

Governance: to put Light on a Lampstand

Dan W. Goodenough

"I have come as a light into the world, that whoever believes in Me should not abide in darkness" (John 12:46).

"Nor do they light a lamp and put it under a basket, but on a lampstand, and it gives light to all who are in the house" (Matthew 5:5).

At an Academy Board retreat in 1999 there was a brief discussion of secularizing the Academy, and some directors asked if I would discuss this subject more fully. When the General Church governance study committee asked Theological School Dean Brian Keith and me to consider governance in relation to the Academy, secularization was one of our subjects. Dean Keith has written an excellent paper summarizing the historical secularization of North American religious colleges and universities. The present paper is more focused on the Academy.

I want to emphasize that in writing this paper I am not urging major changes in the Academy's present governance, other than finding ways to increase the structural connections between the Academy and the General Church. Some readers might wonder if big changes are on the way, or if the Academy is having a major problem with secularization. I do not see new dangerous trends, but secularization and the related governance questions are perennially important, since positions and decisions reached now will have long-term effects on the Academy.

Factors Producing Secularization

The secularization of religious colleges and universities over the last century and a third has mirrored the basic trends in American society, particularly intellectual development among professional academics. Brian Keith's historical study very well outlines the fundamentals of this sad process. Like his paper, my study grows from George Marsden, *The Soul of the American University*, 1994, and James Tunstead Burtchaell, *The Dying of the Light*, 1998.

Additionally I have benefited from a number of conversations with presidents of colleges of different religious affiliations I am struck by how strong and rapid the secularization was, how quickly it took place in various universities, and how far theology fell.

Let me summarize the important factors in secularization of colleges and universities:

- financial pressures leading to fundamental change in order to receive private and public funding with various conditions that minimize religion
- marketing pressures, search for students, appeal to more and more applicants, in order to grow or just survive
- parent church's own weakness, secularization, and other deficiencies
- conflict in institutions' basic purpose: to serve both the parent church constituency and the whole American public
- governance separation between the parent church and the college or university, as lukewarm church adherents replace faculty, administration, and trustees whose primary allegiance was to a specific religious tradition
- dominant intellectual and philosophical trends among faculty, such that a general moral philosophy replaces theology
- an attempt to attract the most prestigious faculty, with little regard to theological orientation, leading to academic achievement's becoming more important than religious strength and growth. (Historically "the faculty was the first constituency to lose interest in their colleges being Lutheran or Catholic or Congregational"--Burtchaell, pp 828-9.)
- strong influence from alumni, foundations, and other donors whose prime interest is worldly excellence rather than loyalty to parent church tradition

- failure to support a specific theology, so that the parent church's theology becomes marginalized and ceases to lead the institution from within.

Loss of Theology as Central Focus

While many causes interacted to bring about decisive and irreversible secularization in American colleges, the loss of theology as an institution's central focus is a key ingredient of secularization. Why did this occur so often and so readily, sometimes essentially within a decade or two? Why did private colleges and public universities so easily remove their founding theologies from the center to the periphery, or cast them out entirely? I suggest these answers:

1. Traditional Christian theology is based on the paradox of three Persons who make one infinite and eternal Divinity. This theology is further complicated by a vicarious atonement through which the second Person's loving sacrifice appeased the first Person's wrathful justice. This theology cannot be made intellectually respectable, and its inherent weakness led to its own silent abandonment in the eyes of many thoughtful Christians. The mainline Protestant churches never formally gave it up, but when a strong theology was needed as an intellectual base, there was nowhere to go. Natural creation and human existence lost believable spiritual cause, purpose, or meaning.

2. In the 19th century, historical and literary criticism came to America from Germany and attacked the concept of the Bible as written revelation. A historical and purely developmental approach to religion robbed it of validity, and in its place science and evolutionary concepts came to be seen as the only reliable path to truth. Connected with this is a highly individualistic philosophy of man as autonomous, rootless, and fundamentally unconnected. And since there is no reliable absolute truth, everyone decides truth for oneself, from his own experience, logic and feelings.

3. The growth of democracy as a total ideology for society argues against recognizing distinctions among people. Society and government have become hostile to distinctive religious beliefs and to institutions that might threaten social cohesiveness. Many see social solidarity as the highest good, so that all society may be one and connected, without divisions.

For example, the Methodists' University Senate now evaluates Methodist schools' "church relatedness" by these bland and theologically meaningless criteria: a "common core of values rooted in the Judaeo-Christian heritage and the tenets of a free democratic society" (Burtchaell, p. 835); these values have produced some discipline of Methodist colleges for failures in finances and athletic integrity, but no action on account of their changing religious loyalty).

4. The definition of religion has broadened greatly, especially among mainline Protestants, to mean public morality and religious sentiment. Religion in higher education became defined not by theology, but by broad moral values and feelings that are common to most religions and in fact to nearly all people whether they are religious or not. Churches and religious institutions continued to call themselves religious even while the substance of religion was disappearing.

Duke University's founding mission statement in 1924: "The aims of Duke University are to assert a faith in the eternal union of knowledge and religion set forth in the teachings and character of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Compare this with its 1988 statement: "Duke cherishes its historic ties with the United Methodist Church and the religious faith of its founders, while remaining non-sectarian" (Marsden, pp. 421-2).

5. Underlying these factors has been the strong long-term tendency of colleges and universities to mirror the perceived needs and the Weltanschauung or essential world outlook of changing American society. Society as a whole seeks to make the material American dream available to more and more people, and is skeptical of any one spiritual path or set of answers.

Similarly, American academia champions a higher education which is individualistic (yet equal for all), scornful of higher intellectual authority, respectful of knowledge but not authoritarian truth, and committed to the scientific method of inquiry as the only criterion of valid knowledge.

Powerful religious thinkers note the inconsistency of invalidating all non-experiential knowledge, and point out that non-religious, naturalist assumptions are even more arbitrary than spiritual assumptions. Yet the forces for removing religious thought from serious academic consideration have been overwhelming in this century, and theology is no longer a respectable center for education. Cardinal John Henry Newman's vision of theology as the core of the true university has turned out to be a Christian educational swansong rather than the vision for the future that he intended.

As President Maurer of Beloit College summed it up, "The warrant of religion is two-fold: to speak to the moral conscience of the scholar, but to refrain from confronting his intellect" (Burtchaell, p. 832).

A New Church appraisal of the possibilities for genuinely New Church higher education in the 21st century can feel a justifiable separation from the failure of old and untrue theology. But an honest appraisal will also take seriously the awesome march of secular and materialistic thinking, which rejects (along with the old theology) the possibility of non-material explanations for the meaning of human life.

As Burtchaell convincingly shows, "Higher learning, if not an irresistible seducer, is still a very able one. The mind's affluence does seem at least as beguiling as that of the body. There was ... little learned rage against the dying of the light " (p. 851).

The forces that secularized hundreds and hundreds of colleges in a generation or two must be taken seriously, because as a New Church institution the Academy must live within the social and intellectual world that it seeks to change.

"Walk while you have the light, lest darkness overtake you; he who walks in darkness does not know where he is going. While you have the light, believe in the light, that you may become children of light" (John 12:35, 36).

But How Do You Know?

But how would we know if we did secularize the Academy? Historically, when secularization occurs, those primarily responsible for making it happen either don't see it for what it is or else deny that it is occurring. The secularizers are not just outsiders moving in, but highly intelligent and moral people, frequently church leaders and members. One of the most striking features of secularization is the inability of participants and observers to realize what is taking place. A later generation looks back and notes that the college's character has lost its theology as a central guiding force, and retains it only in external trappings, through attractive symbolism and some nice traditions.

This is somewhat reminiscent of the situation at the Last Judgment of 1757. Those who were judged, although they were evil inside, were convinced they were solid Christian believers with a strong faith and plenty of good works to their credit. Long since gone to hell were the criminal element and evil people aware of their dominant evils. The world of spirits was full of individuals who fully professed the Christian religion and for the most part lived good moral lives. But they had failed to shun evils because they were sins against God, and as a result, all their external good words and works were motivated by ambitions to promote themselves to power, honor, reputation and wealth. Their very success blinded them, and they were unable to see the realities of their inner hearts until the earthquakes and lightning of the Last Judgment, when the spiritual sense of the Word revealed their interior states for what they were (see LJ 59, 69-71; CLJ 10, 16).

In no sense do I imply a spiritual judgment of those individuals who brought secularization to American colleges and universities. My point is that people can be blind to the most obvious realities if they do not wish to see them, and especially if success in the world, "the tide in the affairs of men," seems to favor them. In retrospect it is almost beyond belief how rapidly and thoroughly Christian institutions replaced theology with scientific, empirical and democratic values as their supreme ideals. A crucial lesson for New Church people is that dramatically secularizing changes may take place under our very noses, in front of eyes wide open, and not be recognized for what they are.

Like all churches, mainline Protestant churches changed not by conscious, deliberate decision to abandon their founding theology in favor of the Enlightenment worldview and democratic ideology. They saw themselves as updated Christians in a modern world. Churches decline when "from being interested in inward things they become interested in outward ones, till at length they do not care about inward things, and make the whole of worship consist in outward things"(AC 10437). We can guard against this ultimate of slippery slopes by maintaining internal, spiritual goals as our central focus, and applying them on the natural plane without allowing external concerns to be our principal focus. This is why it is crucial to be structured so that New Church theology will lead.

How do we determine if we are secularizing or not, and whether we are being true to our central ideals and values, or are coming to love externals more than internals? This question will continue as long as the Academy seeks to be "of the New Church." Answering it requires open discussion, and above all a widespread and sincere wish to seek light from the threefold Word. We are unlikely to find unanimous agreement on questions of this kind, and in whatever directions the Academy heads, dissenters may argue that we are betraying the true import of New Church doctrine.

That's our New Church culture.

So what decides? Majority rules? Those in governance or administrative power? The priesthood? Donors? Consultants? My deepest hope is that we continue to follow W. F. Pendleton's inspiring call to be led by the Lord and not by human constitutions. In practice I think this means both priesthood and laity going to the Lord's written Word, studying passages and their meaning and practical applications, discussing broadly and patiently, listening carefully to other opinions with a true willingness to rethink one's own position, reaching as much consensus as possible in a sphere of good will, with a willingness to delay for a genuine consensus. The dialog between clergy and laity must be real, giving due recognition both to essential theological ideas, and to the natural realities of our worldly environment in which applications must be made.

Still, how do we define secularization? At the Academy some suggestions for change have been carried out that I thought were weakening New Church religion in life. Undoubtedly some New Church people feel that way about different decisions reached during my presidency, which I feel were New Church applications. How will we know? In a generation or two our descendants will judge our present course as readily as we characterize the secularization of Princeton and Harvard over a century ago. In the meantime our standards will almost certainly move in the direction of the dominant standards within our New Church culture. The Academy schools will reflect the values and ideals of the religious faith of our faculty and administrators, laity and priests, students and families, corporation and board, and alumni and friends.

For instance, while the Academy of the past had little interest in external evangelization, today the Academy increasingly joins the General Church and its schools in wishing to attract genuine spiritual seekers. A generation ago when I favored college courses on comparative religion and moral application, an older theological perspective saw this as secularizing, because it meant less time studying basic New Church doctrines.

At present the wave of interest in other religions and applications of doctrine has grown greatly, and while I strongly support this, as priest president I believe we must not diminish the doctrinal content of courses, or the amount of New Church doctrine studied for credit. These healthy everyday questions truly beg for a working partnership among priests and lay people who share some expertise in academic subject areas, and who love to understand the doctrines. (If this sounds like a plug for our M.A. program in Theological School, it is!)

Maintaining New Church Vision and Direction in a Secular Academic World

A New Church school requires:

- a committed New Church faculty

- programs and curriculum founded on the doctrines
- governance that facilitates flow of the doctrines throughout the institution, and a sound organic tie with the General Church
- strategic planning and budgeting priorities that reflect the educational vision from doctrine
- student life policies guided by the doctrines
- a student body made up of students who, though not perfect, are personally seeking spiritual and moral answers from the threefold Word
- worshipful activities and teaching practices founded on New Church principles, including rationality and freedom
- a spirit and sphere of charity in relationships among students, faculty, administration, board, corporation, families and alumni.

These critical elements depend on the principles that the institution talks about, evaluates and insists on in daily operations, and on the people whom it hires, particularly the faculty. How can we maintain and improve our commitment to truly New Church schools? Let me focus on two governance prerequisites, essential to provide the requirements that I just listed.

Governing Board: We need an active board of dedicated New Church men and women who care deeply about New Church religious education and also about the business of running our schools. The board needs individuals who provide the Academy with high-level expertise in financial, legal, and other business experience, who support the Academy financially, and who are themselves fully committed to the General Church and also to specific distinctive New Church doctrines and the Academy educational vision.

The appointment and election of such a board is crucial to the long-term spiritual direction of the Academy, and this means that the power to determine the board's makeup is also a crucial question. Whatever group or groups have the power to determine the board's makeup in effect control the character of the board, and in the long run, the future of the Academy. Historically, when a church has lost this power, a school has gradually separated from the church. Typically the board of a religious college is at first appointed in part or in total by an organ of the parent church. As secularization occurs, the college president and board find ways to move the key decisions away from the church trustees and to minimize or eliminate the church's influence in board appointment. Generally a president has a large role in the board's makeup by influencing the nominating body, often away from church control and policies.

At one prominent religious University the board consists of all the top clergy of the church, as if the Academy board were made up of the Bishop's Consistory of priests. Secularization here has tough sledding, but the environment lacks commitment to freedom and rationality, and has been described by one New Church student there as "wooden." The Academy should give close attention to the process that nominates to the corporation and board. Compared to other religious schools, our parent General Church has little official input, though the Bishop's appointment of the chair and committee members allows input in a relatively small, informal, friendly environment. In a less personal environment in which a school might seek to be more independent from the church, our present nominations procedure provides little to maintain the Academy in a General Church direction.

Nominations to a governance board seems an obvious area where we need cooperation and partnership among priests and lay people, and I suggest the nominating body include a non-Academy General Church priest.

It has been suggested that in a crisis the Executive Bishop could just step in and take over the administrative position of the Academy president. I question whether this would work, especially if the president and board were united. The Executive Bishop can now fire the president, and perhaps this means he can assume the administrative position himself for a time. If the Executive Bishop were highly respected by the Academy board, this would be possible. If the president were popular with the board and involved in a protracted conflict with the Executive Bishop, it would be difficult for the Executive Bishop to step in and take over the president's job, even temporarily. I can well imagine the board's refusing to allow that during a state of real tension--when it would be especially needed--unless there is a clear organic tie

between the Academy and General Church.

Schools and colleges can be organically connected with parent church bodies in a number of ways, and that organic connection should be of crucial concern to us--not due to present dangers, but because in the long run, church schools seek to increase their freedom of action and independence from parental church bodies. The time may come when the Executive Bishop plays a substantially smaller role at ANC, but before this happens, appropriate connection with the General Church should be provided.

Why a Priest President? I sought my present position because I believe the president and chief executive officer of the Academy should be a priest, and I continue to believe this strongly. Though this may seem self-serving, let me explain my reasons, with the comment that as a General Church priest and Academy professor I am a priest president out of conviction for New Church education. If the board thinks a lay person should be the top academic administrator, I would disagree firmly, not out of personal aspirations, but on principle and because I think essential Academy uses would suffer.

The Academy's top administrator should be a priest in order to facilitate spiritual leading of key educational directions. At present the Academy president has less authority over the schools than a decade ago--due to breakout budgeting and other factors. The lay heads of schools are largely autonomous in reaching their own decisions. Exceptions to the schools' autonomy: they cannot act without presidential approval in hiring full-time faculty, or in budget or major program changes, although they remain the driver in all these areas. It is difficult to see the president's having less responsibility without giving up all ability to veto a staffing decision or affect basic direction. Certainly any school head at times wishes for increased authority, and sees the president (or the board, or other administrators, or clergy, or whoever) as being too powerful.

Why is it important that a priest be top administrator rather than a lay person? Won't any sincere New Church man or woman lead from the doctrines? Having attempted to make New Church administrative decisions, I know how difficult it sometimes is to lead and decide from doctrine in actual situations, and how much help I have had from knowing specific doctrines, and from using them regularly in everyday teaching, preaching, and counseling. Long-term familiarity with the doctrines in many working situations is invaluable and, I believe, essential for the decisions that a president/CEO must make in educational administration. Certainly educational expertise and administrative ability are necessary, but so are doctrinal training and experience.

In addition, consider the matter of a professional's basic focus. While ministers from their training and orientation push (or should push) agendas of theology and spiritual life, often lay people from their training and life work push agendas relating to this or that practical application. All these agendas are important, and we need cooperation so that neither the doctrinal agenda nor the application agenda ignores the other. The best decisions in the Academy come from cooperation between lay people and clergy, so that the spiritual and natural agendas change and adapt to each other, then are implemented. We probably all agree on this, and the question is, which should lead? If the spiritual should lead and flow into the natural application, then an administrative structure should be established to encourage doctrine to lead and flow into natural applications (everyday administrative decisions). If, on the other hand, the structure puts at the top of academic administration those whose primary ability and inspiration lie in practical educational applications rather than theology, then that is the inspiration and light which will lead the institution's daily decisions. This was one major cause of the secularization of American colleges and universities.

For example, I've noticed that while priests tend to see many questions in terms of spiritual meaning (maybe forgetting other aspects), lay people sometimes (not always) focus on power questions and on other down-to-earth issues. Certainly questions should be examined on all these planes, and power and other worldly issues cannot be ignored; that's why we must have effective clergy/lay cooperation. At the same time, it is crucial what principles and issues are taken as key and guiding, and what fundamental motivations we act from: doctrine, marketing demands, prudent financial planning, personal and political realities, power issues. All these and more are part of the Academy's daily decisions and directions.

But what are the principal motivations and values? What are the motivations and values that we not only talk about, but truly and really act from, in the decisions that direct the institution-in staffing, basic programs, planning and priorities, student life policies, growth issues, outlook to seekers?

When you are analyzing a problem, the questions you ask, your vocabulary, and the categories you use to interpret the problem will greatly influence the motives from which you reach a conclusion. For example, what are the leading questions and terms and criteria you should use to resolve a staffing or marketing or student-residence or donor-recognition issue? The conclusion will come from the motivations (loves) that are inspired by your analysis, and by the questions that you see as primary. (For a disillusioning example, recall the widely differing questions, vocabulary and categories used to analyze and judge a politician's conduct a year ago. For a happier example, review how the newly born General Church analyzed key governance questions in the late 1890s, after the separation from Benade.) Conclusions come from the questions and methods of analysis.

Let me illustrate with a current question. There is fairly widespread agreement that the Academy, particularly the college, should seek to grow by improving our appeal to spiritual seekers from outside. But it is crucial to the Academy's integrity and spiritual direction that decisions about this be motivated by a genuine spiritual wish to build the Lord's kingdom, rather than by worldly (yet not bad) reasons for growth. I believe a priest president/CEO can lead the Academy to good decisions in such an area more easily than one whose primary light has come from a non- doctrinal expertise. From his theological training and career orientation, a priest president can keep at the head of the discussion the spiritual import of an issue. Because he tends to be respected as a representative of the Lord, it is easier by this office to insist on a charitable hearing of all controversial opinions. And after a decision is reached, he may have an easier time than lay leaders in showing dissenters that the Academy is acting for spiritual reasons, not natural.

This last is no easy task since so many Academy decisions face agitated opponents.

The goodness of a decision includes the motive and the thinking that go into it as well as the space-time decision itself, because the motive and thinking that lie within decisions are what define our institution. The doctrine of discrete degrees shows that the prime reality of any work or action or decision consists of the love and understanding that produced it and lie inside it. Spiritually, the Academy, like each of us, consists of the motivation and the thinking that produce what it does (see DLW 179-247 and other treatments of discrete degrees in the Writings). Ignorance about this inner reality of administrative decisions was another reason so many colleges secularized.

Spiritual directions are maintained not just by a priest at the top talking about our prime spiritual values, but through actual decisions made on specific educational programs, individual staffing questions, policies on enrollment of non-baptized seekers, student-life issues, strategic planning and fundamental budget priorities--in other words, basic educational administration. Daily decisions in all these areas greatly impact the Academy's character. I believe faculty staffing questions are especially critical for a priest president because pressures for secular educational excellence in the view of many people may outweigh the value of dedication to the New Church.

School heads and other administrators make, and should make, many of the actual decisions that define the Academy. In decisions on faculty staffing, the school heads, as committed New Church people, are the initiators and drivers. We certainly don't need priests throughout our middle-management positions, and lay leaders of the schools and other parts of the Academy give it its real life. Still, having a priest as the top educational administrator says to the school heads, administrators and employees throughout, as well as to students and families, that the top Academy priority is faithfulness to the Heavenly Doctrines-- even when (for example) it means not hiring an effective teacher who does not believe in the Writings.

In urging this traditional view, I do not imply that I or past priest-presidents always have made the best New Church decisions. But by our love, training and experience we do try to do this. If education is in fact a church use, then New Church schools need the supervisory role of those whose first love, primary intellectual expertise, and career orientation are the Heavenly Doctrines.

NJHD 311-318 say that priests should govern church uses. Other colleges and schools that seek to maintain their religious direction appoint clergymen as presidents, which is a statement and symbol of their distinctive theology. This statement of purpose loses meaning unless the clergy president has administrative authority to lead the institution through staffing directions, policy formulation, and selection of priorities. But priestly leadership should be combined with lay initiatives and with nourishing lay people in leadership roles. Without true partnership and cooperation we cannot succeed.

In considering change we should know the reasons why our present structure has developed. Benade did bring to our movement a priestly high-handedness that hurt us. In fact the movement might have broken up in 1897. But under W.F. Pendleton our predecessors revised governance values, basing them on council and assembly. The Academy movement/General Church has maintained a strong desire for charity, order, and leadership by the Heavenly Doctrines, with open deliberation, and with freedom to consent or deny consent to leaders at every level. All our administrators, board members and leaders have agendas (they'd be ineffective if they didn't), and we need a structure so that spiritual agendas flow into natural and instrumental agendas and guide them.

Appendix on Academy President and Administration

Let me offer my version of how decisions are made at the Academy. Our effort is toward consensus and team decisions, rather than flow-down management. I see this as in line with the teaching of the Writings on freedom and rationality. Also, this increases cooperation and trust through being open. It lessens latent conflict, and leads to a sense of joint ownership and responsibility. Much Academy progress has resulted from an open-consensus approach to decision making, as is evident in our Five-Year Plan. Board involvement in governance and administrative oversight have also increased much over the last generation.

One result of this approach to management is that the Academy Leadership Team (ALT--four school heads, development officer, CAO, business manager, CPO head, chaired by the president) has become the top administrative body at the Academy and is responsible (largely through strategic planning) for developments at the Academy in the last few years; the Academy operated differently before the ALT was formed in 1992. Though we aren't fully there yet, our consistent effort is to operate as a single institution, organically unified, rather than as a collection of separate entities operating primarily from their own agendas. These changes take hard work and don't happen by themselves. We believe we function more efficiently by seeking ALT consensus and coordination than by making one person (e.g. president) the sole conduit through which every key decision passes. Of course, the president, and then the board, make final decisions. But the driving force, the focus of energy for progress, comes from ALT discussion and direction, and much of the president's work is in dealing with ALT members to promote consensus solutions.

In recent years the president became more and more involved in business and financial planning in order to coordinate finances and academics. The development of strategic planning, increased fund-raising, and the computer network all took very large parts of the president's time, as did needy areas such as analysis of scholarship funding, developing board agendas and organizing for board meetings under our new format, Cairnwood governance, pavilion governance, facilities planning, real estate planning, sewage treatment plant, as well as financial planning and pursuing ways to pay for capital improvements.

Reorganization of the financial offices and governance has also taken considerable time. In early May the Academy Board, during its retreat, gave much consideration to these functions, and there seemed to be board agreement that a priest-president should be Academy CEO and top academic administrator in order to maintain and strengthen the Academy's New Church distinctiveness in an era of growth and change. To my great relief the board told me to work more on spiritual and academic leadership, and less on financial, business and legal matters. The newly organized Centralized Shared Service (CSS) led by a Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) have done much to free the president from non-academic areas, making possible greater attention to spiritual and educational leadership.

I believe lay people should be responsible for business, financial, and legal affairs. At the same time,

business matters connect closely with educational and spiritual matters, and true partnership among clergy and laity is a sine qua non. Let me repeat: without real working cooperation, we fail. In the actual activities of running a school, the spiritual plane, the educational plane, and the financial/business/legal plane are closely related and must work and plan together--in staffing, in strategic planning, in planning residence halls, etc. We are still learning how to coordinate educational and financial planning, and integration of these two is a key goal.

In many of these planning and administrative activities, lay people should take the lead, as they now do, but without removing the priesthood entirely from administration or decision loops. As for determining the fundamental educational priorities of the institution, a priest administrator is essential, while lay people direct the strategic planning process. In other words, the top educational administration (as opposed to business, financial, and legal management) should be in the hands of a priest-educator whose primary orientation is to the Heavenly Doctrines.

Similarly, education and business committees should not be appointed solely by priests but in close consultation and in cooperation with the lay people who will chair committees. Some may feel the Academy President should make fund-raising his first presidential responsibility, as in other colleges where it is increasingly the president's top priority (I have not heard this from our Academy Development Committee or Office, present or past.) Certainly fund-raising here is a presidential responsibility, along with other aspects of development. Yet in an institution which seeks to be guided first of all by its spiritual mission, the prime Presidential responsibility is to maintain and move forward the Academy's spiritual direction. If something else becomes the principal responsibility, the Academy becomes secular to the extent that another priority precedes the spiritual. I believe that leadership in fund-raising and development, as guided by the doctrines, is an important, indeed crucial presidential responsibility, though not the top.

One possible change has been widely discussed--a chief operating officer, provost, vice-president or "danco" (director of ANC operations), to take on many of the president's responsibilities for academic administration. Though I tended to favor this for a while (before the reorganization of the last nine months), I found the school heads negative to this possibility. As the heads of the Academy's essential organic uses, they should have contact with, and report directly to, the top, not through an intermediary I agree with them that in an institution of our size the insertion of an intermediary office such as a provost or academic vice-president would be unnecessary bureaucratization that would complicate our operations and probably lower our efficiency. And vice-presidents (if any) should include the school heads themselves.

Additionally, several have noted that the president has a very small direct constituency within the Academy as it is. To remove him from the schools by an additional reporting layer would take him further from the faculties and from education. This would not be a way to bring the doctrines into daily Academy operations. In larger colleges, provosts are appointed so that the president can give more time to public relations, nation-wide fund-raising and marketing, networking with other institutions, union negotiation, and often state and federal lobbying. From conversations and observations I believe this moves the president away from the college's (or school's) central mission. If the Academy went the way of an intermediary between president and school heads, I'd recommend that it be a priest-educator.

I realize nearly all my reference points are to colleges and universities rather than to secondary schools. The literature is much fuller concerning secularization of higher education, and so is my own experience through personal contacts. Though more gradual and less stark, the process has been similar with secondary schools.