

Board Of Trustees: University Servant?

THE STANFORD DAILY

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1956.

By BRUCE CAMPBELL

(First in a Series)

(Editor's note. This is the first in a six part series prepared by Stanford Graduate Bruce Campbell. The series will examine boards of trustees in American colleges, and focus on the Stanford Board in the latter part of the series. Campbell's research stems from work done last spring as part of a Stanford seminar on higher education in America.)

"Servant of the servants of truth"—a verse appropriated from ecclesiastical circles and paraphrased—might provide a description of a university board of trustees, for the phrase tells something fundamental both about a board of trustees and its relationship to a university.

A university is a group of scholars who have agreed to engage their intellects over various subject matters in order to further the pursuit of truth. The board's task is to create the environment in which scholarly activity thrives.

Students of higher education usually list the principal responsibilities of trustees as these three: to select a president and having done so let him run the university; to oversee and

approve the kind of education offered by the university; to be the final ground of responsibility for the acquisition, conservation, and management of the university's funds and properties.

Quality of Education

But overriding all specific charges to the a college, the organization of a learned and effective faculty.

And Myron Wickes states that "the educational work of the college is the sole reason for its existence, not the balancing of budgets nor the building of great plants, important as these are."

Because the board of trustees can only be understood in its relation to the university, a study of the board must begin with an understanding of the purposes of a university. The

university has a two-fold relation to society: one of accommodation and the other of criticism.

Contract With Society

On one side, the university has entered into a contract with society in which it preserves and transmits to the new generation the accumulated knowledge, skills, and values of the society. The university accepts responsibility which the first of the two roles is in an overbearing position relative to the second. The reason for this is that, in contrast to most European universities, American education institutions are controlled by laymen.

Without Consent

"Almost without exception in this country," says Hubert Beck in *Men Who Control Our Universities*, "governing boards exercise their powers and functions without the consent of the governed."

The significance of lay control is that, because the dominant groups in society control board is its general responsibility to assure that the quality of education in the university is the finest that the institution can provide.

In the words of a special committee of the trustees of Columbia University: "Trustees are a means to an end: in the establishment of its institutions universities are controlled by 'the modern representatives of orthodoxy and authority,'" the Columbia study notes.

Because a dominant class is one favored by the existing social arrangement, members of boards of trustees "tend to be conservative, to exaggerate the merits of the prevailing order and to fear any agitation favoring fundamental changes in the social structure."

To the extent that a university is controlled by these forces, "its function will be defensive and conservative, rather than creative and progressive." In other words, the accommodation function will tend to be more emphasized than the function of criticism.

Vicious Circles

Control by a lay board can lead to a vicious

circle. Because they are not experts on education, trustees must either make decisions based on less-than-complete understandings of situations or they must relinquish the responsibility to those directly involved. The second is the usual practice, most observers contend.

One result of relinquishing responsibility for preparing the new generation to take charge of running the society. This is the accommodating role.

But on the other hand, the university also has a role in conflict with society: it is continually evaluating the culture which it transmits and thus serves as a creative force for bringing change in the society. This is its role as critic.

The prevailing structure of boards of trustees in the United States tends to be one in

for educational policy-making in that this practice tends to breed among trustees a view of their role as principally one of administration, rather than education, since they are concerned mostly with "management" of the university.

And, generally, administration puts a premium of efficiency, the smoothness with which a system operates. In the university, this leads to "commodity" education.

Producing Trained Mind

"There is a cultural assumption in America," an observer has pointed out, "that institutions of society produce commodities." The University produces trained minds, components for the assembly line of society.

In this type of education, emphasis is placed on a passive process of preparation. This leads to people who accept the culture passed on to them and thus to reinforcement of the existing structure of society.

Thus, when the university structure tends to emphasize the accommodating role of the university over its role as critic, "commodity" education results which in turn tends to lead to further emphasis on accommodation.

(Next: The Composition of the Board)

Trustees Fail To Represent Entire Society

THE STANFORD DAILY

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1966

By BRUCE CAMPBELL
(Second in a Series)

Boards of trustees of American universities are severely criticized for being representative neither of the times in which they live nor of the classes of society as a whole.

They are not representative of the times, critics say, because, being composed of people with an average age of 60, they tend to emphasize established parts of the culture over and against new and incipient parts. And they do not represent society as a whole because they come predominantly from only one segment of American society: the class that controls the business world.

Given these criticisms, this article will seek to determine the ideal composition of a Board. We will look first at some characteristics of a good trustee and then present some considerations as to what constitutes an ideal board.

Deep Devotion

The first trustee characteristic mentioned by all students of higher education is that the trustee must have a "deep devotion to the cause of higher education." This should include, besides pecuniary support, an understanding of and commitment to the two-fold role of the university as cultural transmitter and critic.

Second, he must be open-minded, "willing to entertain without prejudice, thoughts and ideas that may at first seem to him not only unfamiliar, but, in some cases, disturbing".

according to the Report of the Special Trustees Committee of Columbia University, 1957.

He must, the Columbia report continues, "actively recognize that conventionality and conformity, no matter how greatly they ease social interactions, are not the prime qualities through which a university grows, prospers, and advances."

Leadership

Third, the trustee must possess the qualities of enthusiastic and inspiring leadership that will command the respect and admiration of others. Fourth, he will probably be success-

ful in his own field of activity. And fifth, he should possess the viewpoint that "the social order and its institutions must constantly change" (William Ashbrook).

Moving to the composition of the board, we find that almost all studies of boards of trustees recommend that composition of the Board be varied as to educational background, vocational experience, geographic location, and age.

Diversity of education and residence prevents inbreeding and parochialism and fosters a cosmopolitan outlook in spirit with the contemporary world in which educational institutions have an expanding range of influence, and interest.

Recommended Age

Age is perhaps mentioned most frequently as needing diversification. Studies have shown that the average age of board members at private universities is about 64. It is frequently recommended that the average age be somewhere in the mid 50's.

"It would also seem desirable," Hubert Beck states, "that no member should serve beyond the age of seventy; there should certainly be substantial numbers of members between 30 and 50."

The primary reason for lowering the average age of board members is that, according to Raymond Hughes, "the board should be young enough to sense the needs of the people it represents and guide the changing institutions to their largest service rather than that a large majority of aged men should maintain policies unchanged."

Occupations

Vocational diversification has proved a great stumbling block. In the past, it was thought that boards needed large numbers of lawyers and financiers because the university needed their expert talents and because they lent a high level of prestige to the board.

These arguments seem far less convincing now, however, because major universities employ investment counsel, legal counsel, and

competent business executives, so that volunteer "experts" may be actually a hindrance. Further, boards need no longer rely strictly on the business community for members in order to maintain a high level of prestige for the board.

But most importantly, the new situation permits the boards to more easily diversify

by vocation and thus would tend to foster a board atmosphere in which an over-riding concern with business matters can be lessened and a focus on education secured.

This would be especially true if educators and social scientists, the groups most frequently mentioned by higher education scholars, could be added in significant numbers to boards of trustees.

Representation

The most frequent general suggestion for altering board composition is the suggestion of "functional" representation. Proponents of this plan argue that if the board is to be made up of laymen, society in general is controlling the university.

But, they say, boards currently do not represent society at all but merely one class in it. They recommend that board composition be changed so that educators, business men, professional men, labor, and, where appropriate, agriculture are represented on the board.

The usual argument against functional representation is a pragmatic one: the board wants the best men it can find and shouldn't be shackled by some lowest common denominator set of qualifications.

The response to this is equally pragmatic. Most boards (at least in private universities) are self-perpetuating and unless diversifying criteria are explicitly stated, board members tend to be replaced with men of the same generation and the same political and social outlook.

Various experiments at diversification of membership have been made in the past, specifically inclusion of alumni and faculty representatives, but these seem to have met with only partial success. In the case of alumni trustees, only small numbers are involved and, frequently, the board is made up predominantly of alumni already.

And, just as with alumni representation, faculty participation on boards seems to be more symbolic than effective. Where faculty representation has been tried, the numbers of faculty involved has been so small that the faculty representative, in the words of one of them, R. G. Marcham of Cornell, has not regarded himself as "qualified to act and speak for the faculty."

As a solution, Marcham recommends that "the university have as its highest and most influential agency a planning committee of about twelve persons, on which trustees, administrators, and faculty are equally represented, and that this body have the responsibility for developing at regular meetings the pattern of the university's growth."

We have found that diversification according to vocation, age, geography, and education is recommended so that the board can be more representative of society whose demands and wishes it transmits to the university and so that it is young enough to be sensitive to the needs of the university.

(Next: Board practices.)

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1966

By BRUCE CAMPBELL
(Third in a Series)

Boards of trustees of American universities are controlled by the old, the rich, and the conservative, critics state, and as a result, the university has a built-in block to change.

Reinforcing this structural hindrance to change are various practices which also tend to perpetuate the status quo and prevent intrusion of forces bringing change.

The most important of these practices is the method of selection, which, at least in private universities, is co-option, i.e. selection of successors by the remaining members of the board.

Fosters Continuity

Co-option is defended as fostering continuity, and affording "some protection against the storms of public opinion and political and religious controversies" (Hubert Beck).

Criticism against it, however, are overwhelming. First it is remote from and unre-

sponsive to popular control, control by constituents or external controls of any type. In other words, a board changes only if it wants to and can be oblivious to outside forces if it so chooses.

Thus, it is difficult to remedy abuses effectively and to accomplish any reforms which may be called for.

Unwanted Minorities

Also, board majorities are "given the power to eliminate unwanted minorities and to perpetuate their own point of view and the university status quo in general" (Beck).

Perhaps the greatest danger in the selection process, whereby board membership is maintained in the upper few percent of the population (according to income, occupation and social standing), is its effect on board policy. There is a close tie between an individual's thinking and his life situation, status, and experience.

Social Position

Karl Mannheim made a study of the effects of a person's relationship to the ruling class on his own ideas and personal perspective. His finding was: "it could be shown in all cases that not only do fundamental orientations, evaluations, and the content of ideas differ but that the manner of stating a problem, the sort of approach made, and even the categories in which experiences are subsumed, collected, and ordered vary according to the social position of the observer." And thus the danger for board policy in having the board controlled by a self-perpetuating group.

Another board practice which has drawn the attention of scholars is length of service on the board, a balance being desired between continuity of board policy and freshness of approach.

"Wisdom and broad knowledge of men and affairs, ordinarily associated with the maturity of the middle and upper age brackets, and imagination and the spirit of adventure, more likely to characterize the younger ages, are the ingredients to be sought in the proper proportions," Donald Belcher writes in a self-study commissioned by the trustees of the University of Pennsylvania.

Terms of Office

In terms of years, several observers have recommended that terms of office be set at about six years, with perhaps one additional term allowed and an upper age limitation of 70.

In commenting on current practices (ten year terms, usually renewable) Ordway Tead

has said: "the end in view is not controlled by mere physical age; somehow the injection of a more youthful point of view, of an outlook somewhat nearer in age to that of students, would certainly not be amiss in trustee discussions."

"The values of long familiarity," he says, "have to be set over against those of freshness of view and of new enthusiasm; and my own estimate is that, on balance, there is usually greater benefit in having limitations upon tenure of office than in long years of uninterrupted board service."

Meeting Practices

Practices on board meetings and committees varies greatly. Frequency, duration, and subject matter of board meetings is dictated by such considerations as board composition and size, and the committee structure.

Standard practice seems to dictate meetings of the full board anywhere from quarterly to monthly. Trustees themselves seem to feel that greater frequency is beneficial, because they can thereby spend more time in deliberation of important items and thus reduce the feeling that they are called together periodically

ally to approve recommendations from the president and trustee committees.

Much board work is carried on between meetings by the trustee committees, which meet officially just prior to the board meeting itself.

Rotate Assignments

For the best long-term effectiveness, many observers have recommended that limitations be put on the tenure of committee appointments and that there be rotation of assignments. This procedure is advisable because, in the words of Alfred North Whitehead, what is desired on boards is the ability "to see the chessboard as a whole."

Five years seems to be the accepted length of service. Recommendations for improving the committee structure usually include: 1) use of non-trustees on advisory committees; 2) early committee decisions on issues of special importance.

The thrust of committee action should be to clear away the details and clarify the central issues so that the full board may devote itself to meaningful discussion of long-range educational issues.

(Next Week: Academic Advisory Boards)

THE STANFORD DAILY

MONDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1966

By BRUCE CAMPBELL

(Fourth in a series)

One of the most exciting and most promising developments in Board of Trustee structure in recent years has been the advent of academic advisory boards.

The bodies are groups of board members and outside experts who are charged with visiting, observing, and discussing the problems of given academic areas. They fulfill the two-fold purpose of both giving the trustees intimate contact with the academic workings of the university and of providing departments and schools with encouragement and expert advice.

Harvard, for example, has a well-developed system of visiting committees, forty-four in number. "Visiting committees of the Board of Overseers," the university explains, "form a sort of two-way street between the various professional schools or departments of instruction on the one hand and the board itself on the other."

Board Keeps Informed

"Through these committees, the board keeps in touch with and is informed about the current activities of all important branches of the university. To these committees also, the faculties of the several schools and departments turn for constructive criticism or for help in securing their objectives."

"The relationships thus established have become an integral part of Harvard's educational system."

(Harvard, unlike most universities, is not run by a Board of Trustees, but rather by two more or less coordinate bodies. The Corporation, composed of the President, the Treasurer, and five fellows, is self-perpetuating with the approval of the Overseers. It handles the week-to-week tasks and most of

its important actions are subject to the advice and consent of the Overseers. The Overseers is a body of thirty alumni elected by the graduates of Harvard for six-year terms.)

Harvard Committee

Each Harvard visiting committee is organized with an Overseer as chairman and includes from five to twenty members, who are not necessarily Harvard graduates and not usually connected with the university.

The committees visit classrooms and laboratories, and hold discussion meetings and occasional dinner meetings with faculty members. Each chairman reports to the board of Overseers once a year orally and by formal written report every three years.

The University of Pennsylvania has ten academic advisory boards, formed in 1954 and composed in part of trustees but chiefly of other individuals chosen by reason of special interest or competence in the particular field to which the board relates.

The function of the boards is "discussing problems and raising questions so that the President and the administrative officers, and the trustees if they so desire, may receive the benefit of their aid and counsel" (Donald Belcher, writing in a self-study commissioned in 1959 by the trustees of the University of Pennsylvania).

Scope of Penn Boards

The Boards concern themselves with "the organization and quality of instruction and research and with their stimulation and support," Belcher says. By developing effective communication with the faculties, the Boards "contribute much in the way of encouragement, cooperation, and assistance to the faculties, especially in their creative efforts to advance the educational objectives of the university."

Previous to 1954, Pennsylvania had a system of "constituent" boards which was discontinued because it "represented such a confusion of policy-making and administrative authority as to conflict with the policy-

making role of the Board of Trustees, promote undesirable autonomy for the various schools, and prevent the President from exercising his full authority" (Belcher).

Penn Boards' Possibilities

Pennsylvania officials believe that with the Academic Advisory Board system trustees "can be offered participation that they will find fully rewarding and the advisory boards can be developed into effective and powerful instrumentalities in the service of the university."

"Indeed, it is not too much to say that herein lies the key, not only to vastly improved relations among trustees, administration, and faculty, but to a strengthening and revitalization of the entire system of university government."

Stanford, too, has some visiting committees, but they stress the advisory capacity to the schools and minimize any connection to the Board of Trustees, although trustees serve on some of the committees, mostly in their professional fields.

Seven Stanford Committees

Authorized by the Board of Trustees in 1960, the visiting committees now number seven, and are mostly in the professional schools. Business, earth science, education, law, medicine, athletics, and computer science now have such committees.

Also, one is being formed for engineering and there are long-range plans for two or three in humanities and sciences, and ones for the Library and student affairs.

The committees are made up of leaders in various professions who analyze current Stanford programs in terms of their professions' needs.

Committee Functions

"The committees advise the President and the Deans of the schools on the operations of professional schools with special reference to the training of the students for the professions," says James Thurber, assistant to the provost and coordinator of the committees.

The functions of the committees, according to the statement of the board of trustees, include: 1) present new ideas to the school visited; 2) bring an outside view on the programs, plans, and operations of the school; 3) help to circulate information about Stanford in general, and the school in particular among alumni and friends;

4) serve as liaison between the school and related professions or industries, educational foundations, etc.; 5) formulate recommendations and conclusions regarding the operations of the school; 6) consider and review plans for the meeting of financial needs.

Each committee makes a two-day visit to the campus once or twice a year. The visit usually includes a report from the Dean, a series of talks by leading professors of the school, a reception with senior students in the school, and a business meeting.

(Next: The Stanford Board of Trustees.)

THE STANFORD DAILY

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1966

By BRUCE CAMPBELL
(Fifth in a series)

Stanford's Board of Trustees compares only moderately well with the standards of structure and practice listed in earlier articles in this series, but, in the words of Board president Richard Guggenheimer, "practice as well as theory must be considered in making a judgment on the functioning of a board."

"If something doesn't work, one should change it," he said in an interview. "I don't see that the present system is not working."

Guggenheimer, when questioned concerning the fact that two partners from the same law firm and two executives from the same company were selected as trustees, responded: "Whatever the apparent illogic, we are looking for the best qualified people and so we nominate by the person more than by stated criteria."

In Good Shape

"The board is in good shape and we are not as undiversified as we might appear," he noted.

Students of higher education recommend that boards of trustees be diversified according to age, educational background, vocational experience, and geographic location.

On the surface at least, Stanford fares poorly in comparison to the theoretical norms set by scholars. The ages of Stanford trustees run from 52 to 69, with the average being 58.6. (Scholars recommend an average around 54, with "substantial numbers of members" between 30 and 50.)

Alumni Predominate

In terms of educational background, twenty-one of the twenty-two trustees are Stanford alumni (the other one has no college listed in any biography available to *The Daily*). But many have advanced degrees (principally in law, but also business and engineering), many of which came from institutions other than Stanford.

"All the trustees are exposed to other institutions as well as Stanford," Guggenheimer states. "These people are involved broadly and much of their work is in organizations related to education."

Vocationally, Stanford's board has been accused of being run by businessmen and lawyers. There are, however, "engineers on the board, as well as an educator and a doctor," Guggenheimer rebuts.

The board's criteria for selection, as stated by Guggenheimer, are not far from those posited by scholars in higher education. Scholars usually recommend that prospective trustees 1) have a devotion to higher education; 2) be open-minded; 3) show qualities of leadership; and 4) have attained success in a chosen field of endeavor.

Objective And Flexible

The Stanford board, according to Guggenheimer, looks for "intelligent people with an honest interest in higher education. We seek people who want to work for Stanford and who are objective and flexible."

As for geographic distribution of the trustees, fifteen are from the Bay Area, three from Los Angeles, two from New York, and one each from Chicago and Houston.

Because so many trustees live around San Francisco (the board offices are located in the city), the board is able to meet monthly and still maintain good attendance (an average of 17 trustees were present for the meetings during the first half of this year). Frequent meetings are recommended by scholars as furthering meaningful trustee involvement in decision-making.

Monthly Meetings?

Monthly meetings, however, may be too frequent for at least two reasons. First, the administration is caught in an unending cyclical process of planning for trustee meetings. At Stanford, for example, planning begins about a week after one meeting for the next month.

Second, when meetings are frequent, the board tends to get too involved in the day-to-day running of the university. At Stanford, the complaint is not uncommon that the trustees sometimes become over-attentive to details some feel to be out of their area of responsibility.

A possible solution to several of the board's problems might be to hold meetings less frequently and to have an executive committee, which would carry on board business between meetings. In this way, it would be possible to have more trustees from outside the Bay Area and still to maintain good attendance.

In addition, the board could then have a positive focus on the long-range development of the University, instead of a watch-dog attitude toward the way the University is being run now.

Consider Self-Appraisal

Even if these proposals are not feasible, it

might still be appropriate for the board to consider a self-appraisal as part of the series of self-studies which will be going on at Stanford this year.

Trustee committees do much of the important work between trustee meetings. They work closely with the appropriate members of the Stanford administration, who make suggestions for the board agenda to the committee chairmen.

The Friday before each board meeting, the

trustees are mailed the program.

70 to 80 single-spaced type-written pages outlining the agenda for each committee. The committees, meeting the following Wednesday and Thursday morning, act on the agenda and the committee minutes then become the agenda for the full board, which meets Thursday afternoon.

Five Major Committees

The board's important committees are:

- Finance: supervises the budget and passes upon all operational financial transactions.

- Investment: supervises the University's endowment. The committee employs a full-time investment counselor and recommends to the board the purchase and sale of securities and other properties.

- Academic Affairs: deals with problems pertaining to faculty and students, especially educational policies and standards, student activities, employment and advancement of professors, budget on academic expenditures.

- Buildings and Grounds: passes on provisions for upkeep of existing University physical buildings; also concerned with policies regarding use of University lands.

- Planning and Development: the money-raising committee. The committee works with the administration and volunteer alumni groups in the promotion of gifts.

Academic Experience

The academic affairs committee has in recent years been the site for an experiment in trustee exposure to academic matters. Almost monthly, professors and deans make reports to the committee about recent developments and plans in their areas. Since the committee meets just prior to the full board meeting,

most of the trustees are able to hear these presentations.

Recent appearances have included: Hubert Hefner on the relationship between the University and the U.S. government; Maurice Osborne on the health service; Vergil Whitaker on the Summer Festival; and Robert Walker on Overseas Campuses and General Studies.

★ ★ ★

The Stanford board is headed by Richard Guggenheimer, an articulate, frank, devoted alumnus and San Francisco lawyer. While he admits that the board exists for legal reasons ("In the legal structure set up by the Founders, we have the judiciary duty to uphold the trust"), he also feels the board has a right to existence for broader reasons.

"The board of trustees of a university," he states, "serves as a bridge between the university community and the university constituency. It interprets the university to the outside, and also it provides within the university itself an independent

view of the community by someone who is outside of the faculty but who still understands higher education."

Who Runs University

He believes the trustees have the responsibility "to see that the university is run well, but not to run it themselves." He realizes that the Stanford board's practices and structure do not agree totally with the theoretical models put forward by scholars but also observes that "I don't see that the present system is not working."

Guggenheim has a suggestion to lessen the friction between university constituencies. "We need to have everybody—students, administration, faculty, and trustees—make an effort to understand the others' position." Guggenheim thinks that right now "the trustees are trying harder to do this than students are."

(Next: Summary of criticisms of board composition and practices; suggested model for ideal board.)

THE STANFORD DAILY

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1966

By BRUCE CAMPBELL
(Last in a series)

Many of the practices and much of the structure of boards of trustees tends to prohibit rather than to foster the proper relation between the board and the university.

This concluding article will summarize criticisms of boards and will present a tentative solution answering these criticisms.

The principal criticisms of boards are that: 1) the boards, although composed of laymen and therefore theoretically representing society to the university, are actually very unrepresentative; and 2) the composition of the board gives the university a built-in hindrance to change.

These factors, critics say, stem from the fact that the board is made up of the old, the rich, and the conservative. Control of boards now rests with business leaders, "the

modern representatives of orthodoxy and authority" (report of the special trustees committee of Columbia University, 1957).

A Dominant Class

Because a dominant class is one favored by the existing social arrangement, members of boards of trustees "tend to be conservative, to exaggerate the merits of the prevailing order and to fear any agitation favoring fundamental changes in the social structure" (George Counts).

There is also some fear that boards are too old to sympathize with student needs and demands.

Structurally, these problems are reflected in the facts that the average trustee is over 60, the terms of office are too long, and board membership is too limited, namely to the upper few per cent of the population (according to income studies, occupations, and education).

Unresponsive To Control

Also criticized is the selection procedure, choosing new members by vote of the remaining members of the board. This method, called co-option, is objected to on the grounds that it tends to promote a board remote from and unresponsive to popular control, control by constituents or external controls of any type.

Other objections to the current system are:

- An almost total lack of background and experience in teaching, research, and educational administration—"the processes that constitute the central core of higher education"

(Hubert Beck, *Men Who Control Our Universities*).

- An apparent lack of members familiar with the subject-matter fields that come under their jurisdiction.

- Limitation of board membership to the privileged classes tends to "destroy public confidence in the disinterested nature of board decisions and in the extent to which higher education serves the public interest" (Beck).

One possible board structure which could be built by integrating all the elements presented in these articles would be a board made up partially out of representative members of the public and partially out of university representatives.

Such a board would most fully exemplify the proper relation of the board to the institution and, in turn, of the institution to society.

That is, the function of the board is to facilitate the work of the university, which is to transmit the knowledge, values, and skills of society to the new generation and to critically evaluate the culture being transmitted.

Balance Of Functions

It would seem that only through a system in which there is membership both from the academic community and the society at large can the university, through its highest governing body, insure a balance between the service function to society of transmission of the culture, and the critical function of culture evaluation.

The board modification here suggested would provide for a broader representation of society's interests, perhaps by functional representation.

In addition it would include a double board structure in which the business management and endowment problems were handled by a small body which was responsible to a larger board. The larger board, once freed of fiduciary details, could concentrate on the real task of the board: "in the establishment of a college, the organization of a learned and effective faculty" (Columbia trustees' report, 1957).

Long Range Policy

Such a board would be able to give primary attention to long range policy and would embody in its consensus a balance between society's interests and those of the academicians.

The public sector would be far more representative than it is now, because it would, for example, include educators, social scientists, professional men, and representatives of labor.

One model (by Hubert Beck) which has been developed along the lines presented in this article suggests a board of thirteen members of which eight would be representatives of the public (two each from business, the professions, agriculture, and labor) and five from the university (two each from the faculty and alumni, and one representative of the students).

Besides the membership modifications already suggested, the solution here presented would include the adoption of age and tenure limitations to assure that: 1) the needs and point of view of youth, for whom the institution exists to serve, are understood and that 2) the board is sufficiently flexible to provide the adjustments necessary to changing economic and social conditions.

The inclusion of academic advisory boards completes the solution: a system responsive to the educational needs of both the public and the university, and one in which communication exists to foster that responsiveness.