

Table Talk

News and Views of the Student Body of The Lutheran
Theological Seminary at Gettysburg.

Vol II No 21

April 5, 1966

EDITORIAL

The Joint Administration of the Gettysburg and Philadelphia Seminaries was undertaken after a careful study of its probable effects on the two schools. The benefits that the planners foresaw have in large measure come to pass.

There is an increasing cooperation between the two faculties which is indeed healthy. The plans for a joint Summer graduate program during the Summer of 1967 are progressing well. The two faculties have met together on several occasions both socially and on "business."

In the economic sphere, matters of the practical administration of the two schools have been shared, primarily through the business managers. This sharing of problems, techniques and ideas has benefited both institutions.

Matters of academic policy and curriculum have likewise been shared under the auspices of the Joint Administration. This is the area perhaps best seen from the student viewpoint.

Despite these good results, the total picture of the Joint Administration is far from rosy. The planners of the joint setup apparently missed the boat very badly in certain areas. Perhaps the biggest of these areas is the dual presidency.

The responsibilities of the dual presidency, aside from the physical tension it creates, has been responsible for some clearly undesirable happenings. The president, of real necessity, must devote the great majority of his time to administrative matters. This had created a formidable gap between president and students. A lesser but now widening gap exists between president and faculties. Let's concentrate on the president-student relationship.

Prior to the Joint Administration, Dr. Heiges was solely responsible for Gettysburg. There was a degree of rapport
(Cont'd on page 2, col. 1)

REACTIVATE STUDENT-FACULTY RELATIONS COMMITTEE

One of the joys of coming to a new school is the opportunity to be a part of that institution's organizations. In the fall of my junior year two seminarians were elected from the junior class to represent the class in an ACTIVE organization called the Student-Faculty Relations Committee.

Those elected to this representative position were quickly briefed on the responsibilities they had just accepted. The Committee, made up of class representatives and faculty representatives, was one of the "most forceful committees" on campus. Here was the opportunity for student and professor to air feelings of all varieties. In previous years Dr. Heiges, then president of only this seminary, was able to be an active attender of those meetings, and thus aware first hand of problems that arose on campus in this area of life.

Since the Committee found itself involved in many campus problems other than the classroom, it saw fit last year to re-define its purpose and I draw your attention to that purpose:

"The Committee sees as its function and purpose, in general to be the strengthening of wholesome relations among members of the Seminary community, for the welfare of the members and for the increase of the sense of community.

Specifically, the Committee sees its work in the following areas: 1. Matters requiring communication between members of the faculty and of the student body.

2. Matters affecting the entire community which are not the responsibility of any other committee or group in the community."
(Cont'd on page 2, col. 2)

EDITORIAL (Cont'd)

between president and students on this campus which was unprecedented in LCA seminaries. The president knew each student by name; there were frequent dorm visits by the president for "bull sessions;" there was constant conversation between president and students in the coffee shop; there was a great degree of communication between them, both of a formal and informal nature. The president really had his finger on the pulse of the Seminary.

All this has passed under the Joint Administration. Dr. Heiges has been unable to maintain any significant degree of communication on either campus because his time is so very divided and demanded. He no longer has his finger on the pulse of the Seminary, and this extends into the faculty realm as well.

The breakdown in communication, physical strain, division of personal loyalties and loss of general effectiveness as a leader at both schools is not inherent in the Joint Administration itself, but rather in the dual presidency. It would seem to be just about impossible for any man to be a human tennis ball, being lobbed between the two schools and not really being able to make contact long enough to make an impression in any one spot.

The Joint Administration of the two Seminaries is not evil in and of itself. My point is this: would it not be better for both schools, their students and faculties if each had its own president? A joint cooperation of the two boards would still be highly valuable. But the dual presidency does a monstrous injustice to both of the institutions and the man who has to fill that presidency. Events of the past year or so have demonstrated without a doubt the sad results of the dual presidency.

The Joint Board as well as the individual boards will be considering these questions during the month of April. Dr. Gordon Folkemer, chairman of the Gettysburg Board, would be most happy if students would let their opinions be known to him. Perhaps we might even persuade him to
(Cont'd next col.)

STAFF

Managing Editor: Fred Krautwurst
Junior Editor: John Woods
Senior Editor: J. Paul Balas
Typist: Carol Avery
Printer: Kirk Bish

EDITORIAL (Cont'd from Col. 1 this page)

visit the campus sometime before the Gettysburg Board's Study Committee meets on April 16th. One thing is sure: this topic needs to be thoroughly evaluated and discussed by boards, faculty, administration AND students; after all, it does affect each and every one of us.

F.K.

REACTIVATE (Cont'd from page 1)

Once the Committee finalized this purpose, it functioned with that intent, only to realize that it was being by-passed in matters of academic concern by students who learned that to go through the proper channels only resulted in compliments for going through the proper channels but did not result in much wanted change.

THIS year that Committee has not met once! This writer had difficulty in learning who this year's junior class representatives were. I would feel safe in making the generalization that to most juniors the words: Student-Faculty Relations Committee draw only blank images.

The nasty question, "Why haven't they met?" could be answered with words such as, "the students have had no problems this year that need to be drawn to the attention of the faculty and the president's representative," (since Dr. Heiges has taken on the dual presidency he is represented by Dean Stroup), and how is this for an answer, "We really don't care if the president knows how we feel about campus goings-on." But let's face it, these words hold no answer to the situation, and perhaps the real answer lies in the fact that the Committee just plainly has been by-passed in efforts to get action
(Cont'd on page 3)

REACTIVATE (Cont'd from page 2)

and reaction immediately, and thus has had no reason to meet.

This Committee at one time was an excellent way for the Administration and faculty to learn of student's concerns and joys. And in a time when communications between student and president have broken down due to the administrative responsibilities of the latter, could not this Committee, which now remains inactive, serve a just function to the students and the faculty as it once did?

David L. DeLong
Middler Representative

THE CAMPUS INFLUENCE

During the 1963-64 academic year, when this writer served as secretary of the Student-Faculty Relations Committee, the functions of that committee were usually those which are listed in the present "Manual of Information." The committee saw ". . . as its function and purpose, in general, . . . the strengthening of wholesome relations among members of the Seminary community for the welfare of the members and for the increase of the sense of community." It dealt with any matter which required communication between members of the faculty and the student body, and also found matters which could not find their way into the (Cont'd next col.)

CAMPUS INFLUENCE (Cont'd from col. 1)

workings of other committees being placed into its hands.

General examples of things discussed in the meetings might be helpful. For instance, the election of the preaching co-ordinator has been held here. On several occasions, when student attitude and/or opinion seemed to be at an extremely agitated and/or low ebb, the concern was brought to the attention of the committee through either the student, faculty, or administration members of the committee. The minutes of each meeting were then posted as general information on several bulletin boards. Some things such as personal matters concerning certain students were not made public.

This writer does not feel that the committee served as a group which ironed out all of the problems concerning student-faculty relationships which were presented to it. But the committee did function as a place where students, faculty, and administration could be sure that problems concerning their inter-relationships would have a hearing. And they could also be fairly certain that if these could not be handled by the committee, they would be channeled into the proper places, and reports on progress concerning them would later be given to the committee. This writer feels that many problems and rumors of problems, when presented to this committee in the form of a "gathering storm" were taken care of in some way or another, before they reached "hurricane proportions."

J. Paul Balas

