then it proved…

: I have a clarification question. We’ve decided I guess that it should not be sent as it is but that something should be sent. Who’s going to do it? (multiple voices)

: …To request such action be taken of the provost or provost among the deans to make such an arrangement. I see that in Item 1, part of the resolution was that the dean actually be designated as moderator. And since that did not carry, then we must return to Item…

: Since I’m designated to do this, I’d like to simply go over this to find out sentence by sentence what people think ought to be changed. This is the most efficient way to do it and I think can be done rather quickly. I’ve already made the following changes and if anybody objects to them just say as I read it. In as much as the faculty feel that there is an adequate liaison between themselves and the administration, and two, the communication channels often seem obscure and subject to clogging, to hereby resolve to request the provost to designate one of the deans as official faculty provost liaison. This dean is to participate in all faculty meetings and, now I don’t know what change should be made because I’m not entirely sure that the force of Jack’s… (multiple voices)…

: Everything was out after that. The rest of it (unclear) unnecessary…

: No, no, wait, wait, wait. Now it’s to acquaint the faculty with business that needs to be done and decisions that need to be reached and time tables for the same. Now you want to (unclear) that as well?

:No. That would be one of the functions…

: I mean, it’s one of his specific functions. Okay. To transmit to the administration the results of all faculty deliberation and action. Now, do you want to excise number three? Coordinate…

: Yes (multiple voices)…

: Okay….

: In fact that was the added addition of the third basic responsibility when we stated that there were only two basic responsibilities.

: Right. And so the second paragraph is deleted since there was no consensus to that. Now we’re back to Item 1…

: Now wait a minute. Do we have any feelings about whether this position should be rotated among the deans or not?

: I’m in favor. (multiple voices)

: May I simply point out that now we are addressing ourselves to the question of who should be the moderator? (multiple voices)

: The last paragraph, short (?) of its humorous comments merely says that it raises the question whether one dean should have this role constantly or whether it should change, whether the position should shift from dean to dean over time.

: Since we’re making the suggestion, obviously it’s his decision, and I for one feel that it’s a good suggestion that can be rotated. It’s a way of being in close contact with all the deans. It’s a way of also saying clearly that we welcome having that relationship (unclear)…

: Sid, do you care how often it’s rotated?

: No. I feel that’s…

: In other words, if it were rotated once a week you wouldn’t care?

: Yeah I would actually.

: Do we wish to leave this entirely to the provost and the deans to determine or?

: They’re going to be traveling and out of town.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Excuse me, point of order. Bob…?

: I’d like to suggest we leave it to the deans but suggest to them that some kind of rotation system (unclear)…

Richard Brian (Moderator): Bob?

Bob Bernard: I think the deans have suggested to treat quarterly at their rotating they could be out of town and it’s their responsibility to (unclear) but at least to get some continuity to how often the communication exists between the deans and the administration. (unclear) might be in one person’s hands long enough to see that a good job gets done.

: By quarterly you mean three months?

: I just suggest quarterly and they could respond to that.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Alright. Fred and then Jack.

Fred Young: I would favor the three month period not because of the acts that may or may not take place but rather propose that the benefit that the dean acting as this…

Richard Brian (Moderator): We’ll be with you in just a sec. Jack?

Jack Webb: I would like to raise what may appear to be a simple question to so many of us that have felt very strongly against any kind of hierarchical structure, whether it be in the area of governance or communication. Why cannot the moderator be charged with this responsibility rather than the dean?

: That of course challenges the whole resolution.

: Yes it does.

: You wish to… (unclear)

: Well I just sense an awfully strong feeling among the part of a lot of us…

Richard Brian (Moderator): Well the moderator doesn’t sense that feeling, Jack. And…

: I mean earlier on in the weeks, I sense that feeling.

: May I suggest that Jack has raised a rather interesting point that actually one would like to mull over in that this would offer us an opportunity for a recess to reconvene following the meeting that’s scheduled here…

: So along with the question of the resolution is still open and we’ll reconvene at 2:30 exactly… (multiple voices)

: Okay, the meeting has now reconvened. Jack Webb has raised an objection to the sense of the resolution that’s going and I’d like to have him restate it and render a discussion. I’ll accept 15 minutes discussion. In which time we either form a consensus or we take a vote. And Sid wishes to reply to Jack. Would you restate your concern please?

Sid White: My concern has been that over the past month or two, several of the faculty if not a major portion of them are concerned with the establishment of hierarchical patterns within the faculty complex. And that they are fairly strongly against this mode of operation. While it does not seem to me that having a dean function in a reportorial way from the faculty to the provost, it may carry that connotation with it. It seems perfectly reasonable and a lot less redundant to simply have the moderator serve the function that the memo proposes, that a dean serves for that reason that I’ve already spoken to. And also because of the problem of the assignments that the provost gives to the deans. (multiple voices) Prior commitments to which the deans must make to the provost which might get in the way of this (unclear)… I see no reason why a moderator, by the word moderator, simply can’t be substituted for the interim dean and that this would simplify procedures and perhaps avoid one of the things that I sense to have concerned us as a faculty over a longer period of time.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Sid?

Sid White: Well I was… I’m one member of the faculty who was and still am concerned about the matter of hierarchy. And I’m interested as a member of this faculty and our finding of ways of getting around that whole (unclear) of hierarchy. The reason why is I found the model of the resolution acceptable and the reason why I feel comfortable about what we’re doing now is that it doesn’t assign to a member of the faculty or groups of faculty a function which I feel earlier had been considered and that is representing the faculty in some way in between the faculty and the provost. As I see it, this is a functional… And Fred persuaded me toward this. This is a very functional way of seeing to it that the ideas of this faculty have an input into the administration and also that the concerns of the administration have clear input. I would object to the idea of a dean being the moderator because I would feel that would create the kind of hierarchy you were speaking to and that I’ve been concerned about. Seems to be that it is a fact that deans are a part of the administration. It is a fact that the deans meet with the provost and have their times allocated to do this. It is a fact as I see it in terms of the resolution that this is a reporting function and it is one that involves augmenting (unclear) reports from the provost and the provost can enforce (unclear). I don’t see that as a power or status or hierarchy function. I think it is an interfacing between this faculty operating in a responsible way and the administration operating in a responsible way. So I for one have no concern about that particular role for a dean’s functional role.

Jack Webb: Let me respond briefly to that. If it is simply a functional role, why cannot we just say that the deans, as full time faculty members which they are, be present and participate in faculty meetings, and that the moderator carry or serve as that informational liaison between…

: I think it’s more functional for the dean to be (unclear) with the information…

Richard Brian (Moderator): Point of order. Fred?

Fred Young: Well first is the original as Jack suggested about the moderator serving as functional. I think this is putting an extreme load on the moderator. To acquaint the faculty with business that needs to be done and decisions that need to be reached and timetables for the same, this is the sort of thing that the deans would presumably know. That the moderator presumably doesn’t. That it would require particular time on his part and on the part of the provost for someone to get this information. Second, I don’t think that the proposal really suggests anything new about the role of the deans or about inserting any new levels of authority or anything of that sort. The functions that are spelled out here are functions that I always assume the deans would have. That somehow the function hasn’t been working. We haven’t been getting the proper communication. The only time that we have got communication was from Barry. And I don’t think that it… I know the demands upon his time. I don’t think that we should have to wait until to have Barry come in and say you should have been making this decision. The deadline is tomorrow. And all that we’re doing here is trying to pin down and make the administration aware that these channels of communication should be a clear path. And the easiest way to do that is not to share the responsibility but to have one of the deans at a time have a responsibility recognized by the faculty and the provost to accomplish these ends.

: Jack, may I assume that either that you have been sufficiently satisfied and I can call a consensus as I think we had before? Or do you wish to have the (unclear) what to decide… Is there more discussion?

: I don’t think we’re ready for it (mumbling) a number of things to be said…

Richard Brian (Moderator): Jack and then Beryl.

Jack Webb: I agree with everything that you have said, Fred. And I’m convinced that ideally it should operate this way for the reasons that you suggest. However, I think in the past it has been our experience as you have said that these roles did not function in this way. And I question the assumption whether Barry does not have the time to provide the other end of that input or is not willing to give it to a faculty moderator. This is with no connotations to be attached to the relations of the deans to the faculty or to the provost. But simply that it has not functioned in the past and I’m wondering if we are being empirically thoughtful with regard to this.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Beryl?

Beryl Crowe: I think that what we are trying to do is to provide a mechanism by which in terms of the realities of this world a role that’s been functionally described but not functionally fulfilled that will become operational. I would hope that the dean is indeed a great deal more (unclear). I would hope that he’s a functional participant in the decision making process as well. I think that it’s extremely unrealistic to expect neither the provost or the deans given the low (?) that exists around here and the pressures of decision making to expect all three of them to be in attendance for any one of the meetings. It seems to me that we made a step in the desirable direction. If we can be fairly well assured of the attendance of one of them. They will act as a liaison communicate with the other three. So as far as establishing a hierarchy it seems to me that the step on the road towards breaking it down. If a hierarchy is established so long as the faculty sets in (unclear) isolation and only communicates with its deans by memo. It seems to me to be moving in the very opposite direction, trying to integrate us and make us one whole decision making body.

: You say this and suddenly I’m unsure whether this means Jack’s proposal or Bernard’s proposal.

: This means the resolution…

: He’s speaking in favor of…

: … In favor of a dean being specifically chosen.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Again is there any further discussion? I sense a consensus except perhaps with Jack and I think he has a… I don’t know if we’ve satisfied your affairs. If not, I’ll be…

: I’d like to go on record to saying that they are not theories, that they are just questions to be raised in light of past attitudes…(multiple voices) And that I’d like to clear the air on that before we proceeded…

: I think that is a very good question to have raised myself and I at the same time am convinced that Sid pointed out, I’m comfortable… I’ve been most concerned at least as concerned as anybody about the hierarchical thing and I don’t think this leads in that direction.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Moderator senses and sense of consensus that the resolution as it was originally stated to direct a single dean to have responsibility for a liaison between faculty and provost should be implemented… As amended, be implemented.

: I just marked my copy of the resolution.

Richard Brian (Moderator): I ask the recorder to read the resolution as it will go to the provost…

Richard Alexander: You want me to read it? I don’t have the last paragraph written but I’ll just read the minutes I’ve got here. In as much as the faculty feels one that there is an adequate liaison between themselves and the administration, and two that communication channels often seem obscure and subject to (unclear)… We hereby resolve to request a provost to designate one of the deans as official faculty-provost liaison. This dean is to participate in all faculty meetings and one to acquaint the faculty with business that needs to be done, decisions that need to be reached and timetables the same. And two to transmit to the administration the results of all (unclear) deliberation and action. I’ve got a little note that this post should rotate among the deans (unclear)…

Richard Brian (Moderator): Alright. Then let’s return to Item 1 under C, which are suggestions for modes of operation and the first recommendation is that the faculty elect a moderator and charge him to expedite the discussions which lead to firm decisions. Any discussions? Yes, Jack then Rudy.

Jack Webb: I would like to nominate the current moderator as the moderator.

Richard Brian (Moderator): That’s out of order. These are just modes of operation. Rudy?

Rudy Martin: I have a question about the last clause. Should all of our deliberations lead to pertinent decisions? Okay this says that a charge of discussions that lead to pertinent decisions… Does that mean all the time or when there are decisions to be made?

Richard Brian (Moderator): The sense of the statement I think is at least to know when decisions have been made and that they can be stated.

: Yeah, unless we were to state specifically to make sure that all meetings did this then the general statement certainly applies that other things will take place.

Richard Brian (Moderator): The moderator sees a sense of the meeting as that a moderator should be charged to conduct meetings. That I think is the sense of the first statement.

: I think one other (unclear) should be the terms for which you should serve. This I don’t think has appeared (multiple voices)…

: Somebody give me a copy of the agenda. I don’t have one. I don’t want to take somebody else’s. Who’s got more… (unclear)…

Richard Brian (Moderator): Alright. Let’s settle the first issue. I sense a consensus that the faculty feels that a moderator should be elected to conduct the meetings and that’s the first item. A term of office… if the moderator may interject… the term of office seems perhaps… (End of Tape 1 Side 2) (763).

Tape 2 Side 1

: I agree with Beryl. I have two questions though that we should (unclear) more about the moderator’s role (unclear) (inaudible).

: We should talk more I think about the means whereby we select the moderator and also when we say (unclear) of the faculty, in the means whereby the event that somebody might not be functioning technically. This can become very awkward, I think can be awkward for us when we’re (unclear)…

: It could be awkward if we for some reason or other …

: It seems to me that if we proceed down the same old track of roles within this faculty becoming ones of prestige, respect and deference, if the role of moderator is to serve the same function at this institution as the president of the faculty serves at traditional institutions which is when the prime steps toward a (unclear), then I think we can worry about such things. If we’re going to learn to behave in a very different way, if we are going to more closely approximate a family which is one of the terms that’s been used around here to describe the change in relationships that is going to exist in this faculty, then we don’t have to be as embarrassed about making these sorts of suggestions. I don’t see why a motion can’t come from before any kind (unclear) to become satisfied and be open to discussion. I sure hope that that becomes a pattern of openness around here. No, I think there are a lot of things that we have to learn here. And if we tie them down and formalize them we see (unclear). That’s one of the things that we were trying to interject into the program I think. It should be interjected into our way of doing business as well.

: I’d like to support part of Beryl’s statement (inaudible)… (rustling) a sort of hierarchical setup. What I fear that it might be a little lasse fair of one person let us say to (unclear) as moderator for a long period of time. I would like to see a fixed term so that everyone takes a turn as moderator partly for the experience that is involved in it and partly because it shouldn’t be anything that is special to any one person in the faculty. This is my reason for supporting a fixed term.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Jack?

Jack Webb: I along with Beryl in the family sense, I don’t attach any degree of merit to moderator except the person who the faculty will accept, who is willing to do it and who does a very efficient job at it. I don’t see why any period of time ought to be attached to it. I don’t think it’s that key thing except in terms of mechanisms, the efficiency of the ability to moderate I think is, and the willingness of the person to do it ought to be the primary consideration above everything else.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Beryl?

Beryl Crowe: There’s also one other thing that bothers me in this role of moderator. It seems to me that at least the role that I would prefer or look to see in play is debilitated in part by this demand for non partisanship. It seems to me certainly you know at this stage and this period of experimentation with only 18 of us here and a whole new world to build there need to be considered opinions of everyone in the group, excluding the (unclear) who is also the moderator. And I don’t think that we need that role in partiality if we’re moving in the right direction. Most of us can separate our personal opinions from that role enough for us to begin to make the decisions and if we can’t then… Now if it is a learning situation in which the other people if we are an open faculty can call it to their attention. And again this comes back to simply that we’re learning new ways of living, new ways of governing ourselves and new ways of doing business and to define that role is to exclude a number of options and possibilities that we haven’t begun to explore yet.

Richard Brian (Moderator): The moderator senses that there is some disagreement among the group as to whether or not there should be a term of office and what the role of a moderator should be? I’m going to invoke that the people who have not spoken to this question may speak and I’d like to terminate the discussion at some reasonable length and go on to the other questions. I sense a consensus that there is a desire to have a moderator. That’s as far as we’ve gotten. Alright, Bob?

Bob Sluss: I’d like to suggest that there not be a term of office. I like Beryl’s arguments. I think the moderator ought to be permitted to speak on the subject. We would be mishandling this I think we can point that out, whether we…

Richard Brian (Moderator): Rudy?

Rudy Martin: I agree.

: That’s out of order on the agenda.

Rudy Martin: Yeah, I was waiting to come to that point. But I agree… (multiple voices)

: That’s number five…

: I’m sorry I didn’t (unclear)… I agree with Beryl’s reasoning on the question of term. I’d like to see it open so that a person who is moderator might decide based on (unclear) and his own responsibilities that he can no longer manage to do the job and be free to do it. On the other hand, anyone in the group or a few in the group can say look we’d like to have somebody else moderate for a while and have the group deal with that in an honest and direct way without casting dispersions or you know pulling rank or anything else. So I like that notion of an unspecified term.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Al?

Al Wiedermann: I like the too supporting this idea of no fixed term but also I like Fred’s idea of trying to work out some sort of system so (unclear) (mumbling) in the period. It wouldn’t have to be (unclear) do it in a certain cycle but somehow it should be worked out.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Sid.

Sid White: I just… I agree and I think this is a question here of our expressing intent rather than trying to set up some kind of formula…

Richard Brian (Moderator): The moderator senses that there is a consensus that there should not be a fixed term of office for the moderator’s role but that some scheme should be worked out to provide the opportunity of the moderator for everyone as a reasonable experience among the faculty…

Sid White: That term scheme in a way contradicts what I’m saying (unclear) and that is the intent or the desire is that we do rotate the people… (laughter)

: It would be the desire that everyone rotate? (laughter)

Richard Brian (Moderator): But if the consensus is that the moderator’s job should be a job which rotates among the faculty. Alright?

: Now wait a minute. That really is not quite the same as the desire that every member of the faculty have the opportunity. I’m not even sure it’s an opportunity. (unclear) I’ll break out in my thinking and making a statement. This is rather strange discussion because the exact nature of the meetings and the responsibilities of the moderator haven’t been discussed yet. Now under certain circumstances, if you set up a certain kind of meeting where the experience of the moderator becomes a highly instructed and educated and necessary experience for every member of the meeting, you might really want to set up a situation in which (coughing) member to take it in turn or have that experience because that’s the nature of what you’re doing. Or you might have another circumstance in which because you are wanted to… nevertheless you felt for instance that the moderator’s duties really require him not to act as an ordinary member of the meeting. You might want to rotate it rather rapidly so that you didn’t get in the hang up of the moderators not being able to provide and (unclear). And just to get back to where we were, there’s somebody trying to write down what you mean. The phrases being used are highly ambiguous. And I suppose what I should really get at is what exactly do you mean? Do you mean, as I think Al indicated, that he meant that every member of the faculty should have a turn at being moderator or do you simply mean that it should shift every now and then but every member doesn’t have to be the moderator or just what is, what does this moderator role should rotate?

: I think my sense was that maybe it should.

: Alright. Is that the sense of the meeting? That every member (interjection) should be required or have the opportunity?

: Should have the opportunity (multiple voices agreeing)…

: Or that it is desirable to…

: That’s different. Have the opportunity is different.

: If you say you should have the opportunity that really seems to imply that anybody who wants to back off from it can back off from it. If you say it is desired that puts some sort of force in the sense of the meeting that even people who are hesitant about this role should take it anyhow. Now which do you mean?

: Well it might be that the (unclear) of the input should be heavy enough to where people feel compelled you know feel an obligation to do that but that we should hang loose enough to where they could be able to pick the time to do it. You know that we don’t do it alphabetically or by some fixed pattern but that the impress being that one of the responsibilities is to chair these meetings. And if you pick a time and perhaps even a subject you know and you feel most free when it’s your thing.

: Well let me ask, there has to be some mode of operation or we’re going to find ourselves in some really weird situations. So how would we expedite that? You know, how would we expedite that?

Richard Brian (Moderator): The moderator senses enough disagreement here that perhaps a small group should be charged with making up some or working out some sort of a scheme to propose to the group.

Richard Alexander: May I propose that we postpone this specific (coughing) until we’ve had enough discussion and conduct in the meetings that we have a clear sense of what the moderator’s role is. We can come back to it because you know if we start setting up committees for every (multiple voices)… Let’s postpone this particular thing until you know we’ve gotten some better sense of what his role is and what the comment of the meetings are and then we can come back to it…

Richard Brian (Moderator): I’ve considered disagreement here too. Willi and then Fred.

Willi Unsoeld: I’d like to back that suggestion of Richard’s that we elect our next moderator which will come up at a later point and that we’ll just leave it open as to what the term will be until we get a clearer picture of what his duties are. And then when we get to the point to where it seems legitimate to address ourselves to the question of the term again we do so.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Okay, Fred and then Larry.

Fred Young: I must admit to a certain amount of confusion because nearly everyone seems to be speaking to the sense of my suggestion about a fixed term. And that is that everyone should have an opportunity to have the experience of being moderator. And yet at the same time there seems to be a reluctance to saying anything about how you’re going to accomplish this. The simplest way to do it, it seems to me, is to have a determinant on some kind of a fixed length, so many meetings or something of this sort. The difficulty that we kind of arrive at in coming to any consensus now seems to be to speak to the point. Is the implication that we are to wait until suddenly there is a consensus that we should throw out the recorder and elect a new one? I don’t understand what’s being discussed. If everyone is to get an opportunity to act as moderator… (unclear)…

Richard Brian (Moderator): I’m sensing a concurrence with Richard’s suggestion from what you say, that it should be something that cannot be decided immediately from the body unless you wish to make a proposal that people will nod their heads to.

Fred Young: But there is a consensus that everyone should get an opportunity to be moderator.

Richard Brian (Moderator): I sense that as a consensus, yes. (multiple voices) That’s true, yes. Larry?

Larry Eickstaedf: I was going to speak to something else. Maybe I’ll pass right now.

: I’m still confused as to what everyone should get an opportunity to be…My actual suggestion was not that we wait until say three weeks from now when we’ve had some experience of how the meetings operate but that we postpone within this meeting until we have discussed it further and have a better sense of what this role is. And then we can come back to the… Because the only thing we’re discussing and we’re discussing two things, do we or do we not desire that every member perform this role? Now how do we know that we desire it unless we know exactly what the role is? Should we expedite this or some other version of this by specifying a fixed time? I don’t see how we can decide… (unclear)

Richard Brian (Moderator): Moderator wishes to close this particular point.

: I wish to move on to the point Richard is raising. May I?

Richard Brian (Moderator): About how…? Yes. One minute (laughter).

: That means I’ll have to move further down on the agenda, i.e. 1) the moderator ought to do number four. He ought to prepare a detailed outline of the agenda and circulate it in advance of the meeting. 2) He ought to be allowed to express his personal views, which is Item number 5 on this agenda. And 3) He ought to be able to do number ten. That is to say he ought to come up with a consensus or a vote on resolutions or decisions made in the meeting….

: That all ties in with number one, charging him to expedite the discussions, coming up with decisions…

: Well that’s really point of order because I think that’s where we should be going.

: Alright, so those are the things the moderator ought to do.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Alright. The sense of… Item number one is that we should elect a moderator. The rest of this at the moment is, that’s all we have. We should elect a moderator. The following questions in order will be taken out. Such discussion should have a recorder and a written record should be produced of meetings and decisions reached. Consensus, anyone who wishes to speak to that?

: I wish to speak to it. (multiple voices) (laughter). Look, this is extremely vague. And let’s put out the problems. The present mode of taking these is to get as a tentative and necessarily inexact but a closer record of what was actually said in a meeting as possible. That is, to record the flow of the discussion. Do we wish the recorder to record the flow of the discussion? Or do we wish him to produce something more like standard minutes where what is recorded is the questions that were taken out and the substantive decisions reached but the mode of debate and who said what and what their points were if not recorded? Now there’s a real difficulty here which was strongly raised by, and if you’ll read the minutes that Brian and I produced which come I think as being as close of an example of an attempt to try to record the flow and then (unclear) very inefficient about certain very particular points. If (unclear) minutes were taken to be at some time in the future records of substantive decisions, they raise enormous promise because what literally got said is in most cases not exactly recorded. And even if it were exactly recorded, what’s being said is being said impromptu and doesn’t necessarily represent what the person saying it actually means. So you know what I’m saying is fine let’s have a recorder but by all means let’s specify what sort of records he’s to prepare. (multiple voices). I’m simply trying to clarify the question.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Jack and then Bill.

Jack Webb: I’d like to ask Richard for some recommendations with regard to whether we ought to have a record flow, second points on whether decisions were actually reached and any other levels in between. What do you think would be appropriate?

Richard Brian (Moderator): Bill?

Bill Aldridge: Well you ruined my fun. I mean I just wanted to… when you’re talking about historical accuracy. (unclear) a terrible, terrible (unclear), it just says Aldridge was late. It should read Aldridge and (unclear) (mumbling) (laughter). And I mean if this goes on the great record of (unclear) (laughter) express a concern.

: I feel that if we go through this step by step and I feel you’re forcing us to go step by step, I think it’s going to take us a lot longer to do this. (people talking at once) consensus and we should determine or propose that as we look at this whole list, let’s find out where there are any questions so that we know where consensus does exist. Let’s establish that. Let’s deal with the area of consensus first and then let’s deal with the areas that need to be clarified. And this is where I feel our discussion is being slowed down by (unclear)…

Richard Brian (Moderator): I sense that there is a desire by the body to have a recorder but the duties of the recorder should be spelled out. And I sense, well actually I don’t sense anything. But the question of having a moderator to produce a written record in the form of a written record is still open. (multiple voices) In the sense of the recorder, I can sense that there should be a recorder. Is that right? Everyone nodding their head? And may I say that I also sense that there is a consensus about an apprehension about what kind of a record it should be and that should come up at some further time so we can proceed down the agenda. Okay, make a recommendation.

: Yeah, I recommend that the recorder record the sense of the meeting. That is, the questions that were taken up and what conclusions were reached and try to get a flow.

: Well I would you know suggest that we use some of the products of present technology. If we want a permanent historical record, we have one. In cases of confusion, there is a permanent record. (multiple voices)

: Now wait a minute. We should make sure, we should have at every meeting some sort of recording device. We should keep the tapes. Alright. But the written records of the meeting should contain merely or simply questions taken out and the sense of the meeting. Well the sense of the meeting which would be if there was a decision if there was one and if there wasn’t one if there wasn’t one and so on. And the record, the tape, is the only flow that is there and it’s not reproduced.

Richard Brian (Moderator): I sense a consensus of the probe of recorders as it has been suggested by the recorder.

: Is that tape recorder working?

Richard Brian (Moderator): Yes it is. (laughter)

: Okay then we will switch to that mode instantly. (laughter)

: … Has the automatic treble control. You know, that simplifies the job of recording it and of listening to it. (multiple voices)

:… That has the thing that’s voice activated and only comes on when people talk which would cut down on the volume of tape used.

Richard Brian (Moderator): The point of order, Item 3 on the agenda, unless (coughing) want to change the agenda in some way that’s fine. But I don’t know how to proceed. (people talking) Alright, Item 3: The length of meetings will be determined in advance and set the times strictly reserved. I sense a consensus that this should be implemented… 4, a detailed outline of the agenda be prepared by the moderator and circulated in advance of the meeting. Already taken care of by the previous one. Item 5, the moderator does not express personal views while conducting the meeting. Any discussion?

: I think there may be a consensus that… Or I’d like to ask that there be a consensus that he should be permitted to express his views.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Can the moderator express a view?

: I’m going to have to speak for the minority again. I’d like to see some sort of compromise provided. That means some technical device by which the moderator leaves his chair as moderator and turns it over to someone else. And I’m just speaking from personal bitter experience. The one time that I moderated here, I felt myself sucked down the tube. I knew darn well I was not looking around for other participants because I was involved. I was very keenly aware of when I went over the line and when I came back again. I watched Byron the next day and observed the same thing happen. In a masterful job of moderating, he too became absorbed and there were hands one of which was Jack’s raised was ignored because he was focused on… I just don’t feel we can afford that kind of risk. I also don’t want to deny ourselves the comments from the moderator. So I think the friends must have some neat gimmick here such as I defer to so and so, so that I can speak my peace.

Richard Brian (Moderator): May the moderator speak to this point? Or that the moderator should speak?

: Yeah, right, something like that.

Richard Brian (Moderator): I think the moderator cannot possibly moderate and be involved at the same time. And some scheme should be worked out but I don’t think it’s possible to expedite a meeting and still be very involved.

: I’d like to go one step further with this. This issue, like the rotation, in fact like the decision to have a vote if consensus isn’t reached, really are very deep decisions that ought to be quite seriously considered and not simply decided without much consideration of the implications. Just to speak to the Quaker model which may be extreme as far as we’re concerned, the clerk which we call the moderator is charged quite specifically with enunciating the sense of the meeting at regular intervals. And even in the middle of controversy. That is, he doesn’t simply wait until he thinks a consensus has been reached. He is actively trying to follow the flow of the discussion and make sure that all the inputs to this discussion are retained and held in relationship to each other and are not passed over you know because somebody said something and then the discussion took another turn so the first guy’s point gets lost somehow. He has to be continually ready to what they call clarify the question. He has to be able to do this at his own initiative. That is, when he perceives that the discussion has gotten off the track or become confused. He has to be able to do it at the request of anybody at the meeting and they have to be prepared to ask him to do it if they become confused as to what it is. Now this requires an extremely active concentration on the part of moderator clerk, one which really gets quite muddied if he also has to be considering all the time his own responses. Now to the business at hand, he has to devote his attention full time in a way that Dick hasn’t yet done and I haven’t seen anybody else do. We certainly haven’t charged the moderator ever with doing, keeping really active control in his own mind over the flow of the meeting. The best image I could give to it really would be the midwife image where the midwife isn’t contributing anything. She’s trying to be very sensitive to what’s happening to the woman whose baby (clicking sound) to be delivered. She expedites the delivery of that baby. Now this is an enormous task. It’s not just a task for the moderator. It’s a task for the members of the meeting. In fact, I’d even go so far as to say that if you place that burden on the moderator, that the members of the meeting must be willing to accept a rather heavier discipline than I’ve seen anybody willing to accept yet but as a discipline imposing silence upon themselves from time to time. Making very clear that they really understand the points that have been raised before they attempt to reply to them, so on and so forth. Now in thinking about the moderator’s role as something less than that, that is, moderator as the chairman of Robert’s rules (unclear) (mumbling) meeting, well then it’s perfectly clear that the moderator can’t be put in (unclear) some input. Even in the Quaker model, if it comes to a point where it’s clear that the moderator’s view is of importance, the group can ask him to put in his own input. And if he knows there’s a piece of business coming up and there’s one where his experience or expertise is necessary for the discussion, he can turn it over to somebody else. But the real hassle here is if the moderator’s role becomes extremely complex of itself then really you can’t afford to have him also playing the role of active participant of the discussion. And I think Willi’s point and his experience in doing it is very true and should be seriously considered.

Richard Brian (Moderator): Sid?

Sid White: I wish to express my concern about what we’re doing because if we do agree that we’ve got a lot of learning to do, you know, we’re talking about rotating… (End of Tape 2 Side 1).
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