

**FINAL REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF TRENT
UNIVERSITY
Otherwise Known As
THE ARTHURS LORIMER REPORT
(March 20, 1997)**

The "official" version of this report was once readily available to the public on the Trent University website. Unfortunately it appears that the report and all its supporting documentation have been permanently removed and are no longer to be found on Trent's website. Recommendations for obtaining "official" copies are listed at the end of this document.

Would it not be prudent for the Board of Governors to make readily available a report detailing which of the Arthurs Lorimer recommendations were accepted, and why, and what was done to implement them, as well as to detail which recommendations were rejected and why?

What explanation can there be for the removal of the Arthurs Lorimer Report and the absence of a detailed implementation report from the Board?

I. INTRODUCTION

We were appointed by the Board of Governors to assist the University in coming to terms with the causes and consequences of the resignation of its President, Vice President (Academic) and Acting Dean of Arts and Sciences. We were asked to address two general questions:

- how to ensure that Trent's administration meets the standard of best practice within the Canadian university community, and
- how to initiate a process which will over the long term promote constructive relations amongst students, staff, faculty, administration, the Board and other bodies concerned with the governance of the University.

More particularly, our advice was sought concerning:

- the appointment, tenure, authority and responsibilities of the President and Vice Chancellor
- the adequacy and appropriate organization of the University's senior administrative offices, the powers assigned and support provided to them, the procedures by which they are filled and the means of ensuring their effectiveness and accountability
- the administration's role in developing financial forecasts, implementing budget strategies and otherwise ensuring the financial stability of the University, and
- the relationship of the administration to the governance structures of the University.

We have addressed all these matters as fully as we could - given the limited time available to us - as well as related matters which emerged during our consultations within the University. Scores of individuals helped us to gain an appreciation of the current situation, its history and context, and of how the University might work its way towards constructive solutions to its problems. In all we met with, interviewed or received briefs or communications from over 100 groups and individuals, including representatives of all significant campus groups and governance bodies. We are immensely grateful, as the University itself should be, for the outpouring of information, analysis, concern and good ideas which we encountered from everyone who spoke or wrote to us. Due to pressure of time, we were not able to meet everyone who offered to speak to us, nor were we able to acknowledge the many written communications we received. For this, we apologize to those citizens of Trent whose contributions went unacknowledged or unheard.

In part II of this report, we offer a summary of what we heard, in effect holding up a mirror so that Trent can see itself. In part III we examine structural issues relating to the senior administration of the University. In our Interim Report of February 27, 1997, we provided advice concerning the appointment of a transition team of senior administrators for the academic year 1997-98 and now, in part IV, we propose a process by which a whole new ongoing administrative team can be put in place as of July 1,

1998. Part V suggests how the University may be able to move forward by establishing a consultative process to address an agenda of issues which we have identified as particularly pressing. In part VI, we offer some general conclusions.

Trent University has seen its share of conflicts in the scant thirty five years since its foundation. So have other Canadian universities. However, few institutions of any age or size can rival Trent's claim to provide its students with high quality, small-scale, innovative, even affectionate, instruction, a supportive college system and a rich extracurricular life - a claim which has deservedly won it the deep loyalty of its graduates, the respect of the community, the dedication of its faculty, staff and Board, and the accolades accorded it as "Canada's finest small University". Trent's reputation for undergraduate education, over the years, has come to be complemented by the growing reputation of its carefully crafted graduate programs and its important centres of interdisciplinary scholarship.

All of the qualities in which the Trent community takes justifiable pride have so far survived intact, despite the University's recurring crises of governance, administration and employment relations. But such crises, over time and especially in the present environment of cutbacks and changing public policies, may ultimately affect the capacity of the University to sustain its high academic standards and its character as a community. These crises tend to impair the University's reputation and consequently its capacity to attract and retain students, faculty and staff, to make its case to government, and to maintain support from its friends, the community and the many volunteers who work so hard for Trent. And worst of all, they make life and work at Trent far less pleasant and productive for all members of the community, especially those who are most deeply attached to it, and almost intolerable for those who find themselves at the epicentre of conflict.

II. THE TRENT COMMUNITY'S SELF-DIAGNOSIS

In the process of conducting interviews with specific constituency groups, listening to the opinions expressed at open meetings and reading the numerous written submissions made to us, two things became immediately clear to us.

Despite Trent's relatively short existence, its builders have managed to generate a remarkable university spirit. All those who communicated with us share a profound pride in the distinctiveness and the excellence of the university. It was immediately apparent that faculty, staff and students have an intense commitment to preserving and carrying forward the academic vision which inspired its original creation. Everyone we encountered greeted the review process in a constructive manner, and was anxious to offer their best assessment of where problems lay and what might best be done about them.

Commitment to the institution, however, does not necessarily translate into a sense of community. Like any university, the Trent community contains numerous constituencies within it. The opinions offered to us as to the nature and the cause of Trent's administrative ills varied and, in some cases, directly contradicted one another. These differences, to some extent, reflected the fact that the community had barely come out of the faculty strike before a new crisis was thrust upon it. In effect, we were asking the community to enter into self-diagnosis while it was still in a state of stress not conducive to such activity.

In order to address the future it is sometimes necessary to revisit the past. Doing so has been difficult for us. We were not part of Trent's past. We were not mandated, nor did we have the time, to undertake the kind of detailed inquiry which could sort out conflicting recollections and interpretations and produce a judicious assessment as to who did what to whom and why. We also believe that it is not constructive for the University to enter into an extended exercise of precisely assessing responsibility for its current problems. What we have chosen to do instead is to summarize, in as neutral a fashion as possible, the representations made to us. This has enabled us to define an agenda of controversies and concerns which need to be addressed. We received numerous submissions which expressed the hope that our report would serve the function of "holding up a mirror" to the university community, so that it could clearly perceive its problems and move on to a constructive resolution of them. This section of the report is written in that spirit.

We were struck by the frequency with which those who communicated to us grounded their analysis of administrative problems by reference to what they perceived to be the founding vision, or at least the initial working practice, of the institution. Trent's founders had a clear vision of the academic objectives of the university. It was to be a largely undergraduate institution committed to educating students in small classes, reinforced by close academic mentoring and the college system. The suggestion that colleges should have greater academic autonomy and make academic appointments, was moved by a committee on the academic role of colleges in 1965, but rejected.

On the governance side, the Trent University Act provides for a conventional bicameral structure. The responsibility for the "government, conduct, management and control of the University and of its property, revenues, expenditures, business and affairs" is vested in the Board of Governors.

[Trent University Act, section 10]

Senate, on the other hand, "is responsible for the educational policy of the University, and, with the approval of the Board in so far as the expenditure of funds and the establishment of faculties are concerned, may create such faculties, departments, schools or institutes, or establish chairs as the Senate may determine...."

[Trent University Act, section 12]

The Act also established the Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science with provision for subsequent faculties which might emerge over time.

[Trent University Act, section 14]

None subsequently did.

In its early days, with only a small number of faculty members, Trent was able to define itself, and largely to operate, as "a self-governing community of scholars." While it is unlikely that the University ever did in fact operate on principles of total consultation and inclusivity, there is a strong perception that faculty were involved in all decisions, via Senate and its committees or the College Councils. Administrative offices were scattered throughout the colleges, and administrators were frequently encountered in the Senior Common rooms, and were personally known to all the staff and students.

Trent has been lucky enough to have a body of faculty and staff who are deeply committed to its particular approach to teaching, learning and governance, and who have committed their careers to the University. Long service in an institution, however, can sometimes breed resistance to necessary change, and the University itself has changed. It now employs some 224 full-time and 100 part-time faculty, close to 400 staff (full and part-time), and has an enrolment of over 5,000 full and part-time students (as of November 1996). It has also added to its original undergraduate focus new graduate programs and a considerable level of research activity. Moreover, in addition to the pressures of growth and diversification, Trent - like every other university in the province - has had to respond to more and more interventionist policies by successive governments of differing political orientations, with differing preoccupations regarding reporting, accountability, equity and excellence. The only common thread of government policy in the last twenty years has been the virtually uninterrupted reduction of per capita funding support for higher education. In this environment, it is hardly surprising that Trent - a small university, especially victimized by the funding formula and committed to an increasingly undervalued vision of undergraduate liberal education - has experienced considerable tension.

The fractiousness which has characterized the Trent community for over two decades, we suggest, reflects very real and unresolved internal conflicts. These conflicts are manifest in debates over governance structures. There is no consensus as to the appropriate representation of different constituency interests in the governance structures of a radically changed institution. Trent's formal allocation of decision-making responsibility between the Board, senior administration, Senate, Faculty Council, departments and colleges and management resembles provisions elsewhere. However, in practice, Trent appears to have translated the informal habits of earlier and smaller days into a politically fragmented system, which, while properly anticipating widespread consultation of all constituencies, has no clear means of moving on from disagreement amongst them. This system, described to us as a

system of "multiple vetoes", is particularly problematic because of the difficulty of balancing the priorities of different constituency interests in a climate of economic stringency.

Three particular conflicts were the subject of representations made to us. They involved:

- the workings of the current administrative structure and the performance of its incumbent officers
- the role of the Board of Governors, Senate, and the Faculty Board
- the management of labour relations

The Current Administrative Structure and the Performance of Incumbent Officers.

Given the recent spate of resignations and the fact that all but one (or, at most, two) of the University's senior administrators must be replaced in the next 12 months, we received numerous representations on perceived problems with Trent's administrative structure, the qualifications of its administrators and their leadership abilities. It was pointed out to us that 19 people have rotated through five senior management positions in 13 years. Those who spoke to us attributed this remarkable inability to establish any continuity or longevity in tenure of administrative office in part to the demands of Trent's administrative structure, in part to the institution's failure to correctly identify what qualifications were needed for particular positions.

There was no agreement on what constituted an appropriate cadre of administrators for a university of Trent's size. While some felt that Trent had too many senior administrators, others argued that the demands upon the President, Vice-President (Academic), Vice-President (Administration) and the Dean of Arts and Science were far too great to allow them to exercise their responsibilities effectively. We took particular note that the thoughtful interim report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Administration (the Hillman Committee), appointed by Faculty Board, identified the need for Trent to "design an administrative structure which would not only serve the needs of the university but which would encourage capable individuals to present themselves to implement it."

The representations made to us indicated that Trent's expectations of the presidency are especially contradictory. One commentator suggested that Trent's attitude to its presidents "alternates between ancestor worship and cannibalism". We were frequently informed that Trent's president must be "accessible", "visible", "hands on" and personally known to all members of the University community. At the same time it was generally accepted that the president must give top priority to pressing Trent's case externally and must therefore spend a good deal of time off-campus.

Many commented on the physical isolation of the senior administration from the University community, characterizing the administrative offices in the Bata Library as an "administrative bunker", and recalling the dissemination of the senior administration throughout the colleges in the early days. We were also told, however, that the location of the Vice-President (Academic) and the Acting Dean of Arts and Science in Lady Eaton College robbed the President of valuable opportunities for consultation and informal exchange of views with his administrative colleagues.

Similarly there was no consensus on the kind of training necessary for the responsibilities of senior academic office. Some felt very strongly that practising academics, with no training in management, were not qualified to hold these positions. Those who advanced this position also felt that academics in senior administration had an inherent conflict of interest. They argued that it was too easy for them to return to teaching and scholarship if they felt that they had made a mistaken career move, and that they were unlikely to make hard decisions regarding faculty when they might themselves return to the professoriate. Administrators with training in corporate management were preferable, in this view.

On the other side, some felt that senior administrative positions had been filled with people with experience of corporate or college management but no understanding of university structures. Other voices pointed out that the University provided no in-service training for any of the senior administrative positions and that there was no natural progression from one level of responsibility to another. It was

commonly felt that senior administrators should have training in the management of labour relations in a university setting.

The relations between administration and staff appear to have been affected by frequent changes to reporting lines. We were informed that there had been a constant and unsettling reshuffling of reporting lines for middle management. Rightly or wrongly, we were informed that the senior administration did not provide adequate direction or supervision for middle management.

There is general agreement that there is no institutional support structure for long-term institutional planning in budgeting, staffing and student enrollment. Our own investigations suggest that data gathering and analysis is reactive and sporadic, and has not been adequately computerized. The administration has no means by which to generate data to inform complex decision-making.

While there is clear evidence that academic planning initiatives of recent years have not been completed, the causes for this appear to lie in disagreement over what constitutes a proper consultative process and how decisions are to be implemented. Many observers pointed out that Trent had made numerous attempts at academic planning, but that successive administrations had failed to implement the recommendations which had arisen from it. President John Stubbs had established the Presidential Planning and Priorities Steering Committee (PPPSC) in January 1993 "to ensure an on-going overview of planning that recognizes financial realities and draws on the financial and planning expertise available within the University". PPPSC was mandated to set an annual planning agenda, to name study groups and tackle planning projects, and to ensure that study groups consulted widely and moved ahead with developing proposals. The Steering Committee was to report to the Senate and the Board of Governors following consultation with Faculty Council. Three study groups were formed in January 1993. The College Review reported in May 1994; the Committee on Colleges accepted some, but not all, of its recommendations. The study group reviewing Curriculum reported in February 1995; its recommendations were not well received. A report on Approaches to Teaching and Learning was submitted in March 1995, and another on New Technologies and Multimedia in September 1995; parts of these two reports were sent to various bodies for action, but there was apparently little or no follow-up. PPPSC met for the last time in January 1996. While closure was achieved on the matter of college structures, no resolution was reached on other issues. The entire process appears to have failed to move in a fluid way through the academic bodies of Faculty Council and Senate, and the budget priority-setting process.

The Role of Established Governance Bodies

The tensions within the Trent community are clearly reflected in perceptions of the role and the adequacy of its established governance bodies.

The Board of Governors

The role of the Board of Governors appears to have become a general focus of concern. Many people recognized that members of the Board were volunteers who wanted to contribute to the advancement of the University in some way. However, several observers were concerned that, as presently structured, the external appointments to the Board do not provide it with a diversity of viewpoint and experience. Some perceive that external appointments have been focussed on those with expertise in corporate management at the expense of community, regional and social representativeness. We were informed, rightly or wrongly, that this element of the Board is committed to driving through institutional rationalization without prior institutional analysis. On the other hand, we were informed that the Board, if it is to act in the spirit of the Broadhurst Report on University Accountability, must fulfil its responsibility to ensure that the University's management and finances are sound, and that this has required it to seek out individuals with business backgrounds. It was put to us that most internal board members - faculty, staff and students - perceived themselves to be "second class citizens" effectively, if not technically, excluded from the Board Executive, Audit and Finance committees and ineligible for the Human Resources committee. Internal members are also said to feel that they were inhibited from acting as representatives of the constituencies which elected them. External Board members, however, felt that while it was expected that internal members would bring the views of their constituents to the Board,

their primary concern, as Board members, should be the overall best interests of the institution. We were also informed by some parties that the recent faculty strike had strained the established reporting relationships between the Board and its committees.

Concerns about the role of the Board also extended to that of the University Secretary, which has become a matter of controversy. During the strike especially, the University Secretary came to be viewed as a buffer or filter of communications directed to the Board from other constituencies. Moreover, the Secretary has come to be perceived as an active member of the University executive, rather than as providing support to its two governance bodies, the Board and Senate.

Senate, Faculty Council and Faculty Board.

If the Board of Governors, or at least certain elements of it, is perceived to be disharmonious and driven by inappropriate corporate management objectives, Senate is perceived to have ceased to function as intended under the Trent University Act. Only Trent's student senators appear to regard their participation in Senate with any enthusiasm. Other representatives stated that Senate has largely ceased to exercise any meaningful function as the senior academic-policy making body. Instead, Senate is commonly perceived to have become a form of "town hall" assembly where trivial non-academic matters like coffee carts and parking dominate the agenda. Consequently, we were told, it is difficult to find faculty members to serve either on Senate or on its committees. Moreover, the reformulation of Senate in the early 1980s reduced both the actual numbers and the percentage representation of faculty; now, faculty do not represent a bare majority as is common elsewhere.

Faculty consideration of academic policy has apparently devolved, by default, through the Faculty Council to the Faculty Board, a body mainly consisting of departmental chairs, which has largely inherited Council's functions. The Faculty Board claims a mandate to serve, among other things, as "an academic advisory committee to the President and his/her senior academic advisors". Its members would not disagree with the commonly held perception that the faculty has largely abdicated interest in Senate because they do not have a leading voice in it. Consequently, they rightly stress the importance of Faculty Board in filling the vacuum left by the absence of majority faculty representation on the senior academic policy-making body of the University. Staff and students, however, feel that some forum must exist where equal weight is given to the opinions of all constituencies on issues of general concern.

The Management of Labour Relations

TUFA

At Trent the relations between the employer and the Trent University Faculty Association have been embattled for more than a decade. A strike was narrowly averted in 1985. A strike took place in 1991 and again in late 1996. From TUFA's perspective, the Board's adamant stand on several key issues, particularly the question of the ownership of the surplus in the Pension Plan, has exacerbated relations between the parties. This has been compounded, in TUFA's view, by the inability of management either to negotiate knowledgeably and effectively, or to administer the collective agreement in a professional manner between negotiations. The Employer, on the other hand, feels that it has been demonized by the extreme rhetoric of the TUFA leadership. There is no consensus between the parties as to the University's financial position.

OPSEU

OPSEU members came within hours of a strike before the settlement of their most recent contract. We received many intimations that staff morale was very low. Downsizing has increased workloads while wages have been frozen. Constantly shifting reporting lines for middle management are perceived to have caused or exacerbated communication breakdowns between different areas and departments of the University. Senior staff feel that their experience is neither used nor valued. The job evaluation and classification schemes currently in place cause considerable dissatisfaction. The training courses administered by Human Resources are felt to be of little value. Under previous policies, the University subsidized the cost of degree or vocational courses both on and off campus; these have been scaled

back. Administrators, staff and faculty were almost unanimous in declaring that the current management and policies of the Human Resources Department only serve to aggravate these problems.

The Administration and the University Community

Both TUFA and OPSEU believe that lack of labour relations experience and expertise in the senior administration has made the process of negotiation more adversarial than necessary. The last round of negotiations was soured by the employer's decision to move to conciliation early in the process. Both also felt that it would be advantageous for the employer to bring experienced outside negotiators to the table.

The recent faculty strike has pointed to potential rifts between employee groups and students. Students are deeply concerned for the future of their University and their educational programs, in light of labour-management conflict. The leadership of TUFA is viewed by all other employee groups as well-organized, militant and capable of pressing the demands of faculty at their expense. Part-time faculty have by comparison, poorer wages and benefits and feel themselves to be subject to insensitive departmental hiring practices. OPSEU members are deeply offended by the post-strike bonus given to NUG staff. NUG staff feel that they have been unfairly blamed for this administrative decision, and are concerned that they have no secure terms and conditions of employment.

The Loss of Civility

All of the forgoing points to a general loss of mutual confidence among the constituent parts of the Trent community. The essential purpose of a university is to promote the pursuit of knowledge. However, if it is to survive, it must have agreed, efficient arrangements for a board of trustees, senior administration, academic governance procedures, management and support staff - all of which must ultimately assist the academic enterprise to function. In these contexts, as elsewhere in the academy, disagreement is perfectly normal and often passionate. However, while it is counterproductive to persist in disagreement to the point of personal conflict, over the past year in particular, responsible and committed Board volunteers, administrators, faculty, staff and students have at times been subjected to, and have themselves engaged in, a process of demonization. Likewise, labour relations may well periodically descend into conflict, but conflict need not take the form of personal abuse. Both parties must be committed to the process of negotiation, and the resolution of conflict should bring with it a commitment to make the relationship work in a reasonable manner.

Whether at the level of the institution or of the individual, then, there must be a commitment civility. Civility requires that all parties accept some level of disagreement in order to arrive at tolerable and mutually beneficial working relationships for common goals. The Trent community appears to share a common belief in the value of the academic enterprise and even in civility, but it has not yet resolved how its component parts can articulate with one another in an atmosphere of mutual respect.

III. THE SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS OF THE UNIVERSITY

An important part of our mandate is to review, and to help to reconstitute, Trent's senior administration. We have heard a good deal about the University's senior administrative offices, have examined the relatively scant documentation covering these offices, and have reviewed job descriptions prepared by incumbents. In addition, we had the benefit of reading and discussing the interim report of the Hillman Committee which was appointed by Faculty Board to review administrative appointments and other matters. Unfortunately, its final report reached us as we were completing our own report, and too late for us to take into account all of its recommendations. Some of these are quite consistent with our own; others - including the recommendation for the appointment of a Dean of Science - we had not seen previously but seem to be heading in the same general direction we have taken; a few are inconsistent with our approach. The Hillman Report should be considered by the University along with our recommendations in the context of the consultative process we recommend in part V, below.

As noted, strong - and often contradictory - representations were made to us concerning what Trent expects from its administrators, and the kinds of personal qualities and credentials they ought to have. We have heard, for example, that the President is expected to be highly visible and accessible on

campus, but also that she or he is expected to spend a great deal of time off-campus representing the University in its dealings with government, donors and the community. We have heard that under no circumstances should career academics be allowed to assume administrative office for a fixed term and then return to teaching, but also that all senior administrators should be from and of the academy. We have heard that the faculty espouses collegiality and civility, but that it extends neither of these to administrators or staff (nor, we are told, to each other). Most importantly, we have heard that the University wants imaginative, energetic and professionally competent leadership, but also that it also expects consultation and participation in decision-making so extensive as to amount almost to multiple vetoes. And other expectations exist as well: for a high degree of autonomy for academic departments, for devolved authority for administrative units, for academic coherence and administrative economy, for transparency and accountability and a willingness to make hard decisions. These are all reasonable expectations in themselves.

However, as Trent's experience shows, if all of them are brought into play at any given moment, the result is that senior administrators may be programmed for failure and University administration may be virtually paralysed. What is positive in the present situation, however, is that the Trent community seems to share a growing consensus about the need to resolve its administrative problems, albeit not yet about the solution to them. Here lies the possibility of moving forward.

Our own general conclusions about the senior administration can be summed up in four general observations.

- Trent is not "over-administered" at the senior level, keeping in mind the insatiable demands on senior administrators emanating from the University's ongoing academic development, from external events and government bodies, and from internal constituencies.
- The roles of the senior administrative officers, and of their relationship to each other, have to be better defined and more widely understood.
- Trent's senior administrators need a higher degree of professional competence, especially in the area of labour relations, and more professional support, especially in the area of institutional research.

Insufficient oversight of middle management is provided by the University's senior executives.

These are relatively non-controversial observations - even amongst University constituencies - although each might certainly provoke modest dissent in some quarters.

With a view to ensuring that Trent has adequate and effective administration, we next make several recommendations for the redefinition and reinvigoration of the senior executive. The purpose of these recommendations is to ensure clear understandings - by both incumbents and the community as a whole - of the functions to be performed by each senior administrator, a process to ensure accountability for the performance of administrative functions, and a better definition of the means by which senior administrators can work together as a team.

Specific Concerns about the Organization of the Senior Administration

Several serious concerns about the organization of the senior administration were expressed during our visits to the University, and have been canvassed in briefs and communications sent to us.

The issue of having both a Provost/Vice President (Academic) and a Dean of Arts and Sciences has provoked controversy at various moments during the University's history, and especially during 1996. As the Hillman Committee has rightly concluded, the work load which would fall upon a single individual holding a combined vice-presidency and deanship would be far too heavy for most people to sustain, and for the optimal performance of all the tasks involved. However, there is a clear need to differentiate the jobs to be done by the Dean and Vice President/Provost respectively, and the relationship between them, which we have done, as we recount below, and as we have set out in Appendix 1.

Several individuals who spoke to us urged that the present position of Associate Dean (Research and Graduate Studies) should become a deanship, rather than an associate deanship. The Hillman Committee appears to be supportive of this change, which would bring Trent in line with other universities, including a number of smaller institutions. We agree with this change of nomenclature and the implied modest expansion of the University's commitment to the position. Indeed, in light of current developments in discussions concerning the financing of research at Ontario universities, more visible and vigorous advocacy for Trent's researchers is likely to be required. Finally, apart from reinforcing Trent's research presence and influence, and ending Trent's anomalous use of the title of Associate Dean, the appointment of a Dean of Graduate Studies and Research will reinforce the academic component of the senior administration as a whole, and do so at relatively little additional financial cost. We have provided an appropriate job description in Appendix 1.

The position of the Secretary of the University was the subject of numerous comments. This position is not identified by name in the Trent University Act, which refers only to a "Secretary to the Board". However, it is a position that is now found in most universities, reflecting a growing awareness that both Board and Senate are essential to the overall good governance of the institution. It is hard to imagine how the two University's governance bodies can function effectively, or work closely with each other and the University administration, absent a Secretary to provide needed information and other support services, maintain their institutional memory, and monitor implementation of their decisions. However, the combination of these functions with those of Executive Assistant to the President is not in accordance with general practice, and it would be better if the University Secretary no longer functioned in this capacity. Needless to say, all of the Secretary's tasks must be discharged with professionalism and discretion. A fuller statement of the responsibilities of the Secretary is found in Appendix 1.

We recommend that the position of Provost/Vice President (Academic) and Dean of Arts and Sciences be separated, that the University should appoint a Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, and that the University Secretary should support both the Board of Governors and the Senate, but not the Office of the President.

The Structure and Responsibilities of the Senior Administration

We have examined and generally approve the existing structure of the senior administration subject to specific recommendations (above) concerning the Provost/Vice President (Academic), the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research and the Secretary. A proposed organization chart, reflecting our recommendations, is found in Appendix 2. However, it is not enough to simply locate the members of the senior administration on an organization chart; it is important that the responsibilities of each member be clearly defined, and that the relationships amongst members of the senior administration should be clearly set out.

At the moment, there are no authoritative job descriptions for senior administrators at Trent. While this is not a fatal flaw - some universities get along without them; others have them and ignore them - the articulation of what jobs are to be done by whom, to what end, and in what relationship to other actors does present an opportunity for a new beginning for Trent's troubled administration.

We therefore recommend that the University accept the job descriptions in Appendix 1 as the basic job descriptions of its senior administrative officers. These job descriptions should be confirmed by the Board, subject to modification and amplification following the consultative process described below, in Part V of this Report. Furthermore, these job descriptions should be reviewed and made more specific by search committees seeking new senior administrators for 1998, and periodically thereafter, with a view to emphasizing which aspects are expected to be particularly important during the terms of office of the new incumbents.

Since our mandate is confined to reviewing and reviving the senior administration, and since we do not have sufficient information about middle managers, we cannot say much about them. However, we acknowledge that the roles and reporting lines of middle managers will have to be addressed at some point over the next year or so. We have been made aware of numerous changes in reporting lines in the fairly recent past, as the University has tried to restructure itself to deal with declining resources, increasing performance demands and frequent changes in personalities and circumstances. The outcomes have included considerable dislocation and confusion, declining morale and, in some cases it

appears, unacceptable levels of performance. Consequently, we suggest that further changes be carefully considered and implemented.

The President's Executive Group

The President's Executive Group (PEG) is convened by the President, who defines its membership, agenda and collective functions. Clearly some form of senior coordinating group is needed, to ensure that the administration is working in concert rather than at cross-purposes. Such a group can also be effective in crisis management, "crisis" being defined to include positive as well as negative high-stakes short-term challenges facing the University.

We have heard suggestions that the PEG has not had an appropriate membership and has not functioned as effectively as it might. We are in no position to verify the latter point; as to the former, we believe that the President must have the right to constitute such a body according to his or her best judgment. However, we point out that given the recommendations contained in Appendix 1, the group of senior administrators eligible for participation in PEG has now changed somewhat. The President may wish to include all three vice presidents in PEG as a core group, expand it to include the two deans, and possibly augment it further by bringing in other individuals as members pro tem or simply for advice and information on specific agenda items. The University Secretary might well be asked to support PEG as its secretary or someone else might function in that capacity.

However constituted, the onus clearly falls on the President to make PEG an harmonious and effective body.

Institutional Research

There is a general recognition that Trent has not had at its disposal the amount and quality of institutional research which ought to support administrative, financial and academic planning, recruitment and enrolment management, collective bargaining and salary policies, and many other functions. We have been advised that new administrators taking office begin more-or-less with a clean slate, that they have neither expert advisors to turn to nor, in fact, can they find in their files well-researched analyses of the difficult issues they have to address, sometimes in their first days and weeks after coming into office. The decision to initiate an institutional research function two years ago - albeit on a temporary, half-time basis - was an important advance. Most people we spoke to, including the Hillman Committee, seem to agree that the University must now take the next step by establishing an institutional research unit which is professionally staffed at something above minimal levels.

We therefore recommend that the University establish an Office of Institutional Research (OIR), reporting to the Vice President (Administration) but working closely with the Vice President (Academic) as well. OIR should comprise at least one researcher, at least one systems analyst and one support person. Its mandate should be to produce timely, easily understood and generally accessible information and analysis, which is accepted as reliable by all elements of the University. OIR will respond primarily to requests for information and research originating with the senior administration. However, it should also respond - so far as it can, as a practical matter - to requests from the University's governance bodies to support their planning and legislative functions, and to requirements for information pertinent to collective bargaining and personnel administration. OIR will obviously supply reliable data; however it should collect and display such data, especially in regard to labour relations matters, according to conventions agreed with the unions. Finally, we see OIR as a potential source of information and advice concerning government policies affecting post-secondary education and research.

We believe that, to some extent, OIR can be staffed with personnel now performing similar functions elsewhere in the University, and that to some extent, the development by OIR of information systems will result in cost-savings resulting from a reduction in manual data collection and analysis. However, even if the University were to incur some new costs in establishing and operating OIR, we believe that this cost ought to be regarded as an unavoidable investment in a strategy to protect, and hopefully improve, the University's share of the provincial higher education envelope. Even modest success in this regard will pay for the cost of OIR many times over. And even absent such success, the notion that OIR might help

to lay to rest some campus controversies which are now the result of misinformation or misinterpretation makes this an attractive expenditure, even in tough times.

Accommodation and support for the senior administration

If the senior administration is to work effectively for Trent, it must have adequate support and efficient working arrangements. At present, one of the Vice Presidents does not have a secretary; the President does not have an Executive Assistant, nor do some other senior administrators; the Vice President (Academic) is located some distance away from the President and the Vice President (Administration); the President's conference room has an uncurtained glass wall looking out on an area heavily used by students. No doubt there are good reasons - historic and symbolic reasons - for these arrangements. However, to the extent that they may impair the effectiveness of the administration, they ought to be revisited. Whatever may have been the advantages of Trent's tradition of physically dispersing its senior administration, and of limiting its support echelon, those advantages must now be weighed against the need to deal with the radically changed circumstances of university administration today. As the University has grown, as financial management becomes more difficult, as regulatory and accountability requirements proliferate, as relations with various university constituencies become more complex, and - we hope - as academic and financial planning become more sophisticated, the need for the senior administration to organize itself differently becomes more and more evident.

We do not propose to make any specific recommendation in this regard. However, we must at least confront the University community with the implications of continuing the present situation. It can continue to reap the presumed benefits - symbolic, psychological, political or practical - of forcing senior administrators to handle their own typing and logistics, dispersing them amongst the Colleges, or labelling attempts at consolidation of the administration as a retreat into "the Bunker". Or it can increase administrative efficiency, improve administrative coherence and reduce the risks of exhaustion in the ranks of senior administrators by accepting a consolidation of administrative offices and some very modest increase in support services for the President, Vice Presidents and Deans.

Administration and management

Rightly or wrongly, the senior administration is not perceived to be competent in discharging its executive functions, including effective control of the University's middle management. This has led to the belief, in some quarters, that all senior officers of the University should have professional credentials or experience for their positions, or should at least receive special training before taking up their positions. In its more extreme form, this position is expressed as a proposal that academics taking on senior administrative positions should abandon tenure and the pursuit of their academic careers.

We cannot agree with this extreme position: it is inconsistent with general Canadian university practice; it would prevent Trent from recruiting experienced senior administrators from other institutions; and it would deprive the University of leadership which personifies the academic culture, values and practices which are central to its mission. However, we accept that the issues of competence and control have to be addressed.

Ideally, senior academic administrators acquire administrative skills by moving up through the ranks from department chair to associate dean to dean to associate vice-president to vice-president to president. At each stage, the individual would be exposed to new and larger responsibilities, and would be moved upward only if she or he proves equal to the tasks at hand. Trent offers rather less opportunities for on-the-job learning, above the rank of department chair, than larger institutions.

To be sure, some individuals seem to have a greater natural aptitude for administrative work than others; some have inspirational or affective talents which more than make up for their administrative shortcomings; and some actually do arrive with, or subsequently acquire, relevant professional training. But most develop their administrative skills on the job. Universities pay a price for this pattern of administrative recruitment: frequent rotation of individuals through academic and administrative positions sometimes results in foreshortened on-the-job training, loss of institutional memory and momentum and, on the other side, much-resented interruption of academic careers. Nonetheless, on balance you pay that

price. They find that filling senior academic administrative positions - specifically presidents, vice presidents (academic) and deans - from the ranks of the professoriate generally works well enough, and sometimes works brilliantly.

However, senior administrators appointed from the ranks of the professoriate are often supported, and where appropriate replaced, by career administrators and professionals in positions which are not directly involved with academic activities. Senior and middle management positions dealing with finance, administration, advancement, human resources, computing and physical resources are all cases in point. Moreover, most universities now provide adequate back-up and professional assistance to senior administrators with conventional academic backgrounds, in much the same way that government provides newly appointed cabinet ministers with a deputy minister and a staff of highly skilled civil servants. Trent has been somewhat delinquent in this regard, and to that extent, the competence of its senior administration may have been impaired.

This brings us, finally, to control which, as it happens, is very much an issue for the civil service as well. How are senior academic administrators to ensure that the professionals and career administrators are doing their job well, and achieving results which advance the interests of the University? Obviously, they must exercise control, at least to the extent of providing middle managers with clear direction and holding them accountable for achieving outcomes. It is clearly the job of the President and Vice Presidents to control those who report to them in the specific sense mentioned, but we have some sense that proper direction and accountability are not always provided at Trent.

Our conclusion, then, is not that Trent's administrative practices or systems have to be torn up root and branch, or that the University ought to veer away from conventional practice in hiring academic administrators. To the extent that the administration's performance is unsatisfactory, the cause is in part the University's failure to provide adequate support, in part the failure of members of the administration to take tough-minded and purposeful action to ensure proper performance by middle management, and in part, the failure of the governance bodies of the institution to hold the senior administrators accountable for their performance.

The principle of accountability, in a university setting, requires some discussion. Current management and political discourse emphasizes the need for accountability by public institutions, such as universities; the recent Broadhurst Report addressed the issue of how Ontario universities might best respond; and it is important that Trent should make every attempt to ensure the accountability of its senior administrators. However, accountability in a university is easier said than done. Universities are highly politicized institutions; they are decentralized and non-hierarchical, especially in regard to their academic functions; they lack agreed and quantifiable indicators for many of their activities - indeed, much of what universities do cannot be quantified or measured; and the importation from the corporate world of conventions and systems for gathering information, making decisions, implementing policies, monitoring outcomes and evaluating results may be inappropriate or unaffordable. For all of these reasons, it is important to devise accountability procedures which are realistic and appropriate to the setting in which senior academic administrators function; specifically, procedures applicable to administrators dealing with the academic affairs of the University are likely to differ from those applicable to administrators responsible for its financial and business-type activities. Nonetheless, to the extent that such accountability procedures can be devised, they should be.

We recommend that the senior administration of the University should be held accountable for their actions as administrators and managers. The lines of administrative accountability should run from Deans (or Directors or Associate Vice Presidents, in the case of administrative units) upwards to Vice Presidents and ultimately to the President. We further recommend that the senior administration as a whole should be held accountable to the Board and Senate for matters within their respective areas of authority under the Trent University Act. We further recommend that initially, and until more experience is gained with the operation of such an accountability system, the senior administrators should propose methods for the consideration of these two governance bodies and, with their advice and consent, implement them as soon as possible. As more experience becomes available, the governance bodies should periodically review these initial accountability arrangements, and revise them if necessary. And finally, we recommend that a special effort be made to construct modalities of performance evaluation appropriate

to the very volatile political and institutional environment with which universities are increasingly confronted.

IV. THE APPOINTMENT OF A NEW ADMINISTRATION TO TAKE OFFICE IN 1998

The consultative process we are recommending in part V of this Report will propose that the University develop permanent search procedures for senior administrative positions. These procedures will have to take account of the requirements of the Trent University Act, of appropriate arrangements for participation and openness, of the conventions and the realities of search processes as they have developed in Canadian academe generally and at Trent in particular, and of course, of the requirement that search committees work effectively and produce the best possible results. The existence of such agreed processes will help Trent get on with its searches in the future without running the risk, on each occasion, of protracted negotiation and - all too often - of controversy.

In this section of our Report, we will deal with the very special circumstances which Trent confronts as it tries to replace much of its senior administration, following the transition period 1997-98. For reasons we will explain, we do not believe that it would be advisable for the University to postpone the appointment of a new Administration until after completion of the consultative process, which involves many issues, and is likely to preoccupy the University for most of 1997-98. Accordingly, we will be recommending a modified search process, to be used in 1997-98 only, in the special circumstances of the multiple searches which the University must now undertake.

We begin by providing some background.

Responsibility for Appointing Senior Administrative Officers at Trent

Under the Trent University Act, section 10(a) and (b) the Board of Governors is empowered to appoint the President, the deans of all the faculties, and the "senior administrative officers" of the University. However, deans and senior administrative officers must be appointed by the Board only upon the nomination of the President, "a provision which does not apply where there is a vacancy in the office of President....". The Board also has power to fix the number and duties of the officers of the University, under section 10 (c). Under its By-law 1, section 7, the Board has indicated that it may appoint "a Secretary of the Board, a Provost, one or more Vice-Presidents, one or more Deans and such other officers as the Board may from time to time determine" including associates and assistants to any of the officers so appointed.

While the Board's statutory powers to appoint senior administrators are exclusive and relatively clear, other University bodies have come to be involved in the appointment process from time to time. According to past practice, Senate has discussed the mandate or role of the President, approved the search procedures for the Vice President (Academic), Provost and Dean (and for other officers not immediately relevant) and has contributed in various ways to other Vice Presidential searches. A provision in the TUFA collective agreement speaks to the appointment of the University Librarian, but not to other senior administrative appointments. And just recently, the Hillman Committee's interim report has been discussed, and in some respects endorsed, by Faculty Council. However, given the provisions of the Trent University Act, neither the interim report nor Faculty Council's endorsement of it has any formal consequences.

a. The President

Following the selection of President Conolly, the Board adopted a Presidential Search Policy (Special Resolution III.2, 26 Nov. 1993) which calls for the appointment of a search committee of 12 members "charged with recommending to the Board of Governors an individual to serve as President..." For reasons set out below, we will recommend that for the searches to take effect in 1998, the Board modify the search procedures established by its Special Resolution. We hope that the proposed new procedures will enjoy the support and engage the participation of Senate and of various university constituencies.

b. Provost, Vice Presidents and Deans

The President is charged by the Trent University Act with responsibility for nominating individuals to the Board for appointment as senior administrative officers. The Act does not require the establishment of provostial, vice presidential or decanal search committees, nor does any Board resolution. Consequently, the President may elect to either act alone in identifying a nominee or to seek the assistance of a search committee. In the latter event, the mandate and membership of any search committee are matters for presidential decision. While this has been a matter of recent controversy within the University, it is clear that neither Senate nor Faculty Council nor Faculty Board have any statutory claim to participate in the establishment of these search procedures or in the appointment process itself. However, we have already noted the existence of a practice of consultation with Senate with regard to the search procedures for Provost, Vice President (Academic) and Dean, as well as the recent interim report of the Hillman Committee. And as we will indicate below, we will be recommending a meaningful role for various bodies and constituencies in connection with the vice-presidential and decanal searches, as well as in the presidential search.

The Mandate of the Senior Administrative Officers

We have proposed in part III of this report what we consider to be an appropriate alignment of senior administrative responsibilities. As indicated above, the Board has authority under the Trent University Act to establish particular administrative positions and to assign duties to them. We assume that this authority will be exercised in a manner which respects the processes outlined in parts IV and V of this report. However, we do not have the luxury of awaiting the formal approval of the alignment of senior offices which we have proposed. Because of the urgency of the present situation, and the need to initiate an immediate search for four senior positions, we are assuming for present purposes that the recommended alignment is the one which will ultimately be accepted. However, if changes occur during the course of the search, the consultative process we propose will allow the new alignment to be conveyed promptly to the relevant search committees.

In addition to the individual responsibilities of each of Trent's senior officers, defined in part III above, all share a collective responsibility for bringing the University through the difficult period ahead. The discharge of this collective responsibility requires not only an array of talents which must be found somewhere in the senior administration, but also a willingness on the part of its members to work together and to support each other in the common enterprise of serving the University. We identify the following critical concerns for the new administration, a list which will no doubt be modified and given specificity by the search committees:

- the re-establishment of trust, civility professionalism and leadership
- effective external advocacy of Trent's interests
- improved employee relations
- the institution of more systematic and effective academic and financial planning and management
- renewal of the University's governance structures

A Process for Appointing the Next Senior Administration

Trent faces the perhaps unprecedented challenge of appointing a President, at least one senior Vice President - quite possibly two - and a Dean, all at the same time. In the normal course, a University would appoint a President, who would then play an important role in identifying his closest associates, and in recommending them to the Board of Governors for appointment. However, while these searches are proceeding, Trent will have an Acting President and two Acting Vice Presidents, who will not be able to play the normal role played by the incumbents of their offices in the vice presidential and decanal searches. Moreover, it is unrealistic to expect that Trent's new President could take office before July 1, 1998 at the earliest. Thus, if the new President were to take the lead in the normal way in searching for the Vice President(s) and a Dean, these searches could not begin until that date, with the result the new Vice Presidential and Decanal appointments would likely not take effect before July 1, 1999. We believe that it would be unwise for Trent to depend on its acting administrators any longer than absolutely necessary, and to do so for more than two years at most, if it can possibly do otherwise. Indeed, it is not fair to ask anyone to serve in such difficult circumstances for such a protracted period.

Accordingly we recommend that the search for all positions - President, Vice President (Academic), and Dean of Arts and Sciences - proceed in tandem. Depending on the availability of the present Acting Vice President (Administration), a search for this position may have to take place at the same time. We further recommend that the University should make every effort to conclude the presidential search somewhat prior to the conclusion of the other searches, and particularly that of the Vice President (Academic). This would enable the University to build a team with complementary skills around the new President, once she or he is identified, and would enable the new President to have some input during the last stages of the other searches.

Membership of the Search Committees

We have mentioned the issue of complementarity and identified the need to put in place a new group of senior administrators who can work closely together. This necessarily implies that the three (or four) search committees for senior administrators should work very closely together. Indeed, we considered the possibility that a single search committee might undertake all of the searches.

On balance, we have decided to recommend the appointment of three (or four) separate search committees, with overlapping membership and a mechanism to ensure close collaboration amongst them.

The search committees should have a common core of members, comprising eight members:

- two members elected by the Board of Governors (all members eligible)
- two faculty members elected by Faculty Council
- one undergraduate and one graduate student member elected by their respective constituencies
- two staff members, one elected by unionized and one by non-union staff members.

This core group will provide general procedural guidelines to the search committees which, however, confront somewhat different situations, operate in somewhat different contexts, and therefore must be permitted some measure of diversity in the way they go about their tasks. It will also coordinate the efforts of the search committees, with a view to ensuring that they share common views concerning the University's needs, that they keep in mind the necessity of building a team rather than just filling one particular post, and that the searches are concluded in the order indicated, if at all possible.

Each search committee should have a composition appropriate to its particular task, comprising some members drawn from the core group, and some from particular constituencies. The core group will specify which of its members will sit on or chair particular committees, and will make an effort to ensure that balance is achieved both in the assignment of its members and in the overall composition of search committees. In particular, undergraduate and graduate students, unionized and non-unionized staff members, and faculty members representing the three disciplinary divisions, should be represented in as near as is possible to an equitable basis.

We note that some past search committees have been very large, though we understand that the size of such committees results from an effort to accommodate the wish of different groups and subgroups to be directly represented. At the point at which committees are so large that they cannot function efficiently, it is necessary to make some compromise on the issue of direct representation. And in this present context, when the University is attempting the possibly unprecedented feat of three (or four) simultaneous searches for its most senior officers, there is a particular need to keep the committees small and efficient. We view nine members as the right number: it is the largest size compatible with the concern for efficiency but it still permits representation for constituencies concerned with the particular appointment. We ask all major elements of the University - Board, students, faculty, and staff - to keep in mind that they have significant representation in the core group described above, and thus an opportunity for significant input into the overall direction of the searches, even though they may not have as much representation on a particular search committee as they might wish or expect. We therefore recommend that the search committees should be constituted as follows:

Presidential search committee: Total 9 members

1 Board member from the core group (to chair)
 2 Board members elected by the Board
 1 faculty members from the core group
 2 faculty members elected by Faculty Council *
 1 student from the core group
 1 staff member from the core group
 1 alumnus/a (to be selected by Alumni/ae Association)
 Vice President (Academic) search committee: Total 9 members
 1 Board member from the core group
 1 Board member elected by the Board
 1 faculty member from the core group (chair)
 2 faculty members elected by Faculty Council *
 2 faculty members elected by Faculty Board
 1 student from the core group
 1 staff member from the core group
 Vice President (Administration) search committee: Total 9 members
 1 Board member from the core group (chair)
 1 Board member elected by the Board
 1 faculty member from the core group
 1 faculty member elected by Faculty Council
 1 student member from the core group
 1 additional student member **
 1 staff member from the core group
 1 additional staff member ***
 1 College Head elected by the College Heads
 Dean of Arts and Sciences search committee: Total 9 members
 1 Board member from the core group
 1 faculty member from the core group (chair)
 2 faculty members elected by Faculty Council*
 2 faculty members elected by the Faculty Board
 1 part-time faculty member elected by part-time faculty
 1 student member from the core group
 1 staff member from the core group

- * - The two members elected to this committee by the Faculty Council should represent discipline divisions other than that of the faculty member appointed from the core group.
- ** - The additional student member of this committee should represent, and be elected by, the student group other than that of the student member appointed from the core group.
- *** - The additional staff member of this committee should represent, and be elected by, the staff group - OPSEU or NUGs - other than that of the staff member appointed from the core group.

Information gathering and consultation

Elsewhere in this report, we recommend the establishment of a consultative process, which will engage representatives from various constituencies and governance bodies in a University Consultative Committee (UCC) with the responsibility of managing and coordinating extended processes of consultation on many subjects and over many months. The UCC would be an appropriate and convenient place for the core group to address any concerns about the mechanics of the search process itself, it being understood that these procedures are formally confided by the Trent University Act to the Board (in the case of the Presidential search) and of the Acting President (in the case of the other searches). In addition, the UCC might serve as a useful sounding board for the core group responsible for providing guidelines to the search committees, and to assist the search committees themselves both in refining the definitions of the mandates of the new administrative team, and in identifying the personal and professional qualities required for each new incumbent. In the special circumstances of the current searches, we favour intense, but not protracted, consultation. In addition, the search committees should

invite written and oral representations from the university community at large on both of these subjects, as well as nominations for each of the offices.

We recommend that the core group and the search committees engage in extensive consultation with the constituencies of the University, and that their work be closely linked with the overall consultative process proposed below, in Part V of this report. We also recommend that the University engage the services of a search consultant at the earliest possible date. The amount of information required to be processed for any one search is considerable; for three or four simultaneous searches, it is intimidating and quite beyond the capacity of volunteer search committees.

V. LOOKING FORWARD: A CONSULTATIVE PROCESS

Our terms of reference required us to provide the Board with advice concerning the establishment of a process designed to promote more harmonious relations among Trent's faculty, staff, students, administration and governance bodies. Our decision to include our survey of the Trent community's own sense of its conflicts, in Part II of our report, reflects our conviction that it would be difficult to offer suggestions for means to resolve conflict without first identifying the community's perception of its causes. "Looking Forward" will remind all parties of the need to move beyond the desire to assign blame, to move out of a culture of mutual distrust and recrimination, to suspend disbelief and to agree to work together in good faith to resolve problems.

We are encouraged by the common commitment we have discovered in all constituencies to the continued excellence of the teaching and research activities of the university and to the well-being of its students. All we can do here is to suggest an agenda of issues to consider, and processes for addressing them. We cannot ensure that there will be the will to do so. The University community itself is going to have to exorcise its own ghosts, solve its own problems and, in short, find its own way forward.

Re-establishment of trust and civility

This is the most difficult and most fundamental item on the agenda, and the item least susceptible to formal resolution. At the moment, the trust quotient amongst (and even within) university constituencies is low. Trust must be re-established if individuals and constituencies are to live and work together for the good of the University. If trust is to be re-established then civility is essential. If the University is to conduct its business successfully, administrators, faculty, governors, staff and students must be able to interact with each other in a reasonable manner. They must be able to raise concerns, discuss them, and work together to resolve points at issue before they become major confrontations.

Thus, civil relationships are a prerequisite for all of the University's academic and governance functions, not to mention collective bargaining and personal interaction. All those who serve the University are expected to demonstrate a high standard of professional competence, and a willingness to take responsibility for their actions and to be held accountable for outcomes. If they are to be expected to act in this manner, they must be able to operate in a climate where they are respected for the quality of their contribution, and able to take justifiable pride in their work.

Civility does not preclude vigorous disagreement on policy or the means to implement it. There must be debates and discussions about goals and priorities and the proper means to implement them. There will inevitably be differences of opinion. Civility does not demand that some form of consensus must always be reached before any action can be taken. What it does require is mutual respect, a willingness to listen to the other side, orderly procedures, and institutional safeguards. If the action subsequently taken follows duly agreed processes, if it based upon open and full consultation and majority decision in duly authorized governance bodies, then those who might not agree must, nonetheless, accept the outcomes. Effective leadership and policy-making in any institution requires nothing less.

Review of Search Procedures for Administrative Positions

At Trent various means are used to establish the search procedures for the appointment of senior administrators. The Board has statutory responsibility for the appointment of the President and it adopted

a Presidential Search Policy in November 1993. Senate has statutory authority to elect the Chancellor and therefore approves the search procedures for the Chancellor. It has been past practice, although not required by the Trent Act, that Senate has approved search procedures for the Vice-President (Academic), Dean, Vice-Dean, Associate Deans, University Librarian and College Heads. Senate is informed about, and has in the past discussed, the search procedures for the other Vice-Presidencies. Provisions relating to procedures for the appointment of the University Librarian are included in the collective agreement between the employer and TUFA. It would appear that with the exception of those used for the appointment of the President and the University Librarian, specific procedures for all other searches are created on each occasion that a vacancy arises. As a result they may become a source of controversy over questions of representation and consultation. In our view, it would be sensible to resolve such problems by establishing agreed search procedures for all administrative positions, as well as a process by which they might subsequently be revised.

In order to achieve this we recommend: that a Committee to Review Administrative Search Procedures should be established comprising:

- 3 members of the Board of Governors
- 3 senators holding faculty rank, elected by all faculty members on Senate
- 1 senator who is a College Head
- 1 senator who is a member of the support staff
- 1 student senator, elected by all student senators.

The Committee should be jointly chaired by a representative of the Board and a representative of Senate, who together should be responsible for preparing the agenda of meetings.

Before making its recommendations, the Committee should consult widely with all campus constituencies, including CUPE, OPSEU and TUFA. The Committee's recommendations should be constructed so as to resolve issues of openness, representation and consultation.

The Committee's recommendations should be directed to the Senate and Board for debate and adoption.

Review of Governance Structures.

In our opinion, the restoration of mutual confidence requires the reestablishment of governance structures with appropriately defined and clearly understood responsibilities, appropriate constituency representation, and open, transparent and accountable processes. Experience with university governance in Canada shows that a bi-cameral system with a Board of Governors, and with the Senate as the senior academic body, is most effective, provided that mechanisms exist to ensure cooperation between the two. At Trent, such mechanisms do not appear to have been fully developed. Faculty, staff and students share a common perception that the practices of the Board do not permit their elected representatives full participation. There are no designated seats on the Board reserved for elected representatives of Senate, although the senior faculty and student representative on the Board (but none of its external members) sit on Senate.

The Senate (currently with 52 voting members) has unfortunately been allowed to decline into insignificance. The processes by which academic policy initiatives should flow from the individual department, to the Faculty Council and Faculty Board, and thence to Senate, have ceased to operate effectively. In some cases the Faculty Board has taken unto itself responsibilities which properly belong to Senate. However, it does not have, and cannot arrogate to itself, the powers of Senate to determine academic policy.

In our opinion, these problems reflect the fact that the present composition of Trent's Senate is inappropriate for its statutorily designated function. Senate is defined by the Trent University Act as the chief academic decision-making body of the University. As currently constituted, however, the Trent Senate is not well-designed for that purpose, since the elected academic staff (faculty, academic counsellors, and academic librarians) whose teaching and research largely defines the University do not constitute a clear majority of its members. In our opinion it should do so.

We also recommend the following processes to restore confidence in Trent's bicameral structures and to facilitate meaningful interchange between the Board of Governors and Senate:

The Board

The Board of Governors should review and revise its by-laws to provide for direct election of internal faculty, staff and students members to the Board by the constituencies they represent, unless, on legal advice, such arrangements should prove to be inconsistent with the Trent University Act.

The Board should direct its Nominating Committee to review and report on the social and regional diversity and representativeness of its external at-large membership, so as to ensure compliance with its existing policy on this point.

The Board should review its practices to ensure that all Board members, internal as well as external, are eligible for membership on all committees of the Board, subject to procedures for public disclosure and withdrawal from committee deliberations when they have a clear and definable financial, personal or constituency, conflict of interest.

Dates and times of Board meetings should be publicly advertised and the agenda posted to the Trent Community on the Trent University web site. The documentation for Board meetings, including agenda, minutes and items not to be heard in camera should be available well in advance and routinely distributed to interested parties, including but not limited to, the Senate Executive, the Steering Committee of Faculty Council, the Chair of Faculty Board, CUPE, OPSEU, TUFA, the undergraduate, part-time and graduate student associations, the College Heads and College Council chairs.

The Board should review and develop a clear in camera policy, to ensure that its meetings are normally open, and closed only by vote. Such a policy should precisely define the topics appropriate to in camera debate, such as matters relating to personnel decisions, commercial and property transactions, student discipline, the discussion of strategy relating to contract negotiations, etc. In order to promote openness and accountability, budget discussions should not fall within the bounds of such an in camera policy.

There should be a joint Board/Senate Committee to develop a university policy on conflict of interest. Of the governance bodies, presently only the Board has clear conflict of interest provisions. The recommended policy should cover all areas of conflict of interest which might arise - personal, financial, academic or otherwise - in the course of the exercise of their responsibilities by Board members, administrators, faculty, management and staff. We would recommend that this committee should consist of 2 members elected from the Board, 1 member of PEG, 3 faculty members elected by Faculty Council, 1 representative of TUFA, 1 representative of OPSEU, 1 representative of the NUG, with the possibility for the provision of advice, as required, by the University solicitor. The Committee's recommendations should be directed to the Senate and Board for debate and adoption. It would be advisable, if the parties are agreed, that the policy should be appended to existing collective agreements.

Senate

A Committee on Academic Governance be established to review the current structure of Senate and present recommendations for its restructuring into a body with a clear majority of academic staff, and with representative seats for the Board of Governors.

The Committee should consist of :

- 3 voting members of Senate, elected by Senate (1 student, 1 faculty, 1 staff),
- 3 members elected by the Faculty Council
- 1 College Head elected by the College Heads
- 1 member elected by the Board of Governors
- the Vice-President (Academic) or his/her designate.

The Committee should report within 12 months of its appointment.

We recommend that the composition of Senate be changed to provide for a clear majority of academic staff (faculty, academic counsellors and academic librarians) even if this might require the reduction of the size of other constituency groups in order to keep the overall size manageable. Members of the Board should have representation on Senate and, conversely, seats for Senators, elected by Senate, should be added to the Board.

Whatever model of Senate is adopted, consideration should be given to the creation of the position of Speaker, to be elected by Senate to chair its business and to ensure orderly process. Although the Trent Act appoints the President as the Chair of Senate, the provision of a Speaker would allow the President to participate fully in Senate debate. The Speaker should report directly to Senate, through its Executive Committee. The Speaker should be supported by the University secretariat and should take responsibility for ensuring that the work of Senate is effectively publicized.

Consequent on the revision of the structure of Senate to ensure that the body has a clear majority of academic staff, the by-laws of the Faculty Council and Faculty Board should be carefully reviewed and, where necessary, revised to remove any provisions which are inconsistent with the enhanced responsibility and authority of Senate.

The Committee on Academic Governance should also review the possibility of revitalizing the role of Faculty Council as a forum for all academic staff within the Faculty of Arts and Science.

The Faculty Board, under the Faculty Council, would appropriately retain the responsibility for management of the affairs of the departments and programs of the Faculty of Arts and Science, and serve as an advisory body to the Vice President (Academic) and to the Dean.

Academic Planning

Both the administrators and the faculty members whom we interviewed agree that previous academic planning processes have failed to come to real closure. One reason for this, in the last planning exercise, appears to have been the absence of a clear progression from the consultative and recommending bodies of the PPPSC to the Senate, and the failure to link academic planning to necessary executive action and financial decision-making by the administration and the Board.

Trent is a vibrant intellectual community with excellent academic programs. As a small university in an increasingly competitive environment, however, it needs to have a clear and agreed vision of its program goals and objectives. During the next academic year Trent will have an Acting President and Acting Vice-President (Academic), an Acting Vice-President (Administration) and, in all probability, no Dean of Arts and Science. It will be searching for new incumbents in at least three of these positions and possibly others. It would be difficult to begin any meaningful, fully consultative academic planning process in these circumstances. We are of the opinion, however, that the recent creation of the Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Planning provides a means to lay the groundwork, by establishing how the future academic planning process should be constituted. The Terms of Reference of the Committee require it to reflect and advise upon a long-term institutional planning process for Trent University, to succeed the former PPPSC. It was to submit a report to Senate to this effect by January 1997. At the same time if the academic community is to devote its attention to a time-consuming planning process it must be assured that this process will have a significant outcome. Thus, all parties to the outcome - the administration, Board and Senate - must commit to the process in advance.

We recommend that the Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Planning continue its work and report to the Senate soon, so that an agreed long-term institutional planning process will be in place by the time the new President, Vice-President (Academic) and Dean of Arts and Science are appointed.

Linkage of Academic and Financial Planning,

Academic planning should drive financial planning. The Senate Budget Committee should work with the senior administration to establish the budgetary implications of any new academic plan, and report and recommend to Senate on the same, before Senate moves to adoption. Although the final decision on the university budget must rest with the Board of Governors, the importance of financial decisions to the teaching and the research activities of the University requires that Senate have a significant role in the construction of the annual University budget, and of any long-term financial plans. The 1992 Senate Review Committee made recommendations that there should be a more inclusive and open budgetary process, with full debate on the budget's provisions in Senate and the results of those provisions being conveyed by the President to the Board. At present, the terms of reference of the Trent Senate Budget Committee require it to advise the President on both long and short-term budget allocations and to report regularly to Senate. It does not, however, as is common elsewhere, recommend the budget to Senate nor, in turn, does Senate recommend it to the Board.

We recommend that a committee consisting of 2 members of the Ad Hoc Senate Planning Committee selected by the committee, the Acting Vice-President (Academic) the Acting Vice-President (Administration), and 2 members of the Board of Governors be established. The purpose of this committee should be to develop a clear written protocol among the parties for the implementation of academic plans which have been reviewed and adopted by Senate. The protocol should establish the commitment of the administration and the Board to accept the budgetary implications of an academic plan adopted by Senate, and provide procedures by which the Board and the administration will consult with Senate should unanticipated financial circumstances prevent implementation of the academic plan.

The current terms of reference of the Senate Budget Committee should be amended to provide for an open and transparent budget process. We recommend the following model for consideration: The detailed budget should be open. It should first be submitted by the administration to the Senate Budget Committee, together with any longer-term financial planning documents which may be prepared from time to time. The Vice-President (Academic) and the Vice-President (Administration) should be ex-officio members of the Senate Budget Committee. Each year the Committee should hold public hearings and receive written or oral representations from the University community. The Committee should have access to the line budget and any other financial records it requires. It should report the administration's budget to Senate and recommend its adoption subject to any amendments it wishes to propose.

The administration's budget and any recommendations of the Senate Budget Committee should be debated, voted on in Senate and forwarded to the Board. Although the Board of Governors retains the final authority to adopt the budget, if it rejects Senate's amendments it should give reasons for doing so.

The University Forum

Our recommendations for the reconstruction of Senate are premised on the conviction that the business of Senate should be confined to matters concerning academic policy, and broader University policies which shape the effective operations of the academic enterprise. Such a body is not an appropriate forum for interchange on a whole range of non-academic issues, even though they are of general concern to the university community. However, those issues might well be suitable for discussion in some important University forum, other than Senate itself, where all constituencies could meet on a reasonably frequent basis to exchange their views on matters of concern to the community.

The mandate of such a forum should be carefully defined so as to preclude discussion of matters such as academic policy or labour relations which, under the Trent University Act and the Ontario Labour Relations Act, are properly reserved to other duly constituted bodies. As we envisage it, such a forum would serve rather to encourage free exchange of opinion on a whole range of lesser matters which can affect the efficiency and effectiveness of the University enterprise, and the harmonious relationships between its various constituencies. It would have no legislative powers, but would pass on reports on matters which seem to require action to appropriate administrative or managerial departments. Minutes of the Forum's discussions should be kept and forwarded to the University Secretariat for circulation to the Board, Senate, PEG, all employee groups and student, academic and college constituencies.

We recommend that an ad hoc joint committee be struck to consider the feasibility of establishing such a University Forum and to make recommendations for its structure and terms of reference. The ad hoc joint committee should consist of:

- 1 member of PEG [or alternatively the Associate VP (Student Services)]
- 1 member of Faculty Council elected by Faculty Council
- 1 college head selected by the college heads
- 1 member appointed by the Committee on Colleges
- 1 member elected or appointed by TUSA
- 1 member elected or appointed by the Graduate Student Association
- 1 member elected or appointed by the Part-Time Students' Association.
- 1 member appointed by CUPE
- 1 member appointed by OPSEU
- 1 member appointed by TUFA
- 1 member appointed by the NUGs

The ad hoc committee should report its findings to the University Consultative Committee by March 1998.

The University Consultative Committee (UCC)

In our recommendations for the establishment of a number of committees, as set out above, we have tried to suggest a series of consultative processes which both respect where the authority and competence to act lies, and at the same time bring different parties to work together in what, we hope, will be more constructive relationships. However, many of the issues which are to be dealt with by consultative committees will be contentious, and can only be resolved over time by slow practical steps, rather than through grand designs. Unless some way is found to animate and coordinate this complicated process over the next year, it may well collapse under its own weight.

For this reason we recommend the following coordinating structure in which all constituencies can have representation and input and which will help to coordinate processes developing elsewhere.

We recommend the creation of a University Consultative Committee (UCC).

We envisage the UCC's role as largely facilitative. It should not seek to displace the authority, or process, of other governance bodies, or their committees, or ad hoc bodies established pursuant to this report. It should, however, take responsibility for oversight of the overall timetable of such processes to ensure that groups and bodies have in fact taken responsibility for their tasks and are moving forward with their tasks on compatible schedules and with compatible aims.

The UCC should deal with concerns about consultation and representation connected with these processes. It should guarantee openness by undertaking the circulation of any interim or final consultative reports and documents to the University community.

The UCC should act as a sounding board for the transitional administration which will hold office until June 30, 1998.

The UCC should provide advice to the search committees responsible for recommending the appointment of the new administration which will take office as of July 1, 1998.

The UCC should exist until July 1, 1998, subject to agreement of the stakeholders listed below that the same, or a new, consultative mechanism should operate after that date.

The UCC should include 1 representative of each of the following bodies and groups, selected in a manner which each feels to be appropriate:

- Board of Governors

- Senate
- President's Executive Group
- Faculty Council
- Faculty Board
- The Colleges Heads (1 representative)
- Full-time, part-time and graduate student organizations (1 representative each)
- TUFA
- CUPE
- OPSEU
- Non-union employee group (NUGs)
- A chair who is not a representative of any group or body, selected by the UCC
- A facilitator (if approved by the UCC)

Each body or organization represented on the UCC should have one representative and one alternative representative, both of whom may attend any meeting. The UCC may permit formal representation by stakeholders not mentioned only if, in its opinion, such stakeholders are comparable to those listed above. UCC may also invite the ad hoc participation of non-member organizations or bodies as appropriate, and especially when it is discussing actions or decisions of those organizations or bodies.

The UCC should meet on a regular schedule to be determined by its members, but probably not less often than every three weeks. Its meetings should be for a fixed time - two or three hours - and its business should be conducted informally with a view to making quick, sensible decisions which will remove blockages and keep the whole process moving forward. Every attempt should be made to decide things by general consensus, failing which by majority vote, each group or body having only one vote.

There is no point in pretending that some of the recommendations made above can be resolved without considerable debate, or that everyone will be satisfied with every outcome. What we envisage, however, is that authorized processes conducted by authorized bodies will make decisions following a reasonable opportunity for interested parties to be heard. This much said, it may well be that the UCC itself, or some of the other bodies involved in pursuing our recommendations, could use the services of an outside facilitator, to help them resolve disputes, to find procedural and substantive solutions which are novel, and to help to mobilize a high degree of support for particular outcomes and for the consultative process itself.

Furthermore, the length and complexity of the agenda which confronts the University, as it works its way through the consultative process, requires an investment of time by highly professional support personnel. Given the financial situation, such personnel will somehow have to be borrowed from other assignments and seconded, at least part-time, by the participating bodies and organizations.

We recommend that the UCC be provided with a small secretariat of seconded personnel to assist itself and the bodies which will be responsible for the consultative agenda. The UCC should also consider the appointment of a facilitator who will be able to gain familiarity with the problems, the parties and the process from the outset, with a view to assisting in the development of creative and broadly-approved outcomes.

Improved Employee Relations

The administration must conduct its employee relations under the dispositions of both the Trent University Act and the Ontario Labour Relations Act. The Trent University Faculty Association (TUFA), representing full-time faculty and academic librarians, was certified in 1979. The Part-Time Faculty is organized as Local 3908 of the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE). Non-exempt support staff are represented by Ontario Public Service Employees Union (OPSEU) Local 365. The exempt staff have no association, no agreement or special plan, and no common framework of employment conditions.

Faculty unions in Canada were generally established to resolve concerns about academic freedom and to secure fair, consistent and non-discriminatory processes of appointment, promotion, tenure and dismissal, to establish appropriate workloads, and to secure a reasonable allocation of university

resources to faculty salaries. Support staff have generally moved to unionize to ensure that they achieve fair and reasonable terms and conditions of employment which recognize their vital contribution to the functioning of the university. Although some would regret the emergence of unionism, seeing it as a sign of the demise of collegiality and of the entry of the academy into an adversarial labour relations mode, this need not necessarily be the case. If proper attention is given by the parties to the management of the contractual relationship, exchanges between employers and unions can be reasonable and constructive and provide a means to resolve differences through consultation, due grievance process and negotiation.

Currently, relationships between CUPE and the Employer appear to be conducted on a mutually respectful basis. However, the two recent strikes by TUFA and the aftermath to the negotiation of the OPSEU contract have created hard feelings between the employer and the two latter unions. This is not surprising and it will take some time for them to dissipate. However, there is an onus on the Board and the administration for their part, and on the leadership of both OPSEU and TUFA for theirs, to work towards restoring a reasonable working relationship in the management of their respective contracts. The means are at hand. What is needed is an undertaking by the parties to use existing procedures in good faith to make the signed agreements work and to resolve outstanding differences.

As a means towards this end we would recommend the following:

The job descriptions of the Vice-President (Academic) and the Vice-President (Administration) should both require training or experience in, and responsibility for, labour relations. The primary responsibility for labour relations policies and strategies relating to academic staff should be assigned to the Vice-President (Academic). Human resources management and labour relations policies, practices and strategies which relate to non-academic staff be the responsibility of the Vice-President (Administration).

The Employer should bring outside experts to represent it at the table during contract negotiations.

Subsequent to the conclusion of contractual negotiations, the Vice-President (Academic) and the Vice-President (Administration), should take steps to ensure that all academic department heads, middle management and other administrative employees are fully familiar with the provisions of relevant contracts and that procedures are in place to ensure compliance with them.

An effort should be made to negotiate a resolution to the outstanding pension issues between the employer and TUFA, if necessary with the assistance of an informed mediator acceptable to both parties.

The administration should review the management and policies of Human Resources with a view to improving employee relations and reducing unnecessary resort to grievance.

Both parties to collective agreements should undertake to ensure the effective functioning of joint committees established for the review of matters of concern arising out of their application and administration. It is incumbent on both parties to ensure that issues brought to the agenda of a joint committee are not left unattended, but that they move forward to closure.

The Vice-President (Academic) and the Vice-President (Administration) should approach the executives of CUPE, OPSEU and TUFA with a view to establishing a process for convening joint meetings with representatives of all three unions to discuss issues of common interest.

With respect to non-unionized employees, we would recommend that good Human Resources policy at any university would require the establishment of some form of employee manual, setting out common terms and conditions of employment.

VI. CONCLUSION

No one is more aware than we of the limitations inherent in any attempt by outsiders to diagnose and prescribe for the ills of a complex and dynamic institution, such as Trent University, whose condition is

the result of history, personalities, culture, environmental circumstances and imperfections of structure and process. Consequently, we offer the University our Report not so much as a blueprint for the future, but rather as a set of observations and suggestions which will assist it in drawing its own blueprint.

This implies that the all elements of the University - its individual members, its official bodies, and its many organized constituencies - will have to work cooperatively, over the next year and beyond, in a constructive spirit, something that they have not had much practice at recently. It will be easy enough to find reasons from the past, or in the inevitable errors or unintended nuances of this Report, or in future events, to avoid this difficult enterprise or to abandon it part way through. Government grants are likely to continue to fall; more collective bargaining lies ahead; real and serious differences of understanding and interest remain unresolved within and amongst the University's constituencies; and even if there were instant consensus about what needs to be done, it would take time to do it. But we urge the University at least to try.

Trying means accepting several fundamental points we have sought to make, even if we have got some of the details wrong. The need for and inevitability of change has to be accepted. People's responses to change have to be treated as being in good faith, at least absent very convincing evidence to the contrary, and disagreements have to be conducted without abuse, demonization or even a determination to win all arguments at any cost. If arguments cannot be resolved by discussion, they have to be remitted to orderly processes and established structures of decision-making. Hence, governance structures have to be repaired and administrative processes put in order so that they can function effectively and thereby regain the respect of the community.

In other words, we hope that Trent will learn to live and work and carry on its inevitable disagreements within the spirit of this report, rather than by focussing on its letter. The letter is not holy writ; it can be deconstructed, interpreted, amended, rejected or simply ignored. But if Trent cannot find a way to live with what we believe to be some fundamental principles of university life, it will find itself again and again in situations which no one on campus really wants, which harm the University's reputation and its ability to perform its vitally important functions and which are inconsistent with the best in its tradition and ideals.

How to obtain official copies of the Arthurs Lorimer Report (March 20, 1997)

It is suggested to contact the individual responsible dispensing official information from Trent University and make a written request for a copy of the report and all supporting documentation. The document collection index is listed below. The contact individuals are;

Don Cumming
dcumming@trentu.ca
748-1011, ext. 1224
Senior Director of Public Affairs

Nancy Simmons Smith
nsmith@trentu.ca
(705) 748-1223
University Secretary
Secretary to the Board of Governors
Senior Advisor to the President