

Archive 4156

A BRIEF TO THE COMMISSION
ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION
of Lakehead University

by

W. D. R. ELDON, Ph.D.

Thunder Bay, Ontario.
January 31, 1972.

CONTENTS PAGE

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Structure in Perspective	1
The Environment	3
Student Requirements	5
The Faculty	6
The Department	7
The Dean	9
Faculties	10
The President	11
Administrative Services	14
Board and Senate -- One Tier or Two?	15
The Board of Governors	18
The Senate	19
Committees	21
Summary of Suggestions	24

January 31, 1972

A BRIEF TO THE COMMISSION
ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION
of Lakehead University

by

W. D. R. ELDON, Ph.D.

Structure in Perspective

"Well-intentioned men can make any system of government work, but in the absence of good men even a good system will not work". This saying suggests that there are factors of greater importance than structure in making an organization work effectively and fulfill its aims. It also suggests that there may be a choice of several systems of government for any given institution. The system favoured (over other equally workable systems) may reflect the prevailing priorities and values of members of the community. My suggestions regarding a governmental structure for Lakehead University necessarily reflect my own priorities and values, and it is hoped that any collision with other ideas as to structure will generate useful debate and a happy outcome.

Ideally, the structure of government of the University should provide for democratic expression of ideas and decisions on academic

policy. It should facilitate the effective carrying out of policy and allocation of resources to different parts of the University operation. The structure should permit anyone to identify clearly who has responsibility for what, and who has authority over what. Ideally too, the responsibility of an individual or committee should not be greater than its authority. The student and the professor should have a strong voice in the affairs of the University, but the burden of committee work should be sufficiently restrained to permit the student to graduate and the professor to teach.

The present structure government provides some genuine opportunities for democracy and some illusions of democracy, some clarity in the division of functions but some troublesome areas of confusion. The Senate, for example, is not sufficiently representative of the University community. The Board is not sufficiently representative of the citizens and potential clientele in the area the University serves. There are genuine differences of viewpoint, unresolved, as to where authority does rest or should rest and as to how authority should be exercised. The channels of communication between student and professor are not always as open as they should be, despite the presence of students on committees in many departments. Nor is there a satisfactory rapport between some faculty and something known as "The Administration".

Some of the difficulties lie deeper than the present system of organization, but result from unresolved differences in philosophy about what a university is and how it should be run. This state is

not surprising in view of the substantial changes that have swept over North American universities in the past decade. At the same time, it is well to air and debate these matters in the context of the current review of governmental organization of the University. It is a welcome opportunity to update the system if it needs it, and to ensure that it will serve the modern objectives of the University.

The Environment

The key to the environment in which Lakehead University must operate in the next ten years is to be found in the trends of the past decade. During this time the government sector of our society and economy has increased its power at the expense of the private sector in a variety of ways. Governmental control has increased in such areas as ecology and consumer affairs, and private business is understandably worried by a mass of complex federal legislation in taxation, labour relations and competition policy, all of which seems designed to restrict its freedom and decrease its opportunities. Large multi-national companies appear best fitted to weather the storm, so that increasingly a university graduate must make his career in big business or big government.

In the universities themselves in the past decade we have witnessed a growth in governmental control over university financing and the introduction of graduate programs. These trends are likely to carry through into the coming decade. Privately financed institutions such as Waterloo Lutheran University and Trinity College (Toronto) will probably succumb and conform to the provincial government's

non-sectarian system. The draft report of the Wright Commission on Post-Secondary Education recommends a further giant step in the direction of governmental decision-making on matters dear to university faculties and senates.

The report cannot be ignored. Neither Dr. Wright nor his report will just "go away". It may be true that some of the Wright recommendations were intended as trial balloons and subject to revision after public reaction, hence the description "draft report". But public tolerance of high educational costs and public support for independent universities is at a low ebb. The government has recently been re-elected with a strong majority. The trend to centralization may prove to be irresistible. And the government may well hold the line on educational spending except at Queen's Park itself.

If these tendencies continue, within the next ten years university senates will lose much of their present power to add or delete programs or faculties even at the undergraduate level. Academic staff will come much closer to being civil servants, with the president something of a branch manager.

In this environment there will be a premium on two things: first, the ability of the institution to deal successfully with Queen's Park, and second, the political strength of the institution in the region it serves. More community involvement and responsiveness to community needs will be required. This the Board in its present form can only partially supply since its concern is more with finance than with academic programs.

Internally, with the likelihood of continuing financial stringency, a constant need to prove "efficiency" will be the price paid by the University for avoiding direct intervention and operation of the universities from Toronto. Thus the pressure to delete low priority programs will intensify.

Student Requirements

Ontario universities are experiencing the early stages of changes in the structure of demand for university academic programs. Arts programs are losing ground. Students will not indefinitely enroll in large numbers in programs that have no relevance to the job market. In a society increasingly controlled by government, lawyers and accountants should do well. Since health and welfare programs can be expected to grow and cost more, earnings in the various branches of medicine and dentistry should continue to improve. Bright prospects for medical graduates are already leading to crowding in some American medical schools. Ecology can be expected to provide increasing governmental demands for personnel. At Lakehead certain science subjects, forestry, business, nursing and any new pre-medical programs may be expected to be growth points. Lakehead University does not offer certain programs that may be attractive to students -- law, medicine as such, and dentistry. The University will have to be in a position to take advantage of new opportunities that will attract government support. Also the University will have to become more proficient in restructuring its program to respond to changing student needs.

Furthermore, if Grade 13 is eliminated or if there is a province-wide move to reduce university undergraduate training to three years, additional adjustments in curriculum will become necessary. A somewhat younger and less mature student population may have rather different requirements. If community colleges are empowered to grant degrees, another suggestion in the Wright report, the competition for students may intensify. The complex set of possible developments in the Province may force the universities to think hard about ways of preventing their degeneration into glorified high schools.

Many requirements of university students may continue as before: the need to learn a capacity for independent study and research, to associate together in a residential environment away from home, to mature. The University structure should facilitate the meeting of all these requirements, changing or unchanging.

The Faculty

Students will adapt readily to the changes in the institution and in the Province. Their needs are in part the cause of change. But the more responsive the institution is to the environment, the greater the discomfort that many faculty members may experience.

The dilemma of the faculty member is that he is a means to an end and not an end in himself. The student is the client. If student enrolment in a program falls, the faculty member is in peril of becoming "redundant". In a hard financial climate, especially if there is limited growth in total enrolment, faculty

members in particular fields and in fact whole departments may see their expectations wither. If the pinch is province-wide, the institution of tenure will not protect redundant faculty. The challenge for the University is to adjust staff numbers to the requirements of changing academic programs without an annual upheaval. The University should explore the possibilities of assisting tenured and probationary faculty who wish to remain at the University in readjusting their qualifications to make this possible. Satisfactory career opportunities may not lie in their chosen field, and some means should be found of assisting the transition to a revised career in the case of a faculty member left high and dry by an ebb-tide.

The faculty association-trade union approach will not be the best response to the problem of faculty members made nervous by change. Carried too far, the trade-union spirit can spoil a university. Should a professor have to worry about spending more time with his students than union rules allow? If the university community meets the problems caused by change head-on and seeks solutions that encourage adaptation and improve job-security, there is no need to extend the scope of operation of the faculty association or to give it specific recognition in the broad policy-making or government of the institution.

The Department

Many of the important issues bearing upon the structure of university government arise within the context of the academic department or faculty. For example, the chairman is responsible for

academic leadership and for the day to day functioning of the department. How far do his responsibility and authority extend? Can he override a vote in his department? To what extent should he share the responsibility for making departmental policy with committees of faculty and students? Should he be elected? Should he be subject to recall? Should he represent his faculty as their obedient spokesman, or should he take the views of his colleagues as "advice"? Should he carry out the policies of the University in his department? What are the limits of departmental autonomy?

The problem is to strike a balance between the legitimate desire of every member of the department to have some voice in matters which affect him and the need to recognize that some academic staff members have greater experience and better judgment than others when it comes to developing and implementing departmental policy. Some possible dangers are that an over-developed committee system may enable inexperienced juniors to override more experienced senior academics, or that timid mediocrity in a department may prevent the upgrading of staff. In addition, too many departmental problems end up on the president's desk because either (a) no one accepts the responsibility for solving them, or (b) no one has authority to make a final decision.

There is accordingly much merit in granting a chairman the authority he needs to carry out his responsibilities for developing and operating the department. The dean should have a distinct influence in guiding the choice of a department chairman, and should be able

to intervene decisively where a department is in a troubled state. The recall of a chairman should not be an intra-departmental matter. The chairman should be able to count on the support of the dean in implementing University policies in his department. In turn, the members of the department, including the students, should be able to offer advice and assist in the developing of departmental policies.

The Dean

The present role of a dean at Lakehead University is ambivalent. Different and incompatible views exist as to what his role should be. Is he mainly a "faculty man", a spokesman for his faculty and a chairman of his chairmen? Or is his role primarily that of a senior administrator who applies the policy of the University in his faculty?

The uncertainty as to what the dean's role is or should be, or differences in the way that different deans interpret their role, have caused a double dose of mistrust. The more senior administrators may come to feel that they cannot rely on a dean to implement policy, while faculty members believe that the dean is a "tool of the administration" rather than the champion they expect him to be.

The modern role of a dean is an in-between one, difficult in a time when all authority is questioned. But so is the role of a chairman. We must recognize the inadequacy of a situation where deans and chairmen may be tempted to solve problems by running before the prevailing wind. My own preference is for giving the dean sufficient authority to carry out his responsibilities to lead

his faculty, to balance inter-departmental considerations within his faculty, and to apply university policies within his faculty.

The opportunity for CUGO to enunciate the appropriate role of deans and departmental chairmen is of crucial importance to the University. No other matter is of such vital importance for faculty morale and for the quality of the academic program.

Faculties

The organization of departments into faculties is not static if the relative importance of programs and student enrolments is changing. There is no significant monetary saving to be achieved by consolidating existing departments or faculties into larger units. For example, the dean of a super-faculty is likely to require an associate dean and more secretaries. In the next few years, however, some regrouping of faculties would seem to be necessary for more effective operation. No department should be part of more than one faculty, since double voting power gives such a department an unfair weight in the counsels of the university. As time goes on, new faculties may be established, particularly if some of the professional schools should grow into much larger units.

In the near future the University might well assess whether a dean should be appointed to oversee graduate studies. The advantage lies in his ability to deal on even terms with other graduate deans in the Province. Also one person in this role can give focus to graduate activity in the University, with a budget to help him promote the most promising directions of postgraduate endeavour.

The same need may well exist with respect to research activity. Especially if the Wright recommendations for separate funding of research and teaching are adopted, it might be advantageous to have a director of this branch of university activity supervising internal grants for research purposes. Probably it would be advisable to consider the appointment of a single Dean of Graduate Studies and Research to fill both roles.

The President

The demands upon the president are numerous and heavy, and the structure of government of the University should facilitate the institution gaining the utmost value from his aptitudes and talents. His desk should not be cluttered with trivia. His time should not be consumed with routine supervisory tasks that he can delegate to others. He should have mobility in the sense of being able to turn his attention to whatever matter is of greatest importance at the time, whether it be persuading the government to adopt a new academic program, raising funds from external sources, improving the image of the University in the area it serves, or developing a strong alumni organization.

The president by reason of the variety of matters that may properly come to his attention has a better overall view of the University than anyone else. He should understand budgeting and accounting and sense the effects of alternative allocations of resources to faculties or functions within the University. He should represent the University to the community, and deliver

innumerable speeches and meet as many citizens as he can.

In addition he must interpret the University's needs to the government and join with other university presidents in developing common strategies for dealing with governments. Within the University he should interpret the University to itself. He should crystallize opinion, define objectives and plan development. The president has prime responsibility for the operation, financing, planning and public relations of the University. Although the power and prestige of a university president has greatly diminished in the past decade, his role is still the most crucial one for the university.

The structure of government, where the president is involved, should therefore permit him to perform his many-sided role and to provide leadership to the university community over a broad front. If he is to do so effectively, he must simultaneously be sheltered from routine problems that others should solve and yet be accessible to currents of opinion in the student body, faculty and community. One of the hazards of the presidency is isolation, and so the structure of government must facilitate communication between the president and the large number of people who make up the body of the university.

Effective functioning of the presidency depends to an important extent upon deans and department chairmen working effectively. If they abdicate their responsibilities, power over matters which should be worked out within the department or faculty will pass to the president's office. When decisions are made in the wrong place,

the effects are bad all round. The growth of the relatively new phenomenon of academic vice-presidents results partly from the fact that the president needs more hands and someone on whom he can rely consistently.

A clear definition of the role, responsibilities and authority of deans and department chairmen, and a system that draws highly qualified people to those positions is therefore of vital importance if the president is to play his proper role in the university.

There is no single organization chart that can be drawn on the basis of these comments, but a few examples will suffice. Just as the president in the academic area should be kept free of matters that should be delegated to a dean or department chairman, so in the administrative services area he should be freed from the mechanics of running the power plant, the cafeteria, and the selection of junior personnel. If the focus of the president's activity is mainly in the academic side or in the community relations, then day to day reporting by administrative heads should be delegated by the president to someone else, such as an administrative vice-president.

On the other hand, the structure of government should enable the president to involve himself directly in the work of policy-making committees such as committees of the senate and board of governors. We should retain at Lakehead the existing formula which allows either the President or Vice-President to sit as an ex-officio member of important committees of Senate.

It is of great importance that the president should not be isolated from the students. This is difficult to provide for in the formal structure of government of the University. To some extent he will meet students in university committees, but only a relatively small number. The president's ability to mingle with the students and to sample their opinions will ordinarily depend upon himself. But he will more easily keep his door open for students if he can delegate most routine tasks to others.

To keep open his channels of communication with students and faculty, the president may wish to establish ad hoc advisory committees for short periods of time. Committees to advise the president on academic and student matters should ordinarily be established for a particular short term purpose. Most academic questions can be satisfactorily handled through the standing committees of Senate, but a president would be unduly limited in seeking advice if he could deal only with the formally established standing committees.

Although these general observations can be made regarding the structure of university government as it relates to "a president", different people occupying the presidency can be expected to function in different ways and to adopt different practices when it comes to delegating routine tasks, meeting with committees, and seeking student opinion.

Administrative Services

The administrative and financial branches of the University on the whole now report directly to the President. Certain standing committees of faculty and students, such as the computer services

committee and the library committee, ensure some influence by the academic community over the policies of some of the service branches. By and large the faculty do not intervene in the day to day workings of these departments which are responsible to the President.

Unless the president has a particular aptitude and interest in these departments, he may prefer to have an officer deputed to supervise these functions. A Vice-President of Finance and Administration would free the president to concentrate on academic and community matters vital to the development of the institution. Such an appointment should be seriously considered.

The expertise of the heads of the academic service departments should command respect. Their morale will suffer if they are subjected to academic intervention in their operations on a haphazard basis. Because academic committees change membership in whole or in part from year to year, they may not be able to adopt consistent policies, or even to develop a policy at all when the need arises. An adequate representation from the appropriate service departments may, however, ensure the necessary continuity of membership and policy. A committee of heads of service departments should be encouraged to develop consistent policies where such are needed across these departments.

Board and Senate -- One Tier or Two?

The present division of labour between the Board of Governors and the Senate of Lakehead University allows each group to concentrate on what it presumably does best. The practical background

of the community representatives on the Board equips them to deal with the finance and business aspects of the institution. These representatives also have an external, community perspective on the university which is quite different from the internal, academic perspective of the members of Senate. At one time universities commonly did not have an academic senate at all, but only a certain number of academic staff sitting on a senate that was largely appointed from outside the academic community. The rather recent development of an academic senate has brought purely academic viewpoints to bear upon problems and questions in the academic area. The merits of the present system are largely the benefits of specialization and control by academics over academic matters.

A question has arisen as to whether the Board and Senate might be grouped into one governing body, a system recently adopted at the University of Toronto but rejected by the University of Waterloo. Representatives of the community would sit with administrators, faculty members and students in a single governing body that would handle the financial and community matters now dealt with by the Board, as well as the academic matters now within the purview of the Senate. External opinion would thus be brought to bear upon academic questions such as addition of new programs and the academic timetable, while academic opinion could be focussed directly on budgets, endowments, and pension plans. Jurisdictional disputes between Board and Senate would not exist, and all major decisions of the University would be scrutinized by both practically-oriented and

academically-oriented people.

Several considerations suggest, however, the advisability of a careful assessment of pros and cons, and particularly of the weight of membership to be given to various groups before an unicameral system is recommended. A unicameral body would have very large powers, not subject to a sober review by a second body within the University. The nature and quality of its decisions and compromises could vary widely depending upon the relative strength of membership representing such diverse groups as junior and senior professors, departments or faculties, other university employees, administrators, local businessmen and representatives of the provincial government. Also, there are both advantages and disadvantages to the involvement of businessmen in academic decisions and of academics in financial decisions: on the one hand, each may learn from the other, but on the other hand the advantages of specialization may be lost by involving people in matters they know little about. At the same time, if the powers of both Board and Senate are truncated in the future by the more detailed intervention of the Province in internal university affairs, the matter of one tier or two may be of little moment.

Assuming, however, that significant decisions remain to be made by the University internally, the crucial consideration may be that community representatives now on the Board of Governors could not afford the additional time needed to become informed and involved in purely academic matters. Nor could a sufficient

number of faculty members or students afford the time needed to sit through what would amount to the combined deliberations of the Board and Senate, plus those of the existing committees of each body.

Furthermore, the present two-tier system is capable of modification short of actually combining Board and Senate into one body. The University community sees rather little of the Board and may be inclined to dismiss it too lightly. The credibility of the Senate might improve if it were more fully representative of the University community.

The Board of Governors

The Board members, with full-time occupations elsewhere, can hardly be expected to spend much more time than they do on the University's business. Consistent with this time limitation, however, it would be desirable to increase the number of formal and informal links between the Board and the University community.

There are many ways of accomplishing this, but one of the formal devices possible is to establish periodically a committee of Board members to "visit" some branch of the University. The committee might be purely a Board committee, or it might be a joint Board-Senate group. The idea is an adaptation from a custom at Harvard University, whereby a committee of the Board of Overseers is established to "visit" a department or school of that University. By talking with the faculty and students in some depth, the Board committee gains an insight into the problems and needs of some branch

of the University.

Another possibility is to establish joint Board-Senate committees to examine some of the areas where the work of the two bodies adjoins or overlaps. Perhaps a joint committee on Board-Senate relations could make some useful suggestions about the sharing of views, information and proposals and about the lines of communication between the two bodies.

The Board of Governors is presently of a manageable size for doing its business, but even so much of its work is handled by its executive committee which meets more frequently than the full Board. An enlargement in the size of the Board, together with a policy of paying expenses of members from more remote points, might make this body more representative of the North Western Ontario area which the University serves. The enlargement of the Board from about 30 to around 40 members would make it possible to establish more Board committees to work with members of the University community. Provided the faculty have some representation on the Board, it is likely neither necessary nor desirable to increase the number of faculty members sitting on the Board. The chief value of the Board is to bring the experience of the community into the affairs of the University.

The Senate

The composition of the Senate, however, should be revised to make it more effectively represent the University community.

Particularly important, at present the student members are effectively

muffled by the faculty. A substantial increase in their numbers, say from two to six representatives, would make it possible for their views to come to the surface.

It would also be desirable to ensure that the representation of elected faculty members should more closely reflect the proportion of staff members and students in each of the four faculties. If each faculty is effectively represented, there is probably no need for the chairman of every department or school of the University to sit on the Senate at once. On the other hand, the Comptroller and a few of the heads of service departments might well be added to the membership of the Senate. Substantially enlarging the total size of the Senate would likely make it unwieldy, though an increase in membership from about 40 to 50 might improve the quality of debate rather than the reverse.

The procedures of the Senate would benefit from some revision. The executive committee of the Senate might well play a more active role in sifting items placed on the agenda. The debate over minutes from committees occupies a disproportionate amount of time in the Senate, and the procedure of reviewing all committee minutes should be abandoned. Rather, chairmen of committees should take the initiative in advancing particular matters for Senate approval, or should report matters of interest to the full Senate when they feel such reports are needed.

Further, the Senate should not be allowed to become a forum for questioning the President on the performance of the administrators

of the University or on the actions of the Board. An adversary system of political parties, government and opposition, is inappropriate for governing the academic affairs of a university

The Vice-Chancellor, as the operative academic head of the institution, should continue to preside over the meetings of the Senate.

On balance, I am inclined to believe that the effectiveness of both the Board and the Senate can be increased, and that there can be more links between them. There is no need to rush into a unicameral governing body which could quickly become a deep disappointment. It would be wiser to wait and observe the experience of the University of Toronto with such a body. Also, the design of an eventual governing structure for the University should await the final outcome of government action on recommendations of the Wright Commission on Post-Secondary Education.

Committees

The poor reputation of committees is embodied in such statements as "Committees always work badly", "The optimum size of committee is one", or "A camel is a horse designed by a committee". Yet the institution of the committee, now deeply ingrained in university life, does provide a mechanism for bringing different viewpoints to bear on a problem, and for dealing with divergences of view. The success of a committee depends upon the manner in which divergences of view are expounded and received. The committee system presupposes that the irritant

grain of sand in the oyster will often start the pearl.

Committees are better for arriving at an appropriate policy than for carrying out necessary but unpopular measures in a speedy and decisive fashion. The limitations of a committee should be recognized, and the device should not be overworked. At all levels of the university -- department, faculty, and university as a whole -- committees have their valuable place. Students and faculty members should participate at all these levels of decision-making relating to policy. Such activity in policy-making is entirely consistent with a system that allows deans and department chairmen to carry out their day to day responsibilities; there is a workable balance between consultation with committees and the exercise of discretion by the responsible official.

Because committees are generally representative (and should be) of a variety of interests, they may find it difficult to design bold or innovative proposals or to establish priorities that affect some program, department, or faculty adversely. It is often more satisfactory if leadership in such matters comes from the president, the dean, or the department chairman. Yet the university community is entitled to have important plans affecting the development of the university discussed by the appropriate committees.

The inclusion of students on committees can be an important part of their training and education. Even when committee work becomes an exercise in frustration, the student benefits from participation and learns a lesson in realism. In addition, the value

of student viewpoints to the work of a committee can be very considerable. A committee discussing problems in liaison with high schools, for example, in practice must seek advice from people who have recently come from high schools. A student also has more experience of Professor X's classroom and teaching ability than any other staff member has. In some areas such as appointment of staff, salaries, promotion, and tenure, the experience of the student and his particular relationship with the individual cases coming before a committee may make it advisable for membership to be reserved to faculty members and administrators. But even here I would not shut the door on student participation.

The structure of committees in the University is constantly in need of review and updating. No blueprint for committees can be established for the years ahead. It may occasionally be necessary for the Senate or a faculty to establish a "committee on committees" to prune the dead wood. The load of committee work on a faculty member can interfere at times grievously with his research, teaching, and sessions with students. Herein lies the chief need to keep the committee structure under control, -- and possibly in some instances to insist that a faculty member take a breather from committee work!

As new needs develop in the University, new committees will be formed. Some may be called into being to deal with new situations confronting the University because of provincial government policies. The need to reassess teaching methods, the crucial importance of high school liaison, the need to involve the community more deeply

in the University all may be expected to lead to the formation of new committees in the next few years.

Summary of Suggestions

My analysis of the needs of the Lakehead University in the next few years suggests the desirability of definition of roles, of thinking ahead and of evolution rather than radical re-shaping of the structure of university government. The specific recommendations that emerge from this analysis should be interpreted as suggestions that help to stir the pot, not as my final conclusions. The main suggestions are these:

1. The University should examine the feasibility of providing satisfactory career opportunities for probationary and tenured faculty where changing student requirements for courses would otherwise make them "redundant". The opportunity would not necessarily lie in the staff member's chosen field.
2. The University should enunciate, possibly initially through the Commission on University Governmental Organization, what the responsibilities and authority of deans and academic department chairmen should be. These officials should have sufficient authority to exercise academic leadership and to implement University policies in their respective faculties or departments. At the same time, staff and students should play a significant role in developing these academic policies.
3. The appointment of a Dean of Graduate Studies and Research should be studied.
4. The President or Vice-President should continue to sit as ex officio members of most Senate committees.
5. The appointment of a Vice-President of Finance and Administration should be considered.
6. A committee of heads of service departments should be encouraged to develop, wherever appropriate,

6. cont'd.
consistent policies across these departments.
7. The number of formal and informal links between the Board of Governors and the University community should be increased. Periodically, a Board or joint Board-Senate committee should be formed to "visit" a department, school or faculty of the University.
8. A joint committee on Board-Senate relations should be established.
9. The Board of Governors should be enlarged to provide broader representation from the area served by the University and to permit more Board committees to work with members of the University community.
10. The composition of the Senate should be revised and the total membership somewhat enlarged to make it represent more effectively the students, academic staff, faculties and administrative service departments of the University.
11. The procedures of the Senate should be revised to provide for the more effective discussion of questions referred by Senate committees.
12. The question of whether the Board of Governors and Senate should be joined in a single governing body should be left in abeyance pending further experience with a unicameral system at the University of Toronto and until government action is taken on the final recommendations of the Wright Commission on Post-Secondary Education.

In an analysis of governing structures, not enough can be said about people who make the structure work. In a modern university the number of people involved in the government of a university is much greater than it was 20 years ago. Students participate. Faculty members register their opinions and make

rules and policies in committee. Administrators, whether chairman, dean or president, must consult innumerable interested constituencies within the university, and must be responsive to their needs.

Relations of trust must exist between the constituent parts of the university or any structure will tend to become unworkable. At Lakehead the attractive campus is a good base for a university of excellent quality in the Northland. The governing structure can be made to facilitate growth and effective responses to future challenges. But it is the spirit of the University community itself that will guarantee the future.

Thunder Bay, Ontario
January 31, 1972.