

MARCH MAYHEM, 1973

It will be essential for a future historian of The Evergreen State College to deal with the assumptions about student enrollment, faculty strength, and academic facilities upon which the early planning of the institution was based. It will be no less essential to deal with the drastic action of the Washington State Senate at the beginning of March, 1973, which disrupted the planned development and stunted the growth of the College.

When I came to Evergreen in 1970, the Governor's Office, the Legislature, the Trustees, and the President agreed about the rate at which the College was supposed to grow. Starting with a figure that varied from 800 to 1200 students in the fall of 1971, enrollment would grow at an average of 1000 full-time-equivalent (FTE) students each year until, in the mid-1980's, the College would reach 12,000 FTE.

As I worked in the late springs and summers of 1972 and 1974 with Ken Winkley to develop the biennial academic operating budget requests for the College, I learned how State funding was driven by enrollments expressed in quarter-credit hours. Within the budgetary formula employed in the early 1970's, the funding of undergraduate education in the senior institutions would depend upon the number of quarter-credit hours for which the lower-division and the upper-division students would have registered by the 10th days of the terms. The number of full-time-equivalent faculty members (FTEF) compensated under the formula would also be related to the enrollments as projected and then as registered. In these years, 1000 new FTE students each year would have supported 45-50 new FTEF.

It should be evident to an observer that the College as it now exists, almost fifty years after it was founded, is quite different from what the first administrators and faculty members thought they were supposed to plan.

The most visible relic of the ambitious early assumptions stands today as the Daniel J. Evans Library Building. As one of his first projects as President, Charles

McCann visited a number of colleges and universities around the country. He found that most of these institutions were planning to expand their library facilities by additions to current buildings or construction of new buildings. With the concurrence of the Trustees and the support of institutional consultants, he determined to have as the first major academic building of Evergreen a structure which would be large enough to contain a library collection serving 12,000 students. Accordingly, the Director of Facilities Planning, Jerry Schillinger, set to work with the contracted architectural firm to design a building which could also, in the early years, house not only the comparatively modest initial library collection but also the classrooms and offices to serve a college numbering a few thousand students and a few hundred faculty members.

At the time when the building was designed and constructed, the key to such flexibility was the use throughout of 22.5-foot squares for the load-bearing columns. With the exceptions of the main lobby, the central core containing elevators and rest-rooms, the elevator near the loading dock, and the stairwells, the whole massive structure – the largest academic building in the State – resembled a forest of concrete piers the centers of which would be exactly 22.5 feet apart. The lower lobby, the large room on the fourth floor, and the interior of the Library proper, as well as the frame of the clock tower and the columns supporting the portico, display these 22.5-foot squares.

[Bonus: Why the clock tower? On his visits to college campuses around the country, Charles McCann had noticed that some of the new colleges founded and constructed in the late 1950's and the earlier 1960's followed a pattern of decentralized buildings rather than the older idea of a quadrangle which would serve as a kind of town square for the community. He did not like the decentralizing fashion. He said that it made him feel as if he were always between two places rather than in a place. He therefore pressed for a town-square concept, which would leave most of the rest of the college property in its natural state. And to make sure that there would be a sense of focus, of "knowing where you were," he wished to having the town square dominated by a clock tower. Never mind that the hands on the several clock faces usually do not tell the same time. That's just Evergreen.]

As you walk by the exterior walls of the building, you will also see the smooth concrete surfaces of the load-bearing columns set 22.5 feet apart. Rather than having "wet" interior walls through which the utilities and duct-work would run, the interior partitions were "dry" walls which could be taken out, added, and thus freshly configured at need. According to the Master Plan, as both the collection and the student body grew, seminar-room and office partitions would be taken out to accommodate the Library proper. The classrooms, other spaces for academic programs, and faculty offices for the growing College would be provided in the new buildings to be constructed. What were these buildings to be?

According to the **newsletter** of August, 1970 – Vol.2, No. 8, the following projects would be the major academic structures in the capital budget request for the 1971-73 biennium, in priority order (with my addition of the administrative "clients" for each building): Seminar (Dean Cadwallader); Fine Arts (Dean Teske); Drama Music Instructional (Dean Teske); Science Labs (Dean Humphrey); College Recreation Center (Director of Recreation Steilberg); Drama Music Auditorium (Dean Teske). In this listing only the Drama-Music facilities were presented as two projects.

We assumed that the members of the Legislature would more easily understand and respond to the need for an auditorium in an institution enrolling 12,000 students than they would for a building of rehearsal and practice rooms, studios, a recital hall, and a little theater to serve a smaller college in its earliest years. We put into the instructional, intramural first phase an ensemble rehearsal room designed with the dimensions of the main stage of our auditorium-to-be, much larger set and costume shops than would be needed for a little theater, a loading dock to serve both phases, and even a paint-frame room for the production of flats and cycloramas -- so that when the time came to request the auditorium of the second phase, all of the supporting facilities would be ready for the auditorium to be hooked on.

In the next months, as it became apparent that we were unlikely to get State funding for the other projects in their entirety, all of us engaged in the planning of the facilities were forced to make compromises. The proposed Fine Arts

Building presented to me as I came aboard not only left much to be desired for conventional instruction in the fine arts but also did not sort well with the interdisciplinary programs to which the College had committed itself in February of 1970. With the concurrence of my fellow deans, the President's Council, and my advisors on the newly assembled Planning Faculty, I decided not to proceed with the building. The other academic clients working with Jerry Schillinger, Director of Facilities Planning, and his staff architects decided to divide each of their projects into two phases.

Don Humphrey planned his phases, designated Laboratory I and Laboratory II, so that each would contain laboratories, seminar rooms, and faculty offices to support interdisciplinary work in the natural sciences. The phases were not so much different in kind as they were in order of necessity/utility for a growing college. With the recognition that hands-on work in the visual arts resembles work in the sciences in presenting special needs for water, power, climate control, and waste disposal, Don added art facilities to each phase and designated additional funds to construct an Arts Annex.

Merv Cadwallader's Seminar I and Seminar II, however, were to serve quite different purposes. Seminar I, as it appears today, was to contain only a few seminar rooms but was meant to provide the faculty offices for those who would be instructing in the programs to be housed in the adjoining Seminar II. Sem I was to be a gatehouse to the much larger building of the second phase, which would, as I recall the elevation drawings, extend downward for two stories and rise upward for at least three more stories. Merv was intermittently visited by the fear that somehow the second phase would be funded before the first; he would have his seminar rooms and central meeting spaces for whole programs, but there would be no place to put the faculty members. All three of us deans were afraid that Seminars I and II would be funded before we had any facilities for the laboratory sciences and the performing and visual arts.

Following somewhat the same logic as Merv and me, Pete Steilberg opted for a College Recreation Center I, which would contain a swimming pool, weight rooms, other conditioning rooms, racketball and handball courts, shower and dressing

rooms, and a general purpose wood-floored room which could be used for class meetings, athletic activities, and dance-rehearsal. CRC II would house the basketball arena and could serve for other large gatherings. Again, we-the-planners assumed that the members of the Legislature would be more likely to understand Phase II than Phase I. Therefore, we had to put in the work, including the lobbying, to prepare and present the phases of the projects in the order we wanted.

The capital budget requests for academic facilities were connected with the numbers of students in the sense that growing enrollments would require the construction of new facilities. Ideally, the capital projects, as with the Library and the Lecture Halls, should be funded in advance of the students' need for them, not as reactions to enrollment pressures. But the fiscal circumstances of Washington State in the early 1970's were anything but ideal. First, the "Boeing Recession -- Will the last person to leave Seattle please turn out the lights?" (leaving the grandly conceived project of supersonic airliners to be remembered only as the name of an NBA team) and then the "Nixon Recession" left the State with depleted finances. The funding of Evergreen's capital projects was slow and arduous in coming. But the consequences for the operating budget which provided directly for the support of students and the compensation and strength of the faculty were even worse.

As Merv, Don, and I recruited the faculty members for 1972-73, we proceeded under the assumption that the faculty would be growing by 45-50 new members each year. Since Don as budget dean, with Merv's and my enthusiastic approval, had unified the academic budget, we were spared from turf wars of divisions competing for institutional resources: Social Sciences vs. Natural Sciences vs. Humanities & Arts. But we still bore the responsibility for developing competence within the disciplines which would be connected in our interdisciplinary programs. I had to deal with special considerations which arose in my bailiwick: hiring in foreign languages and the arts.

By and large, departments of foreign languages in the undergraduate colleges of the United States were supported by -- subsidized by -- distribution requirements.

Typically, students had to earn credit for two years of coursework in a foreign language -- any foreign language offered by the school. Typically, these beginning and intermediate courses were taught by instructors with talent for and interest in foreign-language study. They often had difficulties dealing with students who had neither talent nor interest. The instructors would perform their duties and hope that someday they could achieve enough seniority to be assigned to advanced courses in literary masterpieces. But Evergreen had no such requirements, no such courses, and no examples to follow for offering foreign-language study within a curriculum largely committed to interdisciplinary, team-taught programs. What would our students need? What would they want? And whom should we recruit to do what? We should not try to recruit faculty members specifically skilled in teaching foreign languages until we had some answers to these questions.

I proposed to my colleagues that we should hire Andrew Hanfman, an expert skilled in European comparative literature and linguistics, to help us with planning and instruction, and that we should also consider offering work early on in Spanish and Japanese because of the lively new interest in Pacific Rim studies. Otherwise, we should hold off on a substantial recruiting effort until we had ascertained the demand and could determine a policy. With so many new faculty positions opening each year, we then could bring on a complement of the teachers we would need.

The issue of hiring faculty members with expertise in the performing and the visual arts was connected with the lack of special facilities in our first years of operation. In these years, Don Chan's Chamber Singers and Jazz Ensemble had to settle for evening rehearsals in classrooms. Ainara Wilder's drama students also had to do their rehearsing in the evening. Both the music groups and theater groups had to put on their smaller pieces amidst the columns of the large fourth-floor room and their more ambitious performances in the Library lobby. We did expand our activities by bringing on Bob Gottlieb for small-ensemble classical music and Bud Johansen for dance. But there was little point in adding further faculty members, despite the large amount of student interest in the performing arts, until we had the facilities to support the work.

Similarly, despite the demand for incorporating work in the visual arts into our curriculum, the few teachers whom we recruited in the early years and their students were frustrated by the lack of proper facilities. We tried to remedy the situation in the second year of operation by renting studio space in downtown Olympia. But by doing so, we incurred costs for transportation and -- because much of the activity took place in the evenings -- security services for our students at the venue and during their commuting. I determined that we should not recruit more faculty members specializing in the arts until proper facilities would come on line. Then, with 45-50 new faculty positions opening each year, and with a clearer idea of what the demand would be, we could hire the teachers we needed in a few years.

These were the problems and proposed solutions for the areas in which I had particular responsibility. Don Humphrey's recruitment in the natural sciences also was conditioned by the early lack of facilities. Faculty members specializing in chemistry and physics would need laboratories, which we would not have for several years. Accordingly, with two biologists whom Merv suggested -- Bob Sluss and Larry Eickstaedt -- and another whom I suggested -- Ed Kormondy -- and his own recruits, Don developed for Evergreen considerable early strength in the life sciences. The campus itself and the waters of Puget Sound could be our first laboratories. It was also true that, as with Don himself and our Academic Vice President David Barry, biologists were likely to be more enthusiastic than their colleagues in other scientific fields about our commitment to interdisciplinary teams.

There was another concern which engaged all three of us founding deans. In a mature, established institution senior professors commanding relatively high salaries would be retiring in a gradual sequence, normally to be replaced by their juniors' moving up in rank and salary and a fresh crop of relatively low-paid young instructors to be hired at the base of the departmental pyramid. The traditions and inertial momentum of departmental activity would allow the institution to "grow its own."

At Evergreen, however, we had first recruited our Planning Faculty for proven

experience in the disciplines professed coupled with the interest and imagination to work in interdisciplinary teams -- or in the cases of those who had worked with Merv at San Jose and/or Old Westbury, direct experience in such teamwork. Thus we had started with a relatively mature group. We then received some excellent advice from Morris Keeton, assigned to the Evergreen team as a consultant at a summer workshop supported by the Danforth Foundation. It went something like this: "You will attract the attention of bright and idealistic young academicians with first-rate credentials who will wish to join your effort. Fresh out of graduate school, they will be enthusiastic and will bring much energy for low salaries. They will seem to offer a favorable bargain. Don't take it. For at least the first four or five years, hire for disciplinary savvy and especially for proven experience with innovation. Then, when you have some tradition and momentum behind your patterns of coordinated study, you can afford to hire young talent to grow your own and move toward a faculty balanced in maturity and youth." And that was the policy which, with relatively exceptions, the academic planners of Evergreen adopted. Once again, we assumed that we would be bringing on 45-50 new faculty members each year and could afford to wait and see.

These were the assumptions about student enrollment, faculty strength, and academic facilities upon which our planning and our decisions were based until the drastic action of the Washington State Senate in early March, 1973.

In **The Evergreen State College newsletter** of March 15, 1973 Dick Nichols wrote as his lead article: "REORGANIZATION, BUDGET PROBLEMS REVIEWED: The issue of staff and services reorganization at Evergreen and the problems of financial cuts contained in the 1973-75 operating budget recently approved by the State Senate have been the subject of campus-wide conversation during the past week....As explained last week by President Charles McCann, the Senate-passed operations budget for Evergreen contains \$10.9 million dollars for the next biennium and if held at that amount involves 'a considerable cut from what the governor recommended' and means that spending in 1973-75 must be reduced by \$1.7 million 'under current levels.' If the \$10.9 million figure becomes a reality (the House of Representatives has not acted yet), Evergreen's response 'must be reductions in force in every area and at all levels,' according to

McCann....

"Following is McCann's analysis of what is likely to happen if the Senate-passed budget becomes a fact: 1. (a) Our first approximation of the effects on personnel would be a significant reduction in administrative and staff persons, numbering approximately 58 individuals.... This reduction reflects the change from an institution which was geared to grow rapidly to 13,000 [sic] students to one which is to grow slowly. The reduction in force reflects both an administrative reorganization to plan for slower growth and reduction of some functions against those formerly required although the Senate was probably unaware of the depth of the cut made, our analysis suggests the reduction from current level of operations exceeds \$1.6 million [approximately \$8.5 million in 2016 buying power].

" (b) Except for a few losses through attrition, there will be no reduction in faculty because we have already agreed to operate at the same cost level (72% of formula) as the other Washington public institutions. Further reduction would squeeze the academic program below its present tight levels at which we have been operating and doing a first rate job.....

REORGANIZATION

"Limitations on enrollment growth at Evergreen whether at the level envisioned by the 1973-75 operating budget submitted by the governor's office or at the totals spelled out by action of the State Senate – have prompted college officials to begin drafting plans for staff and service reorganization, according to President McCann. Discussing the matter at the March 8 Board of Trustees meeting, McCann pointed out that slower growth or no growth in the immediate future means that 'we need to seriously consider reorganization.' 'There is no way to avoid it and to delay planning for it now would be a serious error,' he added.

"We built an administration and service organization capable of planning for and responding to fairly rapid growth,' McCann told the trustees.' That it did and did remarkably well. But, no growth gives us a clear message, We must take another look for the strongest, leanest administrative organization for our size and

resources that we can possibly put together'."

If the Senate action on the budget had stood, the very survival of Evergreen would have been in question. But as Dick Nichols reported on March 15, the House of Representatives had not yet acted. In the interim, Greeners and their supporters mounted an intensive lobbying effort, including not only their wearing of lapel buttons which proclaimed, in green script on a beige background, "**EVERGREEN LIVES!**" but also the distribution of these buttons to whichever legislators were willing to wear them.

In his **newsletter** of April 19, under the heading "state higher education budget approved: EVERGREEN'S SHARE INCREASED," Dick Nichols wrote: "Though less than requested for the college by the governor's, budget office, Evergreen's operating and capital budgets for the next two years are both higher than the amounts originally approved by the State Senate. Both figures were boosted by the House of Representatives and agreed to by the Senate. The 1973-75 Evergreen operating budget is the same as recommended last week by the House Ways and Means Committee. This amounts to a \$298,815 increase over the total approved earlier by the Senate." Dick provides much further information about pay increases and a significant addition through House action to the cuts made by the Senate in the capital budget proposed by the Governor's Office, but the most favorable news seems to be that the Senate had cut our operating budget by more than \$1.6 million and the House had put almost \$300,000 back. Dick concluded by writing: "A THANK YOU TO LEGISLATORS IS IN ORDER."

When the dust had cleared by late April, the College was still standing. The faculty was still intact. But the administrative staff was depleted. Among those who had left were Executive Vice President Joseph Shoben and the Dean of Library Services Jim Holly. The founding Provost and Academic Vice President Dave Barry had been reassigned to function as our Legislative Liaison Officer. In the table of administrative organization, the three divisions which had been the provinces of the three Vice Presidents were now cut to two, reporting respectively to Business Vice President Dean Clabaugh and the new Provost/Academic Vice President Edward Kormondy. The original planning for orderly and robust growth was

scrapped.

Just as the academic operating budget was driven by student enrollment, so, inversely, the cutting and capping of the allowable operating budget by the Legislature slowed to a trickle our potential for over-all growth in enrollment. When the media reported that we were surviving, but just barely, our in-state applications for admission suffered. Our reputation beyond our local region still remained strong, but the same restrictions which prohibited our advertising for out-of-state students also limited us from officially spreading the word that, despite what they may have heard, "EVERGREEN LIVES."

It is hard to calculate how close the prophecies of doom in March, 1973 came to self-fulfilment. But they certainly did not help. We still had to carry on in a larger community which doubted us. Doubters: "We have heard that Evergreen isn't accredited." Greeners: "But a new college can't be accredited until it has graduated its first class of four-year students, and we're finishing only our second year. We have candidate status and are looking forward to full accreditation two years from now – which actually will be about a year early." Doubters: "Ah-Hah! We knew it! Evergreen isn't accredited!"

The reality that our over-all enrollment could grow by at most only a few hundred students a year also completely disrupted our plans for faculty recruitment. Gone were our assumptions that we could soon begin to recruit younger teachers and "grow our own," with a more reasonable total of compensation and range of ages. Most of the faculty members whom I had helped to recruit in my first two years as an academic dean were close to me in age. Shortly after I retired, they were retiring in clusters.

The plans that I had made to wait for significant faculty recruitment of (1) teachers specializing in foreign-language instruction until we would have estimated the demand for their services, and of (2) teachers specializing in the visual and performing arts until the necessary facilities were coming on-line -- these decisions came back to haunt me. Students went so far as to demand opportunities for work in foreign languages as part of their curricular plans -- to the extent of holding some peaceful demonstrations outside the Deans' Office. By

1977 the facilities for the performing and visual arts had finally come on line. But faculty openings were few and far between.

I'm sure that other faculty and administrative planners from our earliest years could provide evidence of disruption in their own areas of concern. Here is some evidence from what students accurately perceived as comparative weakness in foreign language and the arts. In the twenty-five years between my leaving the Deans' Office to take up my faculty appointment and my complete retirement from teaching, only one colleague whose primary credentials were in the expressive arts -- Bill Winden -- and one colleague whose primary credentials had to do with a foreign language (French) and linguistics (Susan Fiksdal) served as academic deans. It was not that others in these areas did not have the interest or the requisite talent to serve. The teachers of arts and languages, given the thinness of our staffing, simply could not be spared. And even though Bill (late 1970's) and Susan (late 1990's) served as deans, they were not assigned to responsibilities for overseeing and fostering studies in the arts and languages.

We did, by the later 1970's, have clusters of expertise in the Specialty Planning Areas. But unlike the earlier years, when Merv Cadwallader, Don Humphrey (replaced after his heart attack at the end of May, 1972 by biologist Ed Kormondy and then physicist Byron Youtz), and I functioned as a kind of interdivisional administrative team, Evergreen did not have the faculty strength to be able to maintain a balance of divisional expertise in the Deans' Office. As a former administrator, I could periodically send over position papers reminding the current group of deans that faculty recruitment in the arts and in foreign languages should be regarded as unfinished business before new priorities for hiring would be considered. The Specialty Planning Areas could lobby for attention to these deficiencies. But we did not have anything like the leverage which could be exerted by a sequence of deans with desk-assignments in these fields.

Another kind of evidence comes from my experience as a member of faculty teams in coordinated studies programs. Proven ability to work well in such a team was a requisite if a full-time faculty member wished to be considered for a

continuing appointment. One of my colleagues in 1985-86 and another in 1989-90 were "on the bubble," in the sense that they had been working exclusively in group contracts, individual contracts, and modular courses without having a track-record in coordinated studies. Ainara Wilder had wished to work in coordinated studies programs and had participated in the planning of several, only to be re-assigned to teaching dramatic art and directing plays yet again by herself because her services were in such demand by advanced students. Setsuko Tsusumi had come to Evergreen because of her interests in English literature and psychology beyond her expertise in Japanese language, literature, and culture. But she had been assigned to work only in Japanese studies and had to prove herself in a coordinated-studies team or have her appointment terminated. Both of these colleagues served well in the programs in which we worked together and went on to give valuable service in varied assignments thereafter.

In the 1980's, however, we lost the potentially valuable services of two visiting faculty members bringing expertise in music -- David Englert and Stephen Scott. In different academic years they had joined us because they wished to participate in interdisciplinary team teaching. But the demand for instruction in their specialty was such that they had to teach by themselves exclusively in music. Each attempted to join in the faculty seminar of a program in which I was currently serving. But their own instructional duties were such that they had difficulty keeping up with the assigned readings and attending more than a few meetings of the programs. They left.

The March mayhem of 1973 also caused major disruptions in our plans for the construction of facilities. Despite some delay in the funding of his laboratories, Don Humphrey witnessed the opening of his Lab I in the fall of 1973, the Arts Annex to it shortly thereafter, and Lab II in 1976. Pete Steilberg was able to celebrate the dedication of the College Recreation Center, Phase I, in the spring of 1973 (for which Willi Unsoeld talked Governor Dan Evans into rappelling down the Library clock tower). But CRC II, containing the basketball arena, which could also be used for other large gatherings, did not come on line until 1989.

Merv Cadwallader was around to see Seminar I open in 1974. But Seminar II

would not come on line until 2004, and then in a different location and in a quite different design from that envisioned in the original Master Plan for the College. The impressive gateway of Seminar I leads to a sloping lawn. After a great deal of tugging and hauling -- including the re-naming of Drama-Music-Art I as the "Communications Laboratory" (see my Note to a Future Historian of Evergreen titled "Communications Building Planning Process" in the Archives), the ComLab was funded in 1974 and dedicated in 1977. But unlike the eventually completed projects of my colleagues who had served as "clients" in the design process, I shall not see any Phase II. When the growth of Evergreen was stunted in 1973, both the need for a 2,000-seat theater/concert hall and the likelihood of such a project's being funded disappeared. Then the extension of the far (from Red Square) end of the building to provide rear corridors and faculty offices negated the original design by making it difficult or impossible to hook Phase I, with its Set Shop, Costume Shop, and dressing rooms directly to any Phase II. "Life [including March Mayhem] is what happens to us when we are making other plans."

With my memories of the disruption caused by the crisis of 1973, I was taken aback by the judgment of William Henry Stevens III in "The Philosophical and Political Origins of the Evergreen State College," (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, College of Education, University of Washington, 1983, 383 pp.) that "the limitation of enrollment at this time was probably fortuitous for Evergreen" (p. 340). Because Stevens' work is important to our historical awareness and not easily available, I shall quote his narrative and his reasoning in full:

p. 339: "The Evergreen State College opened its academic year 1971-1972 with an enrollment of 1183 students and a total faculty of 45. And in keeping with the legislative expectations predicated at its inception, Evergreen's enrollment as it opened its second academic year, 1972-1973, was 2035 students along with an additional 40 faculty members.

"The financial stringency that faced the 1973 legislature, as a consequence of the continuing economic decline of that period, brought increasing constraint to all of Washington State's institutions of higher education, but especially to Evergreen. The Seattle Times for March 3, 1973 announced the budgets approved

by the Senate Ways and Means Committee. The budgets for all of the state's institutions of higher education were pared, but in the case of Eastern Washington State College and The Evergreen State College, enrollments were cut to existing levels.

"By mid-March the consequences for Evergreen were revealed. The Daily Olympian reported:

The budget proposed, said Dr. McCann, is down 1.6 million from the current funding schedule, under which Evergreen would have to freeze enrollment at 1900 students; would have to cut 58 persons off its staff: 19 from general administration, nine from student services, 15 from Plant operations, six from the library, five from instruction, two additional each from computer services and auxiliary services.

"As these curtailment's worked out both David Barry and Joseph Shoben left their respective vice presidencies, and the administrative staff structure came closely to resemble that conjectured by Joseph Shoben several years before when the consequences of financial retrenchment were first considered. Under this scheme Shoben's administrative functions were placed either under the Vice President and Provost (subsequently Edward J. Kormondy) or under the Vice President for Business, who remained until his recent death.

"Given the high costs in emotional and intellectual adjustment required in the socialization of faculty members from conventional modes to Evergreen's modes, especially the team approach indigenous to the Coordinated Studies mode (referred to tangentially by Jones in his volume, Experiment at Evergreen, and by Shoben and Unsoeld in their interviews) the limitation of enrollment at this time was probably fortuitous for Evergreen, despite its cost in the loss of exceptional executive talent. Time was needed to develop Evergreen's faculty. The early burden of developing faculty with one experienced faculty member relating to two or three newly hired faculty members, within an on-going program, had been extremely difficult. A time of consolidation and thoughtful growth was, in my view, fortunate.

"From that time, the fall of 1972, to the present growth has been generally upward but much slower than the originally expected growth of 1000 additional students each year until a total of 12,000 was reached. In my view the slower rate of growth has been wise and has allowed Evergreen to achieve strength and maturity within its innovative modes."

As you might imagine from what I have written, my first reaction was one of denial. Though I would agree that Joseph Shoben and David Barry represented, each in his own way, "exceptional executive talent," their talents had not been compatible. Those who had come to know them respected their considerable academic achievements and valued their quite different but equally effective personal styles. But the breaking up of their high-level administrative rivalry, forced by the drastic action of the Senate, was, to my mind, one of the few beneficial results to come out of the crisis. Otherwise, I found that Stevens' comments amounted to a well-intentioned concluding move to make palatable lemonade from bitter lemons.

Upon much further reflection, I have been able to think about Stevens' words more calmly and deeply. He was already a mature man with a professional career when he returned to formal education in the opening years of Evergreen. He became so much interested in education as a subject matter that he gained experience as an intern and then entered the University of Washington to earn a doctorate. When he writes about the extreme difficulty of developing the collaboration necessary to form and to run successful faculty teams for coordinated studies, I am inclined to take his views very seriously. He lived in the middle of the process, whereas I, once we-three-deans had organized the teams and set the programs in motion, served mostly as a cheerleader (and sometimes as a referee), hoping that everything would turn out strenuously well. His judgment cannot be set aside lightly.

Another memory also supports that judgment. In the spring of 1989, Matt Smith -- then serving as an academic dean -- and I represented Evergreen at a conference organized and hosted by Kalamazoo College. What brought teams from sixteen institutions together was the theme that some 20-25 years before

(with the exception of the older established orneriness of St. John's, Annapolis) each one had "bet the farm" on some major innovation. Kalamazoo, Colorado College, and Beloit had started with revising their calendars and then moved on to re-thinking how patterns of coursework could or should be changed. Goshen College had moved concentration on international studies into the center of its curriculum. And so on. We spent two days of intensive discussion sharing the reasons for the innovations and the histories of what had and had not worked out -- and why.

Matt and I were well prepared for such discussion. Evergreen was in the midst of preparing for a full-dress, ten-year accreditation review in the fall. Matt had been put in charge of preparing the whole academic report. I was a member of his task force and had just finished studying and analyzing two years' worth of program descriptions to ascertain how we, in the substance of the offerings and the allocation of resources, were fulfilling our avowed commitment to interdisciplinary, team-taught coordinated studies. Though no one took votes about anything, a concluding consensus held that Evergreen had made one of the most radical departures from conventional undergraduate education and was still keeping the faith.

The only other public institution represented was the University of California, Santa Cruz. In some ways at its founding the whole institutional design was even more idealistic and forward-looking than ours. Not only did the curricular plans favor collaborative work, narrative evaluations rather than alphanumeric grades, and some of the other correlative innovations; the planners were taking the emphasis on learning communities to the extreme of building a cluster of small residential colleges, each of which would be committed to its own interdisciplinary theme. (Imagine large coordinated studies programs the members of which would study and live and eat and play together throughout the year.) Unlike the turbulent fiscal history of the early Evergreen, UC Santa Cruz was held up as the apple of the eye, the jewel in the crown, etc., of the California University system. Those in power fostered it, and it was substantially funded on schedule.

The team representing UC Santa Cruz was generally apologetic about the backsliding which had occurred since its opening. Administrators were beginning to favor alpha-numeric grades over narrative evaluations, which appeared to drain too much faculty energy, though some teachers still preferred to write them. Faculty members were paying more allegiance to their departmental homes and courses than to the supposedly unifying themes of the colleges. The collaborative work within the learning communities had shrunk from extensive seminars on shared major texts to perfunctory current-events-type discussions of articles. When the team members were asked for their opinions about why the movement back toward conventional departmental rule and the consequent fragmentation were occurring, the UCSC representatives said: "We grew too fast."

William Henry Stevens III died much too soon, and I came to his dissertation much too late. I wish we could have had a conversation. You will have to make up your minds about the impact of the crisis of March, 1973. I leave you with another item from Quoteland.com, posted by "jeffreyg2003" on 05-22-08 at 03:20 PM: "The art of making your dream a reality is simply remaining committed long enough for reality to catch up to your dream."

-- Charles B. Teske

