

The Collegium

A Case Study in Pedagogical Governance

Peter Lawton

The Collegium is the name City of Lakes Waldorf School gave to a council of teachers and administrative staff members working within a new model of pedagogical governance. In this model, the Collegium circumscribes a wider circle of leadership around the traditional College of Teachers.

As a *college* (Latin for a group of colleagues, a partnership) of teachers forms a circle at the heart of a Waldorf school, guiding the school's pedagogical and social mission (Trostli, 2011; Pewtherer, 2011), its members are not alone. In addition to guidance from the spiritual world, standing close behind the college members are colleagues who share their level of commitment and intention. If a college of teachers takes a step inward into a circle—a circle in which these individual teachers and staff members align and attune their own personal intentions and destinies with those of each other and with the larger mission of the school (Pewtherer, 2011)—its members step in from a larger circle of other similarly dedicated teachers and staff members. In my school, we've recognized and named this outer circle of the Collegium, and further defined and codified many of colleagues of responsibilities. Although our College of Teachers continues to fulfill critical leadership and management functions, it shares responsibility with the larger Collegium, which empowers, supports, guides, informs, and affirms the work of the College.

Collegium membership criteria are the same as those of our school's College of Teachers, so, in the coarsest terms, the Collegium is a circle of College- and would-be-College-members. Collegium members are self-selected and meet certain inner/dispositional and outer/experiential criteria that readers will recognize as being similar to the requirements of many colleges of teachers (for recent descriptions of the College of Teachers see the articles by Beaven and Trostli). Membership criteria for the Collegium include a commitment to the school and to Waldorf education, a commitment to working collaboratively, fidelity to a path of inner development, an openness to spiritual realities and insights, and a minimum of two years of service to the school. Although most organizational and managerial analogies fall short, the Collegium members may be compared to senior partners, major stakeholders, or

employee-owners in other contexts. The Collegium forms a larger circle deeply connected to the mission and destiny of the school and encompassing the College of Teachers.

Because our school believes the College needs an earthly, institutional mandate in addition to the inner call to serve felt by its members—the *spiritual mandate*, you could say—we've given the larger Collegium the authority and responsibility of selecting and mandating, or empowering the College of Teachers each school year. All Collegium members are eligible for service on the College, which is selected by consensus from within the ranks of the Collegium. The College in turn is responsible for instructional leadership and the day-to-day management of the school's pedagogical mission. Now beginning its second year of existence, our Collegium currently numbers about 25, roughly half the school's employees and a group much larger than the seven to ten individuals typically serving on the College of Teachers.

While both the Collegium and College are governed by a democratic spirit honoring the voices of all members, their managerial process of decision-making by consensus is not what we typically associate with the familiar models of democratic governance. The Collegium and College arrive at decisions and agreements communally; they don't vote. Following more closely a republican rather than a liberal-democratic model of governance (not to be confused with the two major American political parties; see also Ernst, 2019), the consensus process is characterized by a spirit of solidarity akin to what one might observe in a council of elders. Members represent not only their self-interest or the interest of their constituent groups, but the interests of the whole community and the school's larger mission.

In addition to selecting and mandating a newly constituted College of Teachers each year, the Collegium further informs and affirms major pedagogical changes, and maintains a process through which College decisions may be appealed. The responsibility to affirm major changes and hear appeals is both an acknowledgement of the responsibility of Collegium members to stay committed and intentional in their relationship

to the wider school and its mission, and of the College's responsibility to include major stakeholders in important pedagogical decisions (Pewtherer, 2011). Prior to the establishment of the Collegium, the College of Teachers self-selected itself each school year; there was no institutional requirement of the College to include faculty and/or other employee stakeholders in major pedagogical decisions; and there was no institutional mechanism to question or appeal College decisions.

The present article examines the background and impetus behind changing the school's pedagogical governance structure through a consensual process whereby the Collegium and the new structure were envisioned and affirmed by all the employees of the school. It further explores a description of some of the Collegium's roles and responsibilities, as well as some of its structural elements, such as the appeals process. The article concludes with a look at some initial successes, ongoing challenges, and outstanding questions.

It perhaps goes without saying that what is offered here is not intended to be prescriptive, nor is it explored from a fully objective point of view, as the author works at City of Lakes and has participated in the new governance envisioning process. This individual case is offered in hopes that in the description of the structural changes made by our school, and of the cultural and relational context surrounding these changes, others working in similar settings will earn new insights into their own schools' governance and leadership models.

Background and Impetus for Change

Currently in its thirty-first year, City of Lakes Waldorf School is a private, independent elementary school (pre-k through grade eight) serving the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. The impetus arising several years ago to explore new governance models was proactive, that is, it was not a response to any particular crisis. On the contrary, this initiative came at the heels of an extended period of healthy enrollment and staff stability. The inspiration for change arose in our school's College of Teachers in response to ongoing challenges experienced both within, and in relation to, the College. The College traditionally consisted of a small, self-selected group of teachers and administrative staff members responsible for strategic and ongoing pedagogical decisions, such as those involving school programs, staffing, professional development, etc.

Some of the challenges traditionally experienced by our College can be reasonably interpreted as those inherent in any horizontal, collaborative governance structure, such as the twin syndromes of 'where-does-this-go'

and 'who's-in-charge?' Other challenges are simply part of the natural order, faced *even* by vertical, hierarchical governance structures. These include lack of time, money, resources, etc. However, several of the challenges facing the College fell under an entirely different heading, and an uncomfortable one at that. These included what College members perceived as a lack of engagement and participation on the part of those colleagues rarely or never serving on the College, and what non-College members (and many newer and/or younger colleagues) perceived to be in-group or out-group status. These two relational challenges had real, practical implications. The first was a resource problem: there were simply not enough hands on deck. The second created a morale problem. Other challenges are explored in subsequent sections.

Even though the College was self-selected and open to membership from any colleague meeting the criteria and willing to make the time commitment, there were nonetheless negative forces at play discouraging participation. Two popular working theories explained the problem. The first was psychological or temperamental. Some people are leaders, others followers. Some have extra energy, some don't. Etc. (This theory, by the way, was espoused not only by members of the "in" group, but of the "out" group as well. In the initial envisioning conversations that ultimately lead to the Collegium, one colleague—a self-identified "out-group" member—said College membership was fine for those who had the time; she just didn't.)

The other theory explaining the lack of participation and engagement was cultural. Organizational culture, as in the larger society, is adaptive at first, but aspects of culture may become fixed, immutable, and possibly even maladaptive as organizations grow and change. Unexamined habits, unspoken norms, not what is said but the *way* things are said, subtle body language—these are but a few of the implicit elements of culture. Other aspects of culture concern underlying assumptions and values. Some organizational values are self-generated, but others encroach upon them from the wider culture. A seeming example of an unconscious but operative value working in our school is the assumption that it's better to have *someone* in charge, be it an individual or small group, and that the ability to get things done varies inversely with the size of the decision-making group. I'm not suggesting there isn't some truth to this view; I'm suggesting that while it is widely applied, it is often unexamined. For better and for worse, this seems to be one of my school's and our nation's (Holdrege, 2019) managerial default settings.

Through the year-long process of collectively envisioning the Collegium and throughout its first year of existence, it became apparent that while there were certainly temperamental and cultural influences at play, the twin challenges of lack of participation and poor morale were not only related: they were partly structural in nature. The challenges were structural in the sense that our organizational forms—the codified ways in which we conducted business—did not support inclusion and transparency of process. Everyone was *for* inclusion and transparency. Yet, whenever there was a particularly strong impulse to include a larger group, there was no structure or vessel within which to place that impulse. A process for including and being transparent had to be invented anew each time. Other structural factors are analyzed in subsequent sections.

Before diving into the Collegium further and exploring its genesis, it may be important to clarify that the governance changes examined in this article encompass only the pedagogical realm. Traditionally in Waldorf schools, the College of Teachers is one of two decision-making bodies, the other being the Board of Trustees. Composed of a select group of faculty and staff, the College is responsible for the school's pedagogical decisions, and as such bears the defining mission of the school. Because Waldorf schools have a deeper mission for social renewal, the College may be said to carry the school's spiritual mission as well (Trostli, 2012). The Board of Trustees, composed of parents and other community members as well as school staff, is responsible for legal and financial decisions (Beaven, 2012). Of course, there are more or less gray areas where pedagogical (cultural), financial (economic), and legal (political) concerns conflate (McAlice, 2009). The current case focuses solely on pedagogical governance—areas and activities traditionally falling under the purview of the College of Teachers.

The Envisioning and Affirmation Process

Because of the longstanding belief that the College's dual challenge of participation and morale was in part cultural, the College decided to try and build a solution from the ground up through a democratic/consensual process involving all school employees (coworkers). Firstly, the College understood that any process intended to address the two challenges had to take place outside the governance structure extant at the time, which in some part was responsible for the problematic dynamic in the first place. Secondly, College members understood that the exploratory process itself should exemplify the ideals they hoped any new governance form might engender. The College came up with an initial plan for... coming up with a plan. The rough outline

stated: (1) Seek universal acknowledgement of the problem. (2) Seek unanimous consent to explore new pedagogical governance models. (3) Select through consensus a small working group/task force to facilitate a year-long envisioning and affirmation process involving all coworkers. (4) Try not to freak out—understand that any proposed changes would have to be unanimously approved, including by the current College of Teachers (who were understandably anxious and cautious). (5) See what happens.

The seeds of what would grow into the Collegium were planted at the school's first in-service day in the fall of 2017. In the spirit of acknowledging the participation and morale problems, the College posed a question to all coworkers: "Who mandates the College of Teachers?" The conversation that ensued was one of the most illuminating and remarkable of the entire envisioning process. Conducted as a talking circle, wherein each coworker had the opportunity to speak in successive go-arounds, responses ranged from left to right of the political gamut. The response from the left suggested: 'It doesn't matter who mandates the College. The College wields unfair power, and that power should be distributed equally. Blow the whole thing up!' The response from the right insinuated: 'The (ever mysterious) *School* mandates the College, and thank God there are people willing to step up and do this work. Now shut up about it!' More illuminating was the revelation that a significant number of coworkers had only the vaguest notions of what the College was, or the nature of its work, or the processes by which it works, let alone a working understanding of terms like "mandates."

This was a huge wake-up moment for the College. Members soon realized that the participation and morale challenges were in part managerial, concerning professional development and organizational leadership, two of the College's areas of responsibility. The problem was due in part to the school's failure to train its various staff members about the governance structure within which they worked. This professional development and leadership shortfall had real, institutional repercussions. After all, coworkers need to be trained and mentored not only in their own areas of expertise, such as teaching Spanish or running a capital campaign, but also in governance, especially when working within a collaborative leadership model. This governance component may be doubly important given the paucity of trained Waldorf teachers entering the workforce and the fact that experienced teachers are less available to provide College leadership as they spend more time in classrooms mentoring new teachers (Soule & Stewart,

2016). Without being trained in governance and collaborative leadership models, some coworkers may not self-select or volunteer for something as mysterious and intimidating as College leadership. In this sense, low participation/engagement may be interpreted as a professional development challenge, as much as a cultural or temperamental challenge. It also may be interpreted as a structural problem, as there need to be structures or organizational forms which *embody* the governance-and-collaborative-leadership-training gesture. Organizational forms that provide governance and leadership training as part of their ongoing mission, as part of their normal ways of conducting business, will arguably be more effective than any discrete “training sessions.”

At the conclusion of several more exploratory conversations, it seemed coworkers had reached a better understanding of our school’s extant governance structure. They arrived at a tacit acceptance of the existing organization and role of the College as a small, empowered working group of the leaner, default management style mentioned above. The suggestion of a different direction was a real possibility in those initial meetings, and the new direction moved away from the College, small-mandated-group model and towards a flatter, whole-group model involving all the coworkers equally. Still, that suggestion never arose.

I can imagine readers already asking at this point: Why add another institutional layer of complexity with the creation of the Collegium? Why not just grow the College from 10 members to 25? Or why not just make decisions in the larger coworker circle? I cannot provide school-wide answers because those questions never came up. I can, however, articulate a rationale. Firstly, it’s not immediately obvious that growing the College would be any less institutionally complex than creating another layer. Secondly, I can reiterate the strong, long-standing confidence among our school employees in the power of delegating and mandating and the need to seek input and affirmation from larger, constituent groups, notwithstanding, a belief that smaller groups work more efficiently and effectively.

In addition to tacit acceptance of the existing, small-group College organization, there was general agreement that the College should work under a legitimate and living mandate from the school. Furthermore, the coworkers agreed that in our existing governance model there was no mechanism to provide that

mandate. They unanimously decided to pursue a process of envisioning a new governance model and proceeded to select, by consensus, a small task force to facilitate the envisioning and, should it come to it, the affirmation process. The answer to the question “Who mandates the College?” was left unanswered, at least for the moment.

The ensuing envisioning process involved regular conversations within the larger coworker group as well as in smaller constituent groups; back and forth communications and wordsmithing between the task force, College, and coworkers; and many one-on-one conversations. Early on in the process, a conception of a Collegium—this larger group of committed stakeholders selecting and mandating the College—emerged. Several contentious issues also quickly came up. The biggest point of contention was membership. “Who,” in other words, “would be eligible to serve on the Collegium?” Two other questions solicited heated debate,

both related to the Collegium’s role and responsibility of selecting and mandating the College. The first was, “What role, if any, should the Collegium take in pedagogical decisions made by the College?” And the second was, “Should there be an appeals process by which College decisions could be appealed to a larger group?” Through a seven-month, deliberative process involving all the coworkers, the task force ironed out answers to these and other questions. They defined and refined language and terms, made compromises, assuaged egos, and in the last week of the 2017-2018 school year, the City of Lakes Waldorf School’s coworkers affirmed and approved a new governance model.

Collegium Roles, Responsibilities, and Structures

The final, approved Collegium and College of Teachers mandate¹ spelled out specific roles and responsibilities, and outlined membership criteria for both the Collegium and College. It also outlined various processes, including the consensus decision-making process; the process by which the College of Teachers is selected; and the process by which the Collegium affirms major pedagogical changes. The mandate further described Collegium and College appeals processes.

The Collegium’s first and foremost role and responsibility is to select and mandate a College of Teachers.

¹ The entire Collegium and College of Teachers mandate may be found at clws.org/collegium

Here is the answer to the question, “Who mandates the College of Teachers?” The Collegium—a larger circle of committed stakeholders—mandates the College. A more in-depth explanation and rationale is provided below. Once the College is selected and mandated, the Collegium meets at least three times per year, in the fall, winter, and spring, and additionally as needed to review College goals and priorities and to provide input and affirmation on proposed major pedagogical changes. In addition to offering guidance to the College on yearly direction, priorities, and goals, the Collegium provides input and affirmation on *major* pedagogical changes that relate to the overall mission or direction of the school. As part of its ongoing management duties, the College is responsible for organizing and facilitating processes for gathering input and affirmation from the Collegium on proposed major changes. Major pedagogical changes include but are not limited to significant programmatic changes, amendments to the school’s governance structure, major physical changes to the building or grounds, etc.

Here, in the Collegium’s role of affirming (and in its *responsibility* to affirm) is the formerly non-existent institutional requirement to include faculty and staff stakeholders in major pedagogical decisions. Here also lies the mechanism by which it happens. Both the College and Collegium are active participants in the process. The College is responsible for instructional leadership and the day-to-day management of the school’s pedagogical mission (Pewtherer, 2011). This responsibility includes seeking input and affirmation from the Collegium on major decisions. The Collegium in turn is responsible for staying informed of and engaged in major questions or decisions that are in the works. If the overloaded, overworked College members struggle with how to include the larger group or view that inclusion as a burdensome, bureaucratic box to check, then the Collegium must step in and provide leadership and organizational assistance. Similarly, if the Collegium appears to respond with a glazed over, this-doesn’t-concern-me look, if members are not reading preparatory materials or answering emails, then the College must likewise provide more leadership and direction.

Collegium membership criteria—the most heated topic of debate in the envisioning process—were decided in a pretty straightforward compromise between Left and Right, between those who would welcome all coworkers, conceivably even new employees with no

[T]he twin challenges of lack of participation and poor morale were not only related: they were partly structural in nature.

former Waldorf and/or collaborative leadership experience, and those who would insist upon more outward proficiencies, such as years of experience, training, or other bona fides. In addition to the inner/dispositional qualities mentioned earlier, such as commitments to the school, to Waldorf education, to a path of inner development, and to a spirit of collaboration, coworkers agreed to the outer/experiential qualities of two full years of employment, serving in a role subject to yearly review and a tenured status. The latter, in our school, means that in addition to two years of employment, the employee is not subject to any improvement or disciplinary plans.

In the end, coworkers agreed the final Collegium membership criteria exemplified the shared intention to convey (1) a welcoming and inclusive gesture, and (2) a clear and conscientious path to membership. Interestingly, conversations intended to answer the practical question, “Who should be on the Collegium?” deepened and informed answers to the question that started the whole envisioning process: “Who mandates the College?”

The School is in great measure a pedagogy. That pedagogy is embodied, made manifest, by the employees of the School—the teachers and the administrative staff—and the work they do. In one basic but important sense, the School is the employees, students, and parents *all working together*. But just as we, as individuals, are more than our work, so is the School. Just as we embody a being with a unique destiny, so the School has a being and a unique destiny. This is not just a pedagogical mission, but a societal or moral mission (Trostli, 2011). The School has a developmental mission: to transform itself while helping to transform the world. While the School, on one level, is the daily work embodied by those who perform the work, on an even higher level the School is *intention*, embodied by those who, working together and in shared commitment (Smit, 2011), align their own personal intentions and destinies, their own personal development, with that of the School and its larger mission (Pewtherer, 2011). In another sense, these employees are part of a larger, karmic motion. In Waldorf parlance they *carry* or embody the School. This is the level of commitment asked of Collegium and College members, and it provides the rationale for our belief that the Collegium has the natural authority and responsibility to mandate the College.

Finally, the Collegium mandate described transparent Collegium and College appeals processes—procedures by which one coworker or group of coworkers may appeal directly to the College one of its decisions (or the decision of one of its mandated committees) or, in the event of a matter of grave concern, appeal a College decision to the Collegium. Appeals heard by the College include those related to decisions made in the course of its day-to-day management of the school’s educational programs. These may concern the allotment of professional development funds or other resources, the yearly schedule, space use concerns, mentorship and evaluation (including probationary or improvement plans), the hiring and dismissal of teachers, etc. Appeals heard by the Collegium regard major, systemic governance concerns only. Major governance concerns may include those involving the College’s adherence to school governance policies or norms, conflicts of interest, the misuse of authority, etc.

Collegium appeals are managed and facilitated by an ad hoc investigative team consisting of three to five impartial members of the Collegium, Board of Trustees, and members of various school committees as needed, such as the teacher development committee or human resources committee. Both the College and appellant(s) are given an opportunity to weigh in on the make-up of the investigative team and every reasonable attempt is made to form an objective, unbiased appeals team. The team conducts an investigation, and if this team feels there is evidence to support the appeal, it shares findings and makes recommendations to the Collegium, who ultimately rule on the appeal.

Initial Successes, Ongoing Challenges, Outstanding Questions

Beginning now our school’s second year of its new governance structure, the Collegium has successfully selected its second composition of the College of Teachers. As part of the College selection process, Collegium members publicly share their intentions for committee work in the coming school year, including their willingness (or inability) to serve on the College of Teachers. The mood is fairly formal and participants are expected to speak openly and honestly and to provide thoughtful reasons for their participation or lack thereof. The selection process may also involve nominations. From all indications the selection process seems to have inspired confidence not only in younger and/or newer coworkers but in seasoned colleagues as well. For a novice, it is very powerful and encouraging to hear more experienced colleague speak your name publicly and say they would love to see you step up into a leadership role, to say they see leadership qualities

in you. Likewise, it is gratifying for those with more leadership experience to hear others publicly acknowledge their service, thank them, and say their continued leadership is valued. It is further important at an institutional level to recognize and acknowledge, as our newly minted College mandate does, the importance of ensuring a balance between novice and experienced members.

One of the major goals of the whole Collegium endeavor was to encourage more participation at the College and leadership level. Last year’s College included three rookies. Two out of the three new College members said they doubted they would have ended up on the College had it not been for the Collegium selection process. “The process,” wrote one, “changed a nebulous, somewhat intimidating, unclear process of how one gets on the College [into an] explicit, diplomatic, transparent [process] with clear qualifying factors.” The third rookie was encouraged to join the College in a more traditional manner from “behind the scenes,” although she felt emboldened and encouraged by the Collegium selection process. Two of last year’s rookie College members continued their service this year, and were joined by another first-year College member. Several other would-be, College members expressed their interest and willingness to join in the coming years as the need for more novice College members arises. So far, it looks like the Collegium has been an initial success in terms of encouraging more participation in the College and/or enthusiasm in its work.

While one of the explicit goals of the Collegium was to encourage more participation at the College and leadership level, a related implicit goal regarded professional development—to provide a training ground for leadership and coaching for how things get done. This leadership training is modeled on the workings of the Collegium itself and in its activities, such as in the consensual process of selecting the College. In the interest of providing more training in collaborative leadership, the Collegium conducted several studies in its first year, including studies of the consensus decision-making process and the committee reporting process.

One of the Collegium’s late-spring, early-summer responsibilities is hearing formal year-end reports from the College and its mandated committees, such as the teacher development, educational support, and festival committees. At the Collegium level, the purpose of the reporting process is twofold. In the interest of providing guidance to the College on yearly direction, priorities, and goals, the reporting process offers Collegium members the opportunity to stay abreast of these, as

they take place on the committee level, and to identify major themes and challenges. But in terms of leadership training, hearing the reports also entails a larger study of how committees function, or, sometimes, how they don't.

Committee reports have been presented at various times in our school's history to the smaller College or the larger coworker circle. Past committee reports to the coworkers often seemed like an afterthought, a ceremonial piece. Engagement and analysis seemed perfunctory. In contrast, past reporting to the College often entailed the appropriate level of engagement and analysis, but it did not include many of the major stakeholders in the school—those who might be serving on the College in the near future and/or whose areas of expertise would make their input important. It remains the College's responsibility to mandate and guide work at the committee level; however, the formality and seriousness of committee reporting at the Collegium level, coupled with the inclusion of the larger group of stakeholders, may make the Collegium the most appropriate and effective venue for meta-analyses of committee work. One of the larger themes identified by Collegium members at the conclusion of last spring's year-end reports involved inconsistencies in how committee chairs were gaining input and participation from their respective groups; this is a good example of the institutional-level-analysis that the committee reporting process is intended to provide. In addition to increasing participation in the College, hearing formal committee reports in the Collegium promises to be another initial success.

After its first year, the Collegium has yet to inform or affirm a major pedagogical change. Arguably, there have been no major changes to affirm so far, but there certainly are many major questions to address and possible decisions in the works. The College has yet to bring those questions to the Collegium in any formal way, while the Collegium has so far failed to offer proactive leadership. A portion of our first-year Collegium meetings were given to open discussions of what from the items on the College's agenda should be taken up for consideration by the Collegium. These would be seen as items involving a major change or a pioneering impulse that warrant input from the Collegium. Examples of topics that may result in a major change or new direction currently being discussed on the College and throughout the school include the possibility of a helping class, a process for integrating the school's approach to media and technology, and a search for new models for the orchestra program. One of the Collegium's goals for this year is to work more closely

with the College to help identify topics for Collegium input and assist the College in organizing and facilitating those conversations.

The Collegium also has yet to facilitate an appeal of a previous decision. However, as interesting as it would be to witness an appeal from a governance and process standpoint, and as informative as it would be to the effort to improve the appeals process, we are perfectly content never to hear an appeal. Still, we know schools can face existential threats from within in the form of breakdown in the collegial realm—breakdown that carries the very real possibility of damage to the school. To a certain extent, this possibility exists only in the absence of a larger, communal process for resolving major conflicts. Whether ours is such a process, we don't know yet. But we hope the mere existence of a process will mitigate the threat of a major cleavage.

Outstanding questions relate to the intersection between the Collegium, College, teachers, and the critical function of teacher mentorship/evaluation. Currently the teacher development committee is mandated by the College to organize and manage the training, mentoring, and evaluation of teachers. While the College is now selected through a transparent, consensual process, the teacher development committee (like all committees) continues to be self-selected. Two of the committee's three responsibilities—mentoring and evaluating—can lead directly to the dismissal of a teacher. With regard to such a critical and vulnerable area of concern, the question is: How will the school assure that processes are fair and transparent? Whatever the answers, the Collegium will be intimately involved in the questioning process.

Other questions concern the job review process and the relationship between the Collegium/College and the administrative staff, including the administrative director and faculty chair, who by virtue of their positions are standing members of the Collegium and College. Regular review is a requirement for serving on the Collegium, and currently there is no review process for the faculty chair, nor is there a regular or established process for reviewing the administrative director and members of their administrative staff. Additionally, while class teachers (early childhood and grades) are subject to regular reviews, there are many inconsistencies in the way subject/specialist teachers and teachers' assistants are reviewed. Although the remedy here seems pretty straightforward, and although there is universal acknowledgement of the need to conduct formal job reviews, the challenge remains: reviews require huge investments in time, resources, and people

power. Given the critical importance of regular review, and the fact that it is a requirement for membership on the Collegium and College, perhaps the Collegium can (or should) provide more leadership and/or on-the-ground administrative assistance.

The democratic/collaborative governance model by which pedagogical questions are discussed and decisions are made not only creates an atmosphere and process in which employees can develop personally and grow together, it creates living and responsive classrooms. The collaborative process enlivens the school. Collaboration is not just a good managerial model; it enhances the pedagogy. A question that relates to collaboration and the work of the Collegium, but falls outside its pedagogical purview, is the larger question of how collaboration lives in the school's financial, legal, and administrative realms. Unlike the case with teachers, the affirmation and appeals processes are available to administrative staff only in relation to their work on the College or in any of the pedagogical committees; these processes are not guaranteed to the staff in the context of their duties in admissions, development, accounting, and other administrative or clerical tasks. For example, a teacher has input into the process by which teachers are evaluated; teacher evaluation is managed by a team of peers (the teacher development committee); and teachers may appeal their placement on a probationary plan. An administrative staff member, on the other hand, is not granted similar affirmation and appeals processes. While the board does work through a consensual process similar to that of the Collegium, College, and the pedagogical committees, administrative staff members work under a more traditional, hierarchical structure, under the leadership of the board and administrative director. This is not to suggest that the board and administrative director do not seek input, allow for questioning, or encourage team spirit as any good managers would; it is a recognition that the governance structure of the school's administration is that of manager-and-team, as opposed to self-managing team or college. A broader question, and one the gesture of the Collegium brings into sharper focus, asks: Can and should the school extend collaborative models and structures to encompass work in the administrative realm?

As suggested earlier, the Collegium is not first and foremost a form, but a *gesture*, an *attitude*, an *intention*. The Collegium represents an intention that College members have always carried. The intention is to accept—along with the help of spiritual forces streaming from the future—personal and communal responsibility for the future of the school and the vibrancy of its

mission. So far in the process, school morale seems to be running high and colleagues are hopeful. A spirit of possibility and *esprit de corps* pervades the Collegium and College. Lightning in a bottle?

REFERENCES

- Beaven, L. (2012). "Spirit is never without matter, matter never without spirit": A narrative examination of a college of teachers. *Research Bulletin*, 17(1), 25-38.
- Ernst, L. (2019). *Republican—not democratic*. Hudson, NY: Research Institute for Waldorf Education.
- Holdrege, M. (2019). Collegial collaboration: Becoming receptive to an emerging future. *Research Bulletin*, 24(1), 16-22.
- Pewtherer, J. (2011). *The art of administration: viewpoints on professional management in Waldorf schools*. D. Mitchell (Ed.). Wilton, NH: The Economic Committee, AWSNA.
- Smit, J. (2011). *The child, the teachers, and the community*. Ghent, NY: The Pedagogical Section Council of North America.
- Soule, M. & Stewart, M. (2016). New impulses for Waldorf administration, leadership and governance. Retrieved from <https://leadtogether.org/new-impulses-for-waldorf-school-administration/>
- Trostli, R. (2011). On earth as it is in heaven: The tasks of the college of teachers in light of the founding impulse of Waldorf education (Part I). *Research Bulletin*, 16(2), 21-32.
- Trostli, R. (2012). On earth as it is in heaven: The tasks of the college of teachers in light of the founding impulse of Waldorf education (Part II). *Research Bulletin*, 17(1), 9-24.

Peter Lawton, Ed.D: *For the past eighteen years, Peter Lawton has been a class teacher at City of Lakes Waldorf School in Minneapolis, Minnesota, where he has taken two classes from first through eighth grade. Peter's animated three-part video series, Waldorf Education: An Introduction, can be viewed here: www.clws.org/waldorf-education/waldorf-education-video-series/*