

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE  
ON ACADEMY GOVERNANCE

Background

The Committee on Academy Governance (CAG) was appointed in 1990 by then President Howard Block, pursuant to a motion adopted during the Business Meeting at the 43rd Annual Meeting in San Diego calling for a "broad-based" Committee on Academy Governance to "report first to the Board of Governors which will then report to the next Annual Meeting of this Academy." The members of the CAG are Benjamin Aaron, Santa Monica, CA, Chair; John E. Dunsford, St. Louis, MO; Jonathan Dworkin, Amherst, OH; David E. Feller, Berkeley, CA; Claude H. Foisy, Mount-Royal, QUE; James M. Harkless, Washington, DC; David A. Petersen, Pittsburgh, PA; Lois A. Rappaport, New York, NY; James J. Sherman, Tampa, FL; James L. Stern, Madison, WI; and J. Earl Williams, Houston, TX.

On the occasion of the Continuing Education Conference in Dearborn, in November, 1990, the CAG chaired an open forum during which all members present were encouraged to express their views on the present system of Academy governance and to make suggestions for its improvement. Thereafter, in a letter to all Academy members dated 26 February 1991, the CAG summarized the discussion of Academy governance at the Continuing Education Conference and solicited further comment from the membership.

Following some exchange of correspondence and review of the transcript of the open forum discussion in Dearborn and of the letters received from Academy members, the CAG met on 6 July

a:\recommen.ba

1991, in Chicago, to consider its recommendations. All committee members attended and all decisions taken represented a consensus of the Committee.

#### Extent of Membership Participation in the Review of Academy Governance

The number of Academy members who participated in the review of Academy governance was not as great as was initially hoped for by the CAG. At the open forum in Dearborn, attended by approximately 100 members, some 30 joined in the discussion. Only 38 members, a number of whom had also expressed their views in Dearborn, subsequently wrote letters to the CAG on the subject of Academy governance. This is not an impressive sample of a membership that now numbers almost 700. It could be construed as an endorsement of the status quo, a tacit acceptance of the view that "if it ain't broke, don't fix it."

The CAG, however, does not take that position. Despite the relative paucity of comments, a number of thoughtful criticisms and suggestions were received, indicating some defects in the Academy's system of governance and proposing various ways to correct them. We have found some of these criticisms to be valid and some suggestions worthy of adoption, and have so recommended in our report.

#### Appointments to Committees

The subject of appointments to committees is obviously of considerable interest to many Academy members. Rightly or

a:\recommen.ba

wrongly, the impression persists that committee appointments, particularly of chairs, are confined to a relatively few better known Academy members, many of whom have previously served or are presently serving as officers or members of the Board of Governors. There is some basis for this impression. For example, one member wrote:

Based on a review of documents distributed with last year's call for officer nominations, for the years 1985-1989, there were 131 chairmanship slots available on standing committees (not including regional organizations). Seventy percent of the time they were filled by former officers (President, Vice President, Board of Governors). In this same period, only 39 times were chairmanships filled by non-officers. These 39 slots were filled by only 20 different individuals seven of whom were arrangement/program chairs.  
(Underscoring in original)

Further pertinent information is provided by a statistical "snapshot" for the year 1990. The number of standing and special committee slots (including those of chairs) to be filled was 300. The number of Academy members appointed to serve on one or more committees was 207. Sixty served on two committees; 10 served on three committees; two served on four committees; and one served on five committees. The total number serving on two or more committees was 73. The number of chairs serving on one or more other committees was 15. Ten current officers or Governors held committee assignments, and two served as committee chairs. Only one held multiple committee assignments.

These sketchy statistics are, of course, inadequate. Efforts are now underway by the Executive Secretary-Treasurer to

a:\recommen.ba

develop a computer program that will list for each Academy member, on a continuing basis, a record of Academy service, including service as an officer, member of the Board of Governors, and chair or member of committees. We are hopeful that this program will be in place in a year's time. These data will be extremely helpful to Nominating Committees and incoming Presidents in making nominations and appointments to vacancies that occur each year.

Whether committee chairs have been selected from too small a number of Academy members is a matter for consideration. It is at least arguable, however, that former officers and Governors have been selected as committee chairs because of their demonstrated leadership and administrative talents, and that it has not been unreasonable to appoint to those positions a greater percentage of such persons relative to that of members without similar prior experience.

There is another circumstance that merits attention. At present, there are only eight standing committees and 19 special committees. In filling special committee slots, and particularly in designating the chairs of those committees, the President must necessarily consider the known capabilities of particular Academy members. This probably accounts for the fact that some members may be asked to serve on more than one committee, and that persons with established records of distinguished service to the Academy are picked to head special committees.

a:\recommen.ba

A variety of proposals received by the CAG related to the appointment of members to committees. For example, it was urged by a few members that the Academy adopt a rule that no member be appointed to more than one committee. Another suggestion was that no officer or Governor be appointed to serve on any committee, except in an ex officio capacity. Still another proposal was that the size of committees be increased and, if necessary, that new committees be created, in order to ensure that every member wishing to serve on a committee will be accommodated.

The CAG believes that it would be counterproductive to increase either the present size of committees or the number of committees simply to provide more slots for Academy members. In our view, the present size of almost all committees is about right, and no new committees ought to be established in the absence of a demonstrated functional need. Moreover, some members have indicated an interest in serving on only a few popular committees, such as Membership and Professional Responsibility and Grievances.

There seems to be a sound basis for adopting a strong policy of not appointing the same member to more than one of the following standing and special committees: Membership, Law and Legislation, Professional Responsibility and Grievances, Research, Continuing Education, Legal Affairs, Legal Representation, International Studies, and Public Employee

a:\recommen.ba

Disputes Settlement. In respect of other committees, the policy also ought to be to strive to the greatest feasible extent to maximize the number of appointments of members indicating a desire to serve. In our opinion, however, it is highly advisable to preserve for the incoming President a flexibility of discretion in making committee appointments. That is why we emphasize the adoption of a policy, rather than the establishment of an inflexible rule.

Again as a general rule, the CAG believes that officers and Governors should not be appointed to chair or to serve on committees. Exceptions will arise, however, and we believe that in these cases, too, Presidents should have the discretion to make such appointments if they believe them to be in the best interests of the Academy.

Membership on committees is presently limited in practice to three successive one-year terms. This seems to us to be about right: it gives a committee member time to become familiar with the matters with which the committee deals, but also ensures a reasonable turnover in committee membership. The question arises whether the same practice ought to be observed in the appointment of committee chairs. As a general rule, that question can be answered in the affirmative, but there are obvious exceptions, instances in which the Academy has an investment in the accumulated expertise of the committee chair that it would be foolish to dispense with on an automatic basis. Two examples

a:\recommen.ba

that come to mind are the chairs of the Future Meeting Arrangements and of the Professional Responsibility and Grievances committees. We do not suggest that these chairs be appointed to serve for as long as they are willing, but only that an inflexible three-year term is too short. We think that provisions should be made for facilitating some reasonable turnover in these chairs, without suffering unnecessary losses of accumulated expertise; but with that qualification we believe the decision when to change chairs can safely be left to the sound discretion of the incoming President.

The matter of ensuring continuity in the handling of ongoing committee business and the preservation of institutional memory must also be addressed. One option that ought to be available to the President is to appoint an outgoing chair to a one-year term as a member of the committee, if this would ease the transition in leadership.

So far as it appears, the present practice of incoming Presidents, in appointing chairs and committee members, is to take into account, among other factors, the geographical location, seniority, race, and sex of the member being considered for appointment. In the judgment of the CAG, none of these factors should be controlling, but all are properly to be considered before a final determination is made.

#### Nominations for Office

a:\recommen.ba

The nomination process in the Academy elicited more comment from Academy members than any other aspect of governance.

Article VII of the By-Laws reads in part:

Section 1. On or before the 15th day of September preceding the Annual Meeting, the President will designate a Nominating Committee consisting of five members. The names of the Nominating Committee shall be announced promptly to the membership. The Nominating Committee shall select one or more candidates for each vacancy, and shall report its selections to the President on or before the 15th day of November preceding the Annual Meeting. After receipt of the report of the Nominating Committee, the President shall announce promptly to the membership the names of the candidates selected by the Nominating Committee. (As amended April 21, 1976.)

Section 2. (Added by amendment May 26, 1982.) Other candidates for office (except for the office of President) may thereafter be nominated by members of the Academy. To be valid, a nomination must be made in writing by at least 30 (thirty) members in good standing and must be filed with the Executive Secretary-Treasurer, either as a simple petition or as separate petitions, at least sixty (60) days prior to the Annual Meeting at which the election is to occur. If nominations have been made within the period specified, the President shall promptly announce to the membership of the Academy the names of said nominees.

By resolution dated 6 December 1975, the Board of Governors recommended that the Nominating Committee consist of the two immediate past Presidents, one member of the Board of Governors, and two Academy members selected from two different regions. That is the present practice.

Opinion among the members who commented on the size and composition of the Nominating Committee was divided. A number of members, including some of those who have served on that committee, favored keeping it as is; others argued that it should be expanded to seven, nine, or 10 members. Still another

a:\recommen.ba

proposal was to increase the size of the committee to encompass one representative from each region.

The principal arguments in favor of maintaining the status quo were that a committee of more than five members becomes unwieldy; that expanding the committee would make it more difficult to achieve consensus; and that some trade-offs in nominating candidates might result. Also, it was argued that the present five-person committees are as representative as it is possible to achieve, and that, anyway, every oral and written suggestion received by the committee from the membership is given careful and equal consideration. Those favoring an expanded committee argued that it would lead to the canvass and consideration of a broader spectrum of candidates and at least partially assuage the concerns of those members who believe that a committee of only five persons is not truly representative of an organization consisting of almost 700 members.

The CAG believes that Nominating Committees in the past have done a good job in canvassing the entire membership for possible candidates for office, and have carried out their function with dedication and fairness. We are also conscious of the problems that might arise if the committee were expanded unduly. In our opinion, however, an increase in the committee membership from five to seven would not seriously curtail its ability to reach a consensus on nominations and would enhance its actual and perceived representative character.

a:\recommen.ba

As far as the composition of the Nominating Committee is concerned, we recommend that it consist of the two immediate past Presidents, one Governor, and four members selected, where feasible, from four different regions. But members should be appointed in their individual capacities, and not as regional representatives. This composition, we think, will best be able to identify not only those members who have performed well in the past, but also those who show promise of distinguished service in the future. It is the practice of all Nominating Committees actively to encourage the membership to suggest possible candidates for the various vacancies. Active membership participation in the nomination process helps to insure that able prospects will not be overlooked. In addition, members who feel qualified and willing to serve are perfectly free to offer themselves as candidates for the committee's consideration.

The present practice is not to reappoint members of the Nominating Committee for a second consecutive term, except in the case of past Presidents, each of whom, in accordance with the Board of Governors' resolution previously cited, serves for two consecutive terms. The CAG recommends that present practice be continued, provided that a member of the committee may be eligible to serve as chair in a succeeding term. It is conceivable, moreover, that a President may want at some later date to reappoint a member to serve a second nonconsecutive term

on the Nominating Committee. The CAG believes that the interval between such appointments should not be less than five years.

It will be noted that Article VII, Section 1, of the By-Laws, previously quoted, provides for the possibility that the Nominating Committee shall select more than one candidate for each vacancy. In practice, that committee has never availed itself of this option, and has confined itself to selecting only one candidate for each vacancy. Some members of the Academy have urged that multiple nominations be made at least for membership on the Board of Governors, if not for all vacancies.

A proposal to that effect was debated and voted upon at the 43rd Annual Meeting in San Diego. The proposal was defeated. The matter came up again at the Continuing Education Conference in Dearborn and was debated further, although no formal vote was taken. A number of members also commented on the issue in their letters to the CAG. Proponents of contested elections argue that in an organization the size and diversity of the Academy, members should have a choice between candidates for membership on the Board of Governors, and should not be reduced to ratifying the single selections of the Nominating Committee. They contend that, at a minimum, the system of Academy governance should be democratized to that extent. Opponents claim that ours is still a relatively small organization, most of whose members know each other; that multiple candidacies would give rise to divisive election campaigns; and that losers might be embittered and lost

a:\recommen.ba

to further service in the organization. They also argue that the Nominating Committee actively solicits suggestions from all members, and that it is in the best position to judge which of the prospective nominees should be selected at a given time. Finally, they point to the mechanism in Article VII, Section 2, of the By-Laws that permits additional nominations to be made by petition as an additional possible source of candidates.

On the basis of the discussions of this issue at the San Diego and Dearborn meetings, as well as of the letters received from some members, the CAG concludes that a majority of the Academy membership favors retaining the present practice of having the Nominating Committee present only one candidate for each vacancy. In our judgment, that is a sound decision. We believe that contested elections would introduce into the Academy a divisiveness and political competition that would destroy the spirit of collegiality that has characterized our system of governance up to now. Were the Academy to, say, double or triple the size of its present membership, the issue of nominating procedure might well be ripe for reconsideration, but we are satisfied that existing procedures are those best suited for our present needs.

In their statements and written communications, some members raised the question whether there are any established criteria for eligibility for office in the Academy or membership on the Board of Governors. The Constitution and By-Laws are silent on

a:\recommen.ba

the subject, and the Board of Governors has adopted no resolution pertaining to it. The practice has been to consider, among other things, past service as chair of a national committee or of a region, or other substantial service to the Academy, but no definitive statement of criteria, binding on all Nominating Committees, has been issued.

The CAG believes that such a statement, embodying what have been the traditional factors for consideration in the past, approved by the Board of Governors, would dispel any remaining confusion about eligibility for Academy office or for membership on the Board of Governors. It should be sent annually to all Academy members at the time that the appointment of the Nominating Committee is announced. The statement should include an acknowledgement that every member has the right to advise the Nominating Committee of personal availability as a candidate for Academy office or membership on the Board of Governors.

#### Voting and Membership Rights; Elections

Under present policy, Academy elections are held by voice vote during the business session of the Annual Meeting. Only members actually present may vote. In case of a contested election (there has been only one in Academy history), the vote is by secret ballot.

Some members urged that all voting be by mail ballot; a larger number opposed that idea. Proponents argued that some members, for good and sufficient reasons, are unable to attend

a:\recommen.ba

all Annual Meetings, and should not be disenfranchised because of that fact. One member likened the requirement of attendance at the Annual Meeting as a condition to voting to a poll tax, and maintained that the only requirement for eligibility to vote should be membership in good standing. Opponents contended that many members never attend Academy meetings and are unfamiliar with the candidates and issues voted on in the business sessions. They argued that only those members interested enough in Academy affairs to attend the Annual Meetings should be privileged to vote.

The CAG recognizes that some Academy members may miss an Annual Meeting not through choice, but through necessity. We cannot accept that failure to attend betokens, in each instance, a lack of interest. If, however, as we recommend, the present practice of nominating only one person for each vacancy is continued, the mail ballot issue loses virtually all of its significance. At the same time, we agree with the position that votes on other matters--e.g., amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws--are best limited to those who are present at the meeting and who have the opportunity to listen to and participate in the discussion. In our view, the interests of the Academy will best be served by retaining the present policy that only those attending the Annual Meeting may vote.

Some members feel so strongly about fellow members who remain almost totally inactive that they proposed additional

a:\recommen.ba

restrictions on membership and voting rights. One suggestion was that membership be divided into two categories: "active" and "dues-paying," with voting rights presumably being restricted to those in the former group. Another proposal was to require, as a condition of continuing membership, participation in at least one-third of the annual year's Academy activities (national and regional).

It is obvious that those members who are wholly inactive in Academy affairs and who simply pay their dues are missing the real benefits of Academy membership. The CAG believes, however, that such persons, having been duly admitted to membership, are entitled to the same rights of membership as their more active colleagues, and should not be discriminated against because of their inactivity in Academy affairs. Interest in the Academy is frequently enhanced by a knowledge of its history and purposes; currently, the Committee on New Member Orientation is doing an excellent job in providing this information to new members, and it is hoped that, with some encouragement and early involvement in committee work, the extent of member participation in Academy affairs will increase. Meanwhile, we can strive to increase the attractiveness of our Annual and Continuing Education Meetings, as well as our regional programs, so as to arouse the interest and participation of those members who have remained inactive in the past.

At both the San Diego and Dearborn meetings a proposal to alter the size and composition of the Board of Governors so as to include one representative from each region was discussed. The proposal was also addressed in a number of letters received by the CAG. Proponents argued that only in this way can the Board of Governors be made truly representative of the entire membership. Opponents, who seem to be in the majority, pointed out that the present regions vary widely in size, degree of activity, and interest of their members in Academy affairs. They also argued that the proposal would be costly and would result in an unwieldy Board of Governors. Finally, they contended that the Academy was not established on a federal basis, and that most of the issues it addresses involve the entire membership.

The CAG believes that, on balance, the opponents of this proposal have the better of the argument. We are persuaded that, so far as they can be identified, purely regional interests are not being ignored by the Board of Governors, as presently constituted. Annual turnover in the Board's membership means that all sections of the United States and Canada will be adequately represented, although we stress that Governors are elected in their individual capacities and not as regional representatives. Increasing the number of Board members from 12 to 17 would, in our view, be counterproductive, in terms of both expense and efficiency. Consequently, we recommend that the

present size and composition of the Board of Governors be maintained.

Article VI, Section 3, of the Academy Constitution provides that the Executive Secretary-Treasurer shall be elected for a three-year term. In practice, those holding that office have normally been elected to serve two terms. At the San Diego meeting, a proposed amendment to the Constitution that would have limited the Executive Secretary-Treasurer to two consecutive three-year terms was defeated.

The principal argument in favor of limiting the eligibility of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer to two consecutive three-year terms is that the position is one of great power and influence that ought not be vested in any one person for more than six years. It is also pointed out that now that the maintenance of the office is no longer dependent on the largesse of some university or permanent umpireship or the like, there is less reason to retain an incumbent in office for a greater period. Opponents of the proposal stress that the Academy has an investment in the accumulated expertise of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer that ought not lightly be discarded. Also, any change in the location of the office entails considerable effort and expense.

The CAG believes that two successive three-year terms is a reasonable limit for the Executive Secretary-Treasurer which ought normally be observed. Indeed, it is doubtful that most

a:\recommen.ba

incumbents of that office would even be willing to serve for a longer period, because the job is a very demanding one and requires considerable personal sacrifice of anyone who occupies it. Here again, however, we oppose converting a sensible policy into an inflexible rule. There may be situations in which the desirability of a third term is indicated by peculiar circumstances. We think the Nominating Committee may be safely trusted to decide if such circumstances exist, and we are persuaded that it would not be in the best interests of the Academy to deprive that committee of the discretion to nominate the Executive Secretary-Treasurer for a third term if it feels that the circumstances so warrant.

The CAG also received a proposal that the President's term of office, fixed by the Constitution at one year, be extended to two years. The proposal is based on the assumption that it takes one full year for Presidents to settle into the job, and that a second year is needed for them to achieve their respective goals.

We think this assumption does not give sufficient weight to the experience accumulated by Presidents before assuming the presidency. Moreover, the job, like that of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer, is a demanding one that also entails considerable personal sacrifice. In the usual case, the President is well content, at the end of a year's time, to relinquish the duties of the office to a successor. We see no

particular merit, therefore, in extending the President's term of office beyond the period of one year.

Another proposal received by the CAG is that the Vice Presidents' term of office be changed from a one-year term with the possibility of serving a consecutive term to a two-year term without the possibility of serving a consecutive term. Past practice indicates that Vice Presidents are routinely nominated to serve a consecutive term, and the CAG considers the proposed change to be both unnecessary and unwise in that it eliminates the possibility of a contested election for a second one-year term by the petition route.

#### Miscellaneous

From the records of the San Diego and Dearborn meetings and communications received by the CAG, it appears that there is some confusion about the rights of members to attend meetings of the Board of Governors. Under present practice, any Academy member has the right to attend all meetings of the Board, except when it goes into executive session. Privilege of non-Board members to speak, however, is subject to the prior approval of the Board. The National Coordinator of Regional Activities has the right to address the Board on regional matters. The present policy seems adequate for the purpose. The CAG recommends, however, that each regional chair be sent a copy of the agenda of every Board of Governors' meeting, so that if the chair wishes to address the Board on one or more matters on the agenda, there will be

a:\recommen.ba

sufficient time to make a request for that privilege through the National Coordinator. Indeed any non-Board member wishing to address the Board should submit a request to that effect prior to the Board meeting in the interest of efficient scheduling. The Board will decide, at the time of meeting, whether or not to grant the request.

A similar "open meeting" rule has been proposed for committee meetings. Present practice does not encourage participation by noncommittee members in such meetings, and the CAG opposes the idea that every member, as a matter of right, should be able to attend any committee meeting at will. To begin with, much committee work is carried on by correspondence between members, and in such cases the proposed rule would be inapposite. Of greater importance, however, is the fact that a few committees, such as Professional Responsibility and Grievances and Membership, deal with sensitive and confidential information that ought not to be shared with noncommittee members. We believe that the annual written reports submitted by each committee, which are made available to the general membership, provide a reasonable review of the work of each committee. If further information is required, the annual business session offers the opportunity to make verbal inquiries. In our judgment, an "open committee" rule is unnecessary and undesirable.

a:\recommen.ba

Another proposal made to the CAG was that the Academy's By-Laws be amended to provide members with prompt notice of committee action intended for implementation by the Board of Governors through a vote of the Board, excluding Membership Committee votes on candidates for admission to the Academy. The supporting argument for this proposal was that with so much power residing in the Academy officers and the Board of Governors, the proposed amendment is particularly appropriate in the case of "direct-impact" issues, such as the rule governing disciplinary action against members. With appropriate notice, the argument continues, some members could make known their views to Board members, and the Board could possibly benefit from hearing those views. It should be noted in this connection that the Chronicle in its news coverage sometimes is able to advise the membership when the Board of Governors is getting ready to vote on a committee proposal.

We think that whatever merits may inhere in this proposal are outweighed by its administrative unwieldiness. Circulating copies of a committee's recommendations for Board action to the membership would entail additional time and expense; if members were given sufficient time to comment, it would also automatically insure that any action by the Board would have to be postponed until its next meeting--a matter of months. Moreover, the decisions of the Board of Governors are not written in stone. The proposal applies to a very narrow range of issues,

a:\recommen.ba

and those can be raised and discussed at the Annual Meeting even after the Board of Governors has acted. If the Board's decision is disapproved by a majority of the membership, it can be overturned.

There seems to be a widespread desire among Academy members to be told, in writing, of existing policies relating to Academy governance. The CAG believes that this desire is reasonable. Moreover, it understands that a list of at least some of those policies has been prepared and distributed to members of the Board of Governors. In our judgement, all Academy members are entitled to such a list, and we recommend that it be distributed generally among the membership at the earliest feasible opportunity.

### Conclusions

For those Academy members who favor wholesale and radical changes in our system of governance, this report will be a disappointment. After an extensive review of that system, however, the CAG concludes that it has, for the most part, served the Academy well. We acknowledge that there is a perception, especially among newer members, that the Academy is governed by an "elite" of older members. In a 1990 questionnaire sent to those inducted into the Academy since 1980, 60 percent of the respondents were of that opinion, and 45 percent thought that the nomination of officers "fails to reflect the entire Academy." Our review, however, convinces us that the present quality of

a:\recommen.ba

governance is approved by a majority of the membership. Indeed, in the 1990 questionnaire, 76 percent of the respondents agreed with the statement: "The NAA reflects well my sense of what it should be"; only 11 percent disagreed. Nevertheless, we think that the quality of governance can be improved and the perception of the system can perhaps be altered by adoption of the modest affirmative recommendations we have made.

The Academy may not be a model of democratic organization, but we think that its present system of governance is well suited to effectuate the purposes for which it was founded. To the extent that democracy involves freedom on the part of the rank and file to participate in and influence the conduct of the organization's affairs, we believe that it exists to a considerable degree in the Academy. Unavoidably, there are not, at any given time, enough vacancies among the offices or on the Board of Governors or the committees to accommodate every member wishing to participate actively in Academy affairs, but reasonably rapid turnover ensures that such opportunities will arise in due course. Our recommendations concerning appointments to committees and to selection of committee chairs are designed to increase the number of Academy members who serve in those capacities.

The nomination process has been the focus of considerable dissatisfaction. Our recommendations are designed to bring about modest changes: increasing the size of the Nominating Committee

a:\recommen.ba

to make it more representative; limiting the terms of committee members to insure adequate turnover; and publishing criteria for eligibility for Academy office or membership on the Board of Governors, so that everyone will have the necessary information.

Our review of the operations of the Nominating Committees has convinced us that they carefully consider every suggestion submitted to them by members of the Academy. If the membership is concerned that the committee's focus is too narrow, it need only participate more actively in submitting suggestions to the committee.

So far as we can discern, the sentiment of the Academy membership is rather strongly against contested elections for membership on the Board of Governors and the expansion of the Board to encompass one representative from each region. Our consideration of those proposals has led us to conclude, for the reasons previously stated, that neither would improve the quality of Academy governance; rather, each would have a predominantly detrimental effect. In respect of these proposals and the remainder of the others treated in this report, therefore, we have recommended no change in the status quo. To conclude, it is our opinion that the present system of Academy governance is basically sound and effective, and that minor adjustments rather than fundamental changes are what a substantial majority of Academy members desires.

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Appointments to Committees

1. The incoming President should retain flexibility in making committee appointments in order to best advance the interests of the Academy but should strive, to the greatest extent feasible, to maximize the number of appointments of Academy members indicating a desire to serve.

2. In exercising his discretion the incoming President should adhere to the following policies except when, in his opinion, it is clear that the interests of the Academy would best be served otherwise:

(a) No Academy member should be appointed to more than one of the following standing and special committees: Membership, Law and Legislation, Professional Responsibility and Grievances, Research, Continuing Education, Legal Affairs, Legal Representation, International Studies, and Public Employee Disputes Settlement.

(b) Officers and governors should not be appointed to chair or serve on committees.

(c) Membership on committees should continue to be limited to three one-year terms except in respect of the chairs of the Future Meeting Arrangements and Professional Responsibility and Grievances Committees.

As to those chairs, some reasonable turnover should take place to the extent feasible without suffering losses of accumulated expertise.

#### Nominating Committees

3. The size of the Nominating Committee should be increased from five to seven persons.

4. The Nominating Committee should consist of two immediate past Presidents, one governor, and four members selected, where feasible, from four different regions. Committee members should be appointed, however, in their individual capacities, and not as regional representatives.

5. The present practice of not reappointing members of the Nominating Committee for a second consecutive term (except in the case of past Presidents, each of whom serves for two consecutive terms) should be continued, provided, however, that a member of the Committee should be eligible to serve as chair in a consecutive term. The interval between an initial and a second, nonconsecutive term should be not less than five years.

#### Nominations

6. The Nominating Committee should continue to present only one candidate for each vacancy.

7. The Board of Governors should issue a statement, embodying what have been the traditional factors for consideration in the past, of the criteria for eligibility for office in the Academy or for membership on the Board of

a:\recommen.ba

Governors. This statement should be sent annually to all Academy members at the time that the appointment of the Nominating Committee is announced. The statement should include an acknowledgement that every member has the right to advise the Nominating Committee of personal availability as a candidate for Academy office or membership on the Board of Governors.

#### Voting and Membership Rights

8. The present policy that only those Academy members attending the Annual Meeting be permitted to vote should be maintained.

9. The present policy that those inactive Academy members who pay their dues are entitled to the same rights of membership as their more active colleagues should be maintained.

#### Size of the Board of Governors

10. The present size of the Board of Governors should be maintained.

#### Officers' Terms of Office

11. The present terms of the President (one year) and of the Vice Presidents, (one year, with the possibility of serving a consecutive year) should remain unchanged.

12. The term of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer should normally be limited to two consecutive three-year periods. The Nominating Committee should have the discretion, however, in special circumstances, to nominate the incumbent Executive Secretary-Treasurer for a third three-year term.

Board of Governors Meetings (revised: May 28, 1992)

13. Each regional chair should be sent a copy of the agenda of every board of Governors' meeting. Requests by a regional chair through the National Coordinator of Regional Activities, or by any other non-Board member, to address the Board should be submitted to the Executive Secretary-Treasurer prior to the Board meeting. The Executive Committee shall review the request and notify the requesting member in advance of the Board meeting whether the member can be scheduled on the agenda for that meeting.

Written Statement of Existing Governance Policies

14. The Office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer should prepare a list of existing policies affecting Academy governance for distribution to all Academy members at the earliest feasible time.

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMY GOVERNANCE

Benjamin Aaron, Chair

John E. Dunsford

David E. Feller

Claude H. Foisy

James M. Harkless

David A. Petersen

Lois A. Rappaport

James J. Sherman

James L. Stern

J. Earl Williams