



Documenting A Dispute

Point and counterpoint in an emotion-laden conflict arising from the school of medicine.

Introduction

THE SPECIAL SECTION ON LOMA LINDA CONCLUDES with several documents that are particularly relevant to a dispute between certain faculty and the administration of the university. After the brief introductory notes, the documents are printed unedited, in the chronological order of their appearance.

The letter from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) informing Loma Linda University that the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities had removed the university from probation and reaffirmed its accreditation (March 3, 1992). The letter summarizes an extensive, detailed report from the Accrediting Commission of WASC to the university.

The report includes a comment on "an ongoing conflict at LLU between a group of faculty and administration," says that it spent "a significant amount of time discussing it with a variety of individuals and groups during the site visit," and concludes that "grievance pro-

cedures currently in place should be adequate to resolve the issues, and certainly should be tried by the aggrieved faculty before they resort to appeals to external agencies."

Too extensive to reprint here is an exchange concluded in June 1992 between critics of the administration and the administration. On January 15, 1992, Dr. Shankel, on behalf of himself and Dr. Grames, requested that the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), an agency of the federal government, investigate Loma Linda University and the Loma Linda Faculty Medical Group, Inc. for unfair labor practices. In March, the acting regional director ruled that because Loma Linda University is a "church operated school," an "inquiry into a faculty member's dismissal would impermissibly involve the Board in an 'inquiry into the good faith of the position asserted by clergy-administrators and its relationship to the school's religious mission.'" That led to appeals and extensive briefs by attorneys for Shankel and Grames, with extended, responding briefs by attorneys for Loma Linda University. The brief for Shankel

and Grames argued that “in the instant case, Loma Linda has a primarily secular purpose.” Attorneys for Loma Linda University argued that “As an institution of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, the highest body of the Church, the University is an integral part of the Church itself.” In May, the general counsel of the NLRB, citing many of the facts in the university’s brief, refused to overturn the regional director’s ruling, and on June 19 denied a request for reconsideration.

An article in *Academe* regarding a dispute within the school of medicine. *Academe* is the official journal of the American Association of University Professors. An article in its May-June 1992 issue (pp. 42-50), summarizes the history of the dispute, and refers to extensive correspondence between the administration and the AAUP, including a 17-

page critique by the administration of a draft of the article. Since the appearance of the article the association has formally censured Loma Linda University.

The response of Loma Linda University (July 21, 1992) to the completed article published in *Academe*. This document repeats the core criticism in a longer, 17-page critique of the article in draft form.

The response of the Interschool Faculty Advisory Council, which is comprised of two representatives from each school within the university, the faculty of religion, and the library. The president and deans of the schools are also members, *ex officio*. The voted decisions of this body are advisory to the president of the university.

The Editors