

I read your paper last, Byron, having read the other conference papers as they came in during the summer. So, my reading of the paper had the special advantage of being informed by knowledge of certain contingencies which have bedeviled the growth of kindred ventures into alternative higher education.

There are four:

1. The absence of autonomous political authority at the top, i.e. at the level of the boards of trustees. The ultimate failure of the University of California at Santa Cruz to sustain its alternative visions is a dramatic case in point. When the underenrollment crunch of the middle and late seventies spread to Santa Cruz, it was its constituent status as but one of California's many universities, subject to the central managerial authority of that vast system, that contributed largely to its having to survive by returning to traditional policies and practices.
2. Organization by department. This conference will hear of many examples of the virulence of departments in undermining imaginative innovations. Again, Santa Cruz is perhaps the most dramatic example, because the decision to departmentalize that institution was neither blind nor unqualified. The departments there were christened "boards of study", and were meant to generate a creative state of "dynamic tension" with the supposedly equally powerful constituent colleges. In ten years time, the boards of study became traditional departments and devoured the constituent colleges, in all but their residential functions.
3. Careerism. The temptations, especially among administrative leaders of alternative ventures, to advance their individual careers by jumping from venture to venture: often leaving obscured visions, feelings of betrayal and various forms of institutional amnesia in their wake.

The almost comical musical chairs routine which plagued the Rocky Mountain Consortium nicely exemplifies the phenomenon. Closer to home, Evergreen's own 100% turnover in academic leadership in its just seven years would surely have eroded our commitments to innovation more than it did, had our founding president and two of our founding deans not chosen to take up regular faculty positions here, and had you, with your widely acknowledged selflessness, not been willing to take the place of our first two provosts.

4. The inevitable dependence of fledgling alternative ventures on what you call "volunteerism", i.e. on the heroic investments of time, energy and anxiety on the parts of some faculty who somehow find it possible to accept virtue as its own, often exclusive, reward. The inevitable resulting burn-outs have readily led to rationalizations for returning to the easier old ways of teaching traditional courses. There is also the commonly known fact, following your analogy, that parents will make personal sacrifices for babies that they will not make for teenagers.

II

Against that background, drawn from the maturational experiences of a dozen or so of our sisters, I want now to highlight some of the major contributing factors in Evergreen's comparatively healthy childhood:

1. Our Board of Trustees is an autonomous governing body, accountable to no central managerial authority between it and the Governor who appoints it and the Legislature which approves the governor's appointments. Moreover, the particular trustees who saw us through our first year were among the most conservative, republican, successful business persons in the state. They did not always understand what the planning faculty had planned, and did not always approve of what they did understand.

But they did consistently support the plan in response to all forms of off-campus opposition. This or that legislator might call critical attention to this or that program title, or to faculty beards or to student dress (or undress) etc.: but when push came to shove on the several votes to close the college in its early years, the only politically significant eyeballs available for showdown confrontation were those of five white, conservative, republican, successful business persons---and their political clout (and their checkbooks). No more effective protective parenting could have been planned for such an improbable infant as we were; if, in fact, it was planned. In any event, in attempting to explain the health of Evergreen's childhood, the contributions of Herb Hadley, Hal Halvorsen, Al Saunders, Bink Schmidt and Janet Tourtelotte deserve more appreciation than they have received. Some political scientist may wish to assess the irony that may reside in that observation.

2. The planning faculty left no room for second thinking in its absolute eschewal of departments. True, the germ readily mutates, and we now have our specialty areas and specialty area convenors. But, in the five years since their appearance, these still have no stable means of reproduction, very little power and no budgets. Pretty good!
3. As to careerism, the planning faculty set an outrageous example: no tenure, no rank, no merit pay, no seniority perks. Not even the possibility of advancing individual careers within the college by repeating popular programs. Whatever the motives may have been which produced those founding decisions, and however over-reactive some of them may prove to be if programs of coordinated study should cease to constitute our center, they did create an institutional image that was unlikely to attract faculty who wished, even unconsciously, to exploit employment at Evergreen for personal advancement elsewhere.

4. Possibly as a result of numbers 2 and 3 above, our first two massive waves of new faculty (37 the first year and 35 the second) included a very large number of seasoned teachers who foresaw how much unpaid overtime they were signing on for, and who chose to sign on for it. The "volunteer" problem exists at Evergreen, and it will become worse, as you note. But part of Evergreen's comparative success, so far, is probably due to the truism that volunteers make better volunteers when they choose to be volunteers than when they are assigned that privilege.

III

By now, Byron, you must be getting antsy, waiting for me to drop another shoe, as I don't often sound so positive about Evergreen's maturation in your presence. But this is parlor, not kitchen, talk; so I hasten to say here that I agree with your major conclusions. Namely, that in retrospect, and on balance, we saved as much of our planning dreams as we could have saved; we compromised as little as we had to, in order to survive as a tax-supported alternative liberal arts college. Given the peripatetic inter-generational dynamics of the 60's and 70's, and their social, political and economic manifestations.....and, most especially, given our schizophrenic mandate to develop an alternative college which would be a model for the nation and also be a useful college for the citizens of Southwest Washington. Indeed, it may eventually even turn out that we succeeded in meeting this schizophrenic challenge by responding to it schizophrenically i.e. by establishing a national reputation before we even paid attention to the needs of Southwest Washington.

But all of that is for historians to mull over. For the purposes at hand, I want to focus now on Evergreen's future, and what I see to be its most problematic next phase.

I don't foresee any major dangers to our continuing maturation from the four quarters listed above.

1. The authority of the Board of Trustees will continue to be autonomous, and in any future conflicts with the governor or legislature its political strength will be augmented by an increasing number of articulate alumni.
2. Careerism won't pose a danger for the stark reason that a market for advancement outside of Evergreen won't exist, at least not through the eighties.
3. You are probably right that sufficient checks were designed into the specialty areas to prevent them from being perverted into departments.
4. The pinch of our dependence on volunteers will become tighter as our best ones grow older, but there is at least the assurance that our present provost foresees this danger, and is looking for ways to assuage it.

So, I feel sanguine as to the staying power of those felicitous strengths which made for the health of our childhood.

The most problematic development we shall face as a maturing institution is the same as that which inevitably faces a maturing individual in our society after childhood: we are going to have an identity crisis. We already do. We cannot and should not try, to avoid this identity crisis. Rather, we should try to live through it with all possible integrity of self-consciousness. What will this mean? It will mean learning how to conduct and represent the college as it has actually become. Never mind what it might have become, but didn't. Never mind what it might not have become, but did. (A teenaged individual and his parents had best unload similar memorial baggage.)

Also, never mind the oedipal projections of each incoming class of new students into the ink-blot of "the original Evergreen". And never mind some of the lingering regrets of some of the College's founders, who, like me at times, have been disappointed by some of the things the College has become, and by some of the things it has not become.

The question on which all of us--trustees, administration, faculty, staff, students and alumni will be required by our identity crisis to reach a viable consensus is: What kind of an alternative college has Evergreen, in palpable fact, become? (My 13 year old son has not become the boy my imagination projected when he was two, either. But the son for whom my love must find a way for me to continue to father is the teenager that Andy has in fact, become.) I think the answers to what Evergreen has, in fact, become are pointedly there in your paper, Byron. We have become a college which offers two kinds of alternatives to traditional higher education (and, in stating them, I am glad to be able to quote you.) They are: (1) "collaborative, interdisciplinary teaching," and its counterpart, "cooperative rather than competitive learning." And (2) opportunities for students to "take charge of their education." and to "plan their own curricular paths." Those are the two essential components of our identity; in rhetoric, and, in deed. The challenge of living through our identity crisis in health will come in learning to represent the two different offerings differentially in both our public and private relations: and in learning to offer them discriminately, with skill, with candor and with authority. In growing these two identity components two growing pains have emerged which I do not believe are sufficiently articulate in our institutional self-consciousness. The first one is that while we can and do offer both alternatives well, we cannot (and should not try to) offer them simultaneously. This by self-evident definition. The room for confusion here is minimal when a student is pursuing an internship or an individual contract

or a self-paced learning unit. But when a student commits himself to a cooperative learning venture, whether in a program of coordinated study or in some of our group contracts, he must be actively disabused of the expectation that he can also "chart his own curricular path". At present, if a student wishes to join a program of coordinated study he has 100% latitude of choice as to which of the available programs to join. Having chosen a program, however, that latitude of choice is immediately reduced to zero; as such programs have been (or should have been) planned in advance by their faculty teams, down to the finest of details. I no longer offer this as a personal opinion; it is a widely experienced fact. We have not yet learned how to signal that fact of Evergreen life to all of our students; we should make this deficiency a top priority item in our faculty and governance meetings, soon.

The second problem is more serious. It is that the system of values which sustains collaborative teaching and cooperative learning is not only unfamiliar to almost any person schooled in America; it is countervailing to the system of values which is familiar to almost every person schooled in America. The average high school graduate may never have designed an individual learning contract, or done an internship or self-paced learning unit, but the individualistic values and habits of mind which govern those modes of instruction are familiar ones, being, for the most part, private enterprises. In a program of coordinated study, however, not only must the average high school graduate accommodate a novel instructional format; he must also accommodate a set of communal values and habits of mind for which he has been almost totally unprepared by previous school experience. Right now, for example, the most regular threat to the successful conclusion of a well-designed and well-taught program of coordinated study at Evergreen are those increasing numbers of students who transfer out of the program at quarter breaks (often for the worthiest of selfish reasons, as our students go about "charting their own

curricular paths") without even any consciousness of guilt over the broken commitment to the cooperative enterprise which they made to their fellow students. The most galling part of this problem is that few such students transfer out of programs from feelings of dissatisfaction with those programs: most simply think they see a greener Evergreen over some other curricular fence---and are often encouraged to do so by the College's own rhetoric concerning the values of self-determined curricula.

American schools encourage the keeping of commitments to self, to teachers and to subjects--almost never to classmates. Yet the keeping of this latter commitment (at least to the extent of its being a conscious commitment) is essential to the success of a coordinated study program. Without it the cost to the program in morale, in continuity and in colleageality can assume deadly proportions. This problem cannot be solved at the levels of program design or program teaching, because the problem is caused by an undifferentiated college ethos. At present, while individualized and cooperative learning are given equal prominence in our rhetoric, the values of individualism are much more evident in our routine institutional habits. For example, our quarterly Academic Fairs, which often have the effects of encouraging solutions to individual problems while discouraging solutions to cooperative problems.

In respect, Byron, to both of these challenges to our identity development, your choice of the analogy of a maturing individual is apt. In personality theory we even have some refined concepts with which to discuss them. We speak, for example, of the needs for autonomy and for homonomy, i/e. for individual mastery and self determination and for belongingness and participation in ventures that are larger than self. Integration of these two sets of needs is not easily achieved in an individual's adolescent and

early adult years. But achieved the integration must be if the individual is to enter his later years of responsible authority with a vigorous sense of identity. The same must be said of this college, I think.

The first step in the direction of successful integration in such matters is usually successful differentiation. And there, I think, is where we are presently stuck. We haven't yet learned to be sure when and how we are pulling for autonomy and when and how we are pulling for homonomy.

As a beginning to at least starting to raise our institutional consciousness on these issues, I suggest that we give some thought to this question: May our early adulthood be a good time in which to consider the desirability of re-structuring the college into two schools or two divisions or two what-have-you's? A School of Coordinated Study, and/or a School of Specialized Study. With faculty and students and deans distributing their time between the two, from time to time, as they wish. At the very least this would provide a structural reminder as to which of our two identity components a student, a faculty member or a dean is defining his or her efforts by at any given time. With everyone's experience thereby contributing to the integration demanded for the long-range developmental interests of the college. I have no investment in the idea as a solution to our identity crisis--only as a prod to some healthy kitchen talk, after the guests go home.

