

Original mailed special delivery 3/1/78

to: Color Press

P. O. Box 578

College Place WA 99324

Attn: John Wohlers

Daniel J. Evans

Speech to:

Northwest Association of Schools & Colleges

December 6, 1977

With copy to James Bemis

Societal Demands: Positive Educational Response
(Geography, Demography & Winning)

Many people have asked me what the major difference is in going from Governor to President without "Ruffles and Flourishes." I've discovered there are many differences--some pleasant and some not so pleasant, but most are educational. They are educational in the sense that I've discovered once again what it's like to be a private citizen; to be able to do my own thing, to carry my own baggage at the airport, to fly tourist rather than in a state plane, to watch an election for the first time in 20 years with detached interest. I suppose I share some of the same feelings about the change with your speaker of last night, Tom McCall. I've come to the conclusion, however, that the major difference between being Governor and President is 33 yards; that's the difference between sitting on the 50-yard line at the University of Washington football games and the 17-yard line where I now sit. That's not all bad. On the 50-yard line I was almost always seated next to the President or the representative of the visiting institution. That has a hell of an effect on rooting for the home team. Now I can do what I want, not be dignified in the least and cheer the Huskies on to victory.

Now to

~~To move on to my topic I'll begin with~~ "Geography." The geography of the Northwest is going to cause us pain in the future just as it has given us pleasure in the past. It's going to have a lot to do with higher education and education in general in the next 10 years, or perhaps until the 21st century. Lewis and Clark, while they were here 170 years ago oscillated in their description of the Northwest between that dismal swamp and an area of magnificent beauty. I suspect they, like most Northwesterners, varied depending on the intensity and the length of rainfall they had encountered in their trip. A couple of generations later, as America began to expand to the West, settlers one after another found their way across the Oregon Trail through incredible hardships and arrived at their own private Shangri-La some place in this part of the country. As the country became more and more mobile, a story with which we're all familiar began to unfold--the movement of many from rural areas no longer able to support them, to the urban North.

In post-World War II years that wave of population began to recede and left in its wake the scars, and in some cases, the flotsam in our older urban centers of the Northeast. Today that wave is cresting in the sunbelt--all the way from Florida to California--people seeking a new life and better weather--primarily those who are looking for a comfortable place to retire. But that wave, too, may be reaching its crest and a third and different, and to many of us, more troublesome wave is now building.

The Northwest has long been known for its vitality and its life and its young in spirit; an area peculiarly in tune with its own environment and also in tune with tomorrow and its needs and opportunities. Each article in recent magazines touting Washington, Oregon, the Pacific Northwest or the broader area covered by this association, makes most citizens wince. Those citizens who wince most are those who have just arrived, finding their own paradise and wanting to close the door immediately behind them. I think we all feel as a young child who views with horror the thought of someone else finding the cookie jar. To add to these alarming articles will be one big unfortunate one appearing at the end of this week when Time magazine, in its cover story, deals with the Pacific Northwest in almost idyllic terms. It will unquestionably generate more interest and more in the way of immigration from other parts of the nation. We are due to grow and that growth and the fact of geography here in the Northwest, situated almost precisely between the old civilizations of Europe and the new industrialization of Japan and the Far East, make us more likely to be in the center as the remainder of this century unfolds, rather than on the fringes.

I believe very strongly in the cyclical nature of our own domestic history, one of turmoil followed by reaction and progress, but also followed by periods of necessary consolidation which we, too often, mistake for periods of inactivity. Perhaps these eras are well-known to each of you or perhaps you haven't viewed them in this context. Going back through the years of depression, a constant series of events plagued us: after the depression, World War II, an all-too-short interval after the discovery and the fears generated by a new and ultimate weapon, and then Korea. Following that extended period of turmoil, of total involvement of the nation in war, we needed a period of peace and stability, of consolidation. While too many of our political historians tend to look on the Eisenhower years as years of relative inactivity, I think we now recognize them as years of stabilization, of preparing ourselves for another era and another time of progress. That era of Eisenhower even extended into the Camelot years of John Kennedy.

We then began again to deal as a nation with the enthusiasms and the turmoils and the progress, if you will, of the "Great Society," of Vietnam, of an energy crisis which brought us suddenly to the desperate realization that nations, whose names we couldn't even pronounce, could bring America's economy to its knees. Then came Watergate and the incredible peace-time inflation. All these brought us to today, the mid-70's. I am convinced that we are once again facing additional years of consolidation. There's no magic as to why the population looks more conservative; there's no magic as to why the most common phrases used today by citizens in talking to government at all levels, are "Get off our backs," or, if they're being a little more positive, "For Heaven's sake, make government work," or "Make private enterprise work." Again we need a chance to consolidate all of our gains and to absorb the many changes which have affected American society in the last quarter of a century.

That turmoil of the last decade has also lead almost inevitably to the result that Lou Harris finds in polls he takes on a regular basis. For almost 10 years he's been asking people about their level of confidence in a variety of traditional institutions; education, government, the press, medicine--a whole host of those substantial institutions which make up our society. In every single case there is a dramatic drop in people's confidence over the past decade. That

confidence level continues to drop. We may have reached bottom, but there is no precise indication of it yet. Why? Lou Harris has his own ideas and perhaps you have some different ones, but I rather like his and believe they are probably accurate. He says that the levels of expectation of the American people of these institutions have been higher than the institutions could fulfill. It's the missing of the people's level of expectation which leads to that dramatic decrease in confidence. He pointed out in a little side poll he took, that there is at least one group which maintains a very high level of citizen confidence--the garbage collectors of the nation. It's hell representing any other of these major and traditional institutions, to find that it's the garbage collector who has the confidence of our American citizens! Why is this true? As Lou Harris points out, the expectations are that the garbage will be picked regularly, not too noisily, generally without spillage, and those expectations, by and large, are fulfilled. Fulfilled expectations lead to citizen satisfaction. That's a good message for all of us to keep in mind as we pursue our individual responsibilities, whether we are in education, in public life, private, or whatever one or several of those major American institutions we represent: Don't promise what cannot be produced.

If the geography of the Northwest gives us some shudders for tomorrow, but also enormous potential, then also demography is going to effect what we do and how we react. I think we all know the major elements of demographic change, but I wonder how well some of us in decision-making responsibilities really understand the workings of demographics. At least it's not apparent that we have understood in the recent past. How short a time ago we worshipped the cult of the young and we were told that America was consistently growing younger, and it was. We built schools in the 50s and secondary schools following them, and the colleges and universities grew as if there was never going to be a leveling off. Violent crime rose and we were not quite sure why, but we should have been able to predict the rise. Juvenile institutions were expanded. We wrung our hands over the strange behavior of the young. But that's already in the past. The Black Panthers of yesterday have already been replaced by the Gray Panthers of today. America is growing older, not younger. We're all aware of those fundamental statistics, but we still have people in major positions of responsibility who try to tell us things which they are not likely to be able to produce and, again, will lead to unfulfilled expectations. The Presidential candidates of 1976 both talked about their resolution of the unemployment problem and what they were going to do to bring the nation back to full employment. Neither one really recognized, or at least said, that the nation was ~~really~~ doing very well in providing for an unprecedented addition to the labor force each of the past several years.

The combination of that wave of World War II babies entering the labor force, coupled with a rapidly rising number of full-time women applicants has caused some problems which we are not likely to soon absorb. President Carter apparently told the best story, but he's now plagued with unemployment which simply isn't going to go down very easily or very soon. But I would predict, and believe I'll be right, that whomever is elected in 1980 as President of these United States will get the benefit of demographics and almost without doing anything, will see unemployment decline and America once again move to a full-employment economy. And why? All of these elements, all of these past and current problems, caused by the workings of demographics--war gave us the bulge in population after World War I and that bulge caught World War II. An even larger bulge, or wave, as we all know, started after World War II and created the problems and the potential we've faced ever since.

↳ The birth rate explosions of World War I and World War II were followed by equally sharp shrinkages.. World War II babies are now entering the work force in unprecedented numbers but will be followed by sharply declining numbers.

You are familiar with the statistics, but we should have been all along. We seemed to be puzzled when violent crime rates went up markedly. But a pretty fair share of those violent crime rates came from the fact that there were a lot more teen-agers in our society--in numbers and as a total percentage, and violent crime is a particular attribute of the young. (By the time they reach their early twenties they're either too slow or have been caught and no longer are major statistics in that crime rate.) We could predict with almost equal accuracy that tomorrow or within the next few years, violent crime rates are likely to level off or even decline as the number of young citizens declines as a portion of our population.

We've seemed puzzled in the past years as to why public investments grew so rapidly. Taxpayers, with increasing frustration, asked why, when the population goes up only 10%, does spending go up 30, 50, 100, or 150% in public agencies? They didn't understand, and we didn't tell them very well, why. Because, at least at the state level, and I think, to a large degree, in local spending, we don't spend equally on our citizens. We spend an undue amount--a very large percentage of our total investment--on the young, or at least we have. One time I asked our budget officers to separate out the budget of the State of Washington and try to fit it to the various age groups we serve. We found that for every \$1 of state funds spent on people over 21, we were spending \$9 on each citizen under 21 -- 9 to 1 -- in education, in juvenile institutions, in aid to dependent children and in all of the major thrusts of our spending. There's no wonder, then, why there are increases in governmental spending.

Now, turning toward the future, again there are statistics which may be familiar, but they need to be familiar because we must use them as the basis for some very important decisions--both public and private in upcoming years. They've just completed, through our state population division, an estimate of Washington's population change in the course of the next 10 years and I suspect it's similar in other states represented here. From 1975 to 1985 it's expected that the total population will grow by about 20% -- part of it by immigration, part of it natural increase. That may be important, but far more important are the statistics as they relate to each of our age groups within that population. ~~In~~ ~~the~~ 15-19 year-olds, in the face of a 20% over-all population increase, ~~that group~~ will actually decrease by 6%--a radical difference. The 20-24 year-olds up 13%, a slower rate of growth than the total population; ~~in~~ the 25-29 year-olds, up 38%. Some are asking today, particularly in our elementary schools, "Where have all the children gone?" They've grown up and they're in their late 20's or will be shortly. ~~So~~ we should be able to predict, with pretty fair accuracy, what's likely to happen and what our responsibilities will be in the course of the next decade. One thing I am afraid will happen, but I hope ~~it~~ won't, is that our politicians will succeed in closing our urban grade schools just in time for the next bulge in childrens population. To all of those of you who have basic educational responsibility, don't burn your portables. You're likely to need them.

Violent crime is likely to decrease in the course of the next decade. We'll unquestionably see a housing boom if people can figure out how to afford ^{along with} the houses now being built. ~~But~~ New family formation will reach record high, and ~~the~~ ^{the} combination of ~~the~~ new family formation has come in the past 2 years a turnaround ^{the rate} in the birth-rate. The young couples who have delayed having children are now,

six or seven years later, beginning to have them. It is changing the birthrate and when you put that together with the rapidly increasing group in their middle 20s, there's no question that that next wave of youngsters will soon be knocking on the doors of American kindergartens. Leisure activity will be up for the retired. That's another area where population will increase rapidly. Unemployment, particularly unemployment of the youth, is likely to be down and again I'd be willing to predict by the early 1980s, that a typical college graduate may once again be in a position to receive and consider 3, 4, or 5 job offers, instead of none. The important thing in all of this is to tell it like it is to people so that they better understand what is ahead, what to expect, what our problems are likely to be and what our successes may be.

And that brings us to the third of our 3-part title: winning. Winning is almost everything--a measurement of success (if you don't believe me ask the Washington Huskies or the Portland Trailblazers what winning is like.) But education, too, is increasingly being challenged to prove its merit. We may very well be winning in what we're doing but we are being called on now to prove it with some kind of win-loss record. Increasingly legislatures throughout the nation, and even Congress, are seeking to measure educational success by test-scores, by writing literacy, by a variety of other practical and sometimes totally impractical or irrational measurements of educational success. We've got to realize that for each educator and for each hour of formal education there is a large shadow behind ~~it~~ the shadow of television which impacts our children for as many hours as we impact them in education--television which is a wide dose of uncontrolled and undirected education. Today I, unfortunately, believe that we are neither mature on the sending side of television nor on the receiving side of it, but immature though ~~we~~ ^{it} may be, it's a powerful tool which will affect what we do in education. We are increasingly being asked by parents, by legislators and others to show that graduates from our educational systems will be able to cope with life and not just a job they may seek. Increasingly we are being asked to have teachers teach, to be in direct contact with students, to avoid frivolous research which may be an excuse to avoid teaching--to reprioritize, in other words, our educational dollar to prove that results can be achieved. That is a real challenge to everyone in education because legislators and congressmen, public executives of today simply are not convinced, for the most part, that they are getting all they should out of their public education dollar. ^{both} The tragedy of it all is that, as usual, we Americans tend to overemphasize things-- ~~either~~ the problems ~~or~~ the successes. I'm convinced that American education today, by and large, is substantially better than most citizens believe or realize.

How does education then respond to these societal demands, or at least these societal measurements of the future? How do we respond to the workings of demographics and, particularly in this part of the nation, how do we respond to geography? How do we respond to the massive number of citizens in their late 20s and a growing number who are retired, a number who have settled in one location and who are unlikely to be able to pull up stakes and to ~~visit~~ ^{visit} a college or university residential campus? It is time for us to move out and ~~bring~~ ^{bring} our educational opportunities from the campuses to where the students are likely to be.

Let's serve those who have been left behind in their educational efforts, those who were married young, or who took jobs and who had a partial or incomplete college or university education and who now find they would like to complete that education, in order to better compete in the world in which they live. Let's serve those who just want the privilege of a college degree. It's past time for us to figure out

how we can best move some of what we do off the campuses into the communities and do it seriously and well and in a comprehensive fashion to give serious students a chance to complete what they long ago began.

It's time, too, to take a different look at the divisions we have tended to make between vocational and academic education. We split them for counting purposes and we split them for funding purposes and we tend to put a vocational/technical school over here and an apprenticeship program there, and even in a community college we tend to split vocational and academic credit. I think it's time for us to erase some of what may very well be artificial barriers. We have thought too often in the past that a craftsman comes from being an apprentice and it may equal two years at a community college, but that's where education stops. But it need not stop there. A growing number of institutions with what are termed by varying titles -- "upside down degrees", etc. have found ways to bring together the interest of those in vocational and technical subjects with an opportunity to broaden that interest afterward into a more academic and liberal arts program and couple the two together in a 4-year college degree. It's time for us to reach out, even more than we have in the past, to educate through real experience--through internships, through on-the-job teaching, but making very sure that we keep with that a very clear line of academic responsibility. If we can institute one single element into the students of today, it ought to be the importance of the continuity of education; that education is not a short-term experience which terminates with the last degree you achieve, but that education is a life-time experience, and In formal education, if we teach that and nothing more, we have perhaps done the best we can for the citizens of tomorrow. We ought to fiercely uphold the place of broad, liberal arts education as an integral part of our educational curriculum.

And bowing to the television mood of today, no program, except on public television, could succeed without a commercial. (I might just say that ^{my} short experience in education as President of The Evergreen State College, ^{I've learned that} and ~~what~~ the innovative enthusiasms I find on that campus ^{is} suggest that they can and have responded or are responding to these new educational demands--off campus, in the communities, through the real life experience, and in projecting the importance of a life-time continuity in education.)

Let me turn to three "straws in the wind," indications that people are at least giving real consideration to change and to the future. One of them disturbs me greatly. (I speak as a trained engineer) ~~and~~ I read a recent article on a debate between those who are guiding our Naval Reserve Officer Training Program (the academic portion), ^{The debate centered on} ~~and~~ their decision to change the split of students from a 60% science oriented/40% liberal arts oriented to 80/20 science vs. liberal arts, on the basis that today's Navy was technologically oriented and it needed trained scientists in order to manage these ^{is} important and complex ships, ~~they have~~. I think they are going precisely in the wrong direction. It's good to have on board those who are the technicians, and who understand and can operate and deal with the sophisticated technology. But in a world where someone pressing the wrong button can destroy civilization, the breadth of education and understanding and wisdom is so very much more important than just a narrow technological know-how. I like the ^{I see} encouragement/in what others are doing. My wife serves on the Board of Overseers at Whitman College and I see a real review being carried out there of underclass education; how it can be more interrelated, more interdisciplinary in nature; how it can relate more to the outside community. I also see recent articles on Harvard, distressed by the fact that their students are attending one of the world's fine universities, with an almost unmatched faculty who are in fewer and fewer hours contact with their students. They are dealing directly with that problem of how to make sure that those students who go to a fine university can get an opportunity to

work with and to learn from the great teachers who reside there. Now even if we understand all of these elements; the needs of tomorrow, how education itself might change; the demographics and geography of this area, this association, particularly, has ^{the} ~~a~~ ^{very important} responsibility, ~~a very important responsibility to~~ ⁱⁿ recognize all of these elements and to put ⁱⁿ them in the forefront as you deal with the problems of accreditation, ^{you must} ~~in~~ recognizing the need for broadening off-campus education, ^{and} ~~you must~~ insure that that off-campus education is done with a high degree of academic excellence-- to separate out those who, frankly, are out to make a "fast buck" in what they perceive to be a new educational opportunity from those who are seriously trying to reach out and meet the new needs of tomorrow. It's important, as an accrediting institution, to deal with the new combinations of degree opportunities in higher education. It's important in accreditation to realize the validity of internships and of life-experiences as integral to college credit and to recognize those institutions who reach in those directions. Never has it been more important for accrediting institutions and accrediting teams to be at the forefront of education, to understand, not just what's here today, but what's coming tomorrow and be prepared to deal accurately with those institutions who reach for tomorrow. I think we are on the eve of a decade of absolutely enormous promise. Too many of today's citizens are distressed, worried, fearful over tomorrow, fearful that we will run out of irreplaceable resources, that population growth will overwhelm us, that we will be unable to feed the world, or even ourselves. But those doomsayers, I believe, are wrong. I see, instead, some real signs of a world, gradually and in a stumbling fashion, coming closer together, recognizing with each passing year, the unthinkable alternatives to world peace, or at least to better world understanding. I see a decade of potential economic stability, with a work force leveling off, with an America which has always been able to cope with change and new direction, absorbing that work force and turning it in to a remarkably powerful force for ourselves and for others. I see us moving into, clearly, a post-industrial society. In the past we have discovered how to reduce the number of people in our country required to feed

ourselves, from 75 to 80% of our work force, down to less than 5%. We have subsequently figured out how to provide all of the industrial goods for ourselves with a steadily decreasing percentage of our work force, and we are now clearly into a post-industrial society where the increasing job opportunities are in service to ourselves and to others, and there are plenty of those opportunities still ahead of us. Most of all I look for a decade in which there is once again, a renewed awareness, a renewed confidence in education as indispensable for us to achieve these other successes for our society.

that we have been able to do in the past is a reminder

for others to see us moving into a new era

and to see us moving into a new era