

Date of Meeting: June 13-14, 1958

Date of Memo: May 26, 1958

Memorandum No. 1

Subject: Changes in Commission Staff and Organization.

This is a memorandum which I find it difficult to write. But for several reasons, among them the prospect that we may have more members attending the June meeting than any other until at least November, this seems to be the appropriate time to write it.

I have decided that 1958-59 will be my last year with the Commission. While there are several reasons for this decision, the principal one is simply that I cannot continue to serve as Executive Secretary, devote as much time as I want to devote to my work as a law teacher, and keep my work week within tolerable limits. I am now working longer hours than I can hope to continue to work indefinitely and I am not doing the kind of job I ought to be doing for either the Commission or the School. Nor have I found it possible to so organize the work of the Executive Secretary's office as to solve the problem. This last, I suspect, may be due in part to my own inherent inability to delegate important work for which I have ultimate responsibility.

The decision to leave the Commission is a difficult one for me. I like the work and I find it satisfying. And I have enjoyed more than I can say my association with the members of the Commission, the members of the Staff and nearly everyone else with

whom my work as Executive Secretary has brought me into contact. But my decision, though difficult, has been arrived at after much thought and is irrevocable.

My decision will pose some problems for both the Commission and the Law School. The basic problem, as I see it, is whether the concept of a half-time Executive Secretary is a workable one. It would be more than human, I suppose, for me to believe that anyone else can carry a load that I find too heavy. However that may be, I have come to the conclusion that it cannot be done. With the expansion of the Commission's agenda on a scale that I doubt any of us anticipated at the outset I believe that the Executive Secretary's job has become one of very nearly full-time proportions, whoever may be its incumbent.

The Commission and Stanford may accept this judgment or they may wish to continue the half-time arrangement with a new Executive Secretary to see whether a workable modus operandi, presumably involving more delegation within the office, can be worked out. If my judgment be accepted, however, the problem of possible alternatives to the half-time arrangement is presented.

A reasonably close approximation to the present arrangement which might be feasible would be to have a $\frac{3}{4}$ Commission - $\frac{1}{4}$ Stanford (or $\frac{5}{6}$ Commission - $\frac{1}{6}$ Stanford) arrangement, under which the Executive Secretary's law school work would be limited to giving a course or Seminar in Legislation. I believe that this would retain in large part whatever may be the benefits of the present arrangement insofar as the Commission is concerned. I

suppose that it might, however, raise a question in the minds of people in the Department of Finance and elsewhere in the State Government (or indeed, in the minds of members of the Commission) whether such a tenuous connection with Stanford justifies the arrangement, as against having the headquarters of the Commission in Sacramento (or elsewhere) under a full-time Executive Secretary.

Preliminary discussions with the Dean and some members of the faculty indicate that my leaving the Commission is certain to create substantial problems insofar as Stanford is concerned. No one presently on the faculty appears to be interested in succeeding me. Thus, if the arrangement is to be continued on any basis it will be necessary to recruit a successor. The job specification is rather unique: a person otherwise fully qualified to appointment to the faculty who happens to be interested in the job. The "fully qualified" condition is important because he, too, might later decide that he cannot carry both jobs or that, in any event, he prefers to be a full-time teacher. If a $3/4 - 1/4$ (or $5/6 - 1/6$) arrangement were contemplated, Stanford's problem would be aggravated because it would be more difficult to find a fully qualified person who would be interested in an arrangement involving so little opportunity for work and development (and promotion) on the Law School side.

I suggest that the matter be handled in the following way: The Commission should discuss the situation and determine whether it desires to continue the arrangement with Stanford and, if so,

on what basis. It should then initiate discussions with Stanford, suggesting such alternatives as would be acceptable to the Commission. At that point the Law School can consider and determine its position. If this process is begun at the June meeting it should be possible to arrange for discussion of the matter between the Commission and the Law School at the time of the July meeting which is to be held at Stanford.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. McDonough, Jr.
Executive Secretary

JRM:hd