"HARNASSING TRADITION TO SERVE INNOVATION: A CASE STUDY"

by

Gaylon L. Caldwell and Margaret S. Payne

I

The occasion was a community celebration marking his tenth anniversary as President of the College of the Pacific and the date was February 25, 1957, when Robert L. Burns sent ripples throughout the faculty by publicly dropping the hint of things to come. He simply said: "Pacific may have to spawn a new college or colleges if private church-related higher education is to keep pace with dynamic Northern California."[1] The ripples rapidly became waves.

The faculty was concerned for several important reasons: College of the Pacific, "the first chartered institution of higher learning in California," had lived a precarious, tuition-dependent existence since its founding; it was poorly endowed and faculty salaries were still far below those of equivalent institutions; the library and laboratories were inadequate. The faculty quite naturally were concerned about stretching limited resources even more tightly through the addition of new colleges. The faculty, too, had become restive because of the deliberate practice of having been excluded from policy decisions regarding matters ordinarily considered to be of primary faculty concern. In the words of Warren Bryan Martin, the late President, Dr. Tully Cleon Knowles, had for 27 years "controlled every facet of the institution's life while claiming to be uninterested in educational philosophy."[2] He had allowed departmental identities to develop but wanted no faculty involvement in policy formation. His successor, President Burns, had operated on the same principles, although more deftly. These administrative styles had culminated in a faculty resolution a year before the announcement of potential new colleges regarding

the role of the Curriculum and Instruction Committee. The faculty resolution apparently had been ignored.

For his part, President Burns had some compelling reasons to experiment with the very old and very traditional institution: The University Senate of the Methodist Church (to which the College fo the Pacific was then associated) had authorized a Survey Committee to study C.O.P. It's exhaustive Report of 1956 had recommended that this Northern California educational affiliate of the church raise its admission and graduation requirements and take steps to strengthen its intellectual atmosphere. Burns was later to re-affirm frequently that he created the cluster colleges "to shake up C.O.P." He believed that he had to nudge it into new paths. Even though the post World War II "baby boom" was on the way, still, as responsible officer of a private school which relied on tuition fees for survival, Burns was extremely concerned with the giant strides of the California higher education system which was marked by a fantastic proliferation of community colleges, an expanding University system, and a rapidly-growing complex of state colleges. He confided to the Board of Regents the following year (December, 1958) that the College of the Pacific could expect an increasing reduction in the percentage of students attracted as the well-financed state educational system spread.[3] Burns clearly recognized that C.O.P. was at a competitive disadvantage in California because it simply could not compete in areas of finances, faculties and enrollment. It had to become unique. On the other hand, the small Methodist college located in the rich Central Valley, had experienced considerable growth during the decade (up 74% from 1951 to 1,655 students in 1959) but inflation resulted in increased costs which had more than kept pace with enrollment. The possibility of attracting wealthy donors--who could have an entire college bear their names--also figured prominently in his scheme.[4]

President Burns moved on many fronts to change the image of a small Methodist college in order to prepare it for what he conceived was its battle for survival. The College of the Pacific was converted into the University of the Pacific in 1959, thus giving the name to what in fact existed since, besides the liberal arts college which gave the institution its former name, U.O.P. counted Schools of Education, Engineering and Pharmacy as well as a Conservatory of Music and a Graduate School. The affiliation with the Methodist Church was to be further weakened within the decade.

The announcement of the decision to create a small liberal arts college based on the Oxford-Cambridge model was made to the faculty on April 30, 1959. Faculty questions focused on the fact that funds which would go to the new college could be better used--for the improvement and expansion of what already existed. Some few anticipated competition between the old and the new liberal arts colleges on the same campus. The cluster college concept was in the air, however, and Burns determined to be the first to apply it. He and Academic Vice President Samuel Meyer were off to England in September for a close look at Oxford and Cambridge. They returned convinced in the soundness of cluster colleges and even learned that the most viable unit for enrollment would be 250 students.

The faculty were told that the cluster college would be limited to undergraduate studies with no specialties nor vocationalism. It was to have a limited selection of course offerings. Admission was to be highly selective and graduation would be based on "personal competence" as determined by "rigorous examinations." The University would "grow larger by growing smaller," the President said and the cluster college would upgrade the entire institution. The faculty gave a unanimous vote in favor of his cluster college on October 13, 1959. And, the newly created Raymond College was innovative: It had a

"3-3-3" system (three courses per term, three terms each academic year, and three years of study to earn the degree.) It's residential arrangements, with faculty and students sharing common residence and dining halls, were designed to keep students in a continuous climate of learning. Its curriculum was limited. It consisted of 23 courses, each oriented toward seminars, tutorials and independent study and all of which were required.

Gaff (p 135) reports that the College of the Pacific faculty (the earlier institutional name had been retained for the well-known liberal arts college) started out curious, sympathetic and even overtly proud. But envy came, he added, because of the small classes, the newer facilities, the brighter students, the special program, and because Raymond College attracted wide attention. "Finally," he wrote, "fear and envy found a common denominator in hostility."[5] C.O.P. faculty who remember those days, add that the "superiority complex" of the Raymond faculty and students added insult to envy. (Nor were they convinced that Raymond students were any brighter--"more articulate, perhaps, but no brighter.") Gaff pronounced that C.O.P. was too defensive to reform itself, but after his book The Cluster College was published significant changes were made by the College of the Pacific faculty and continue to be made.

President Burns successfully realized his goal of "shaking up" the conservative nucleus.

The faculty was right, too: Cluster colleges proved to be very expensive and did re-allocate already limited resources to the disadvantage of the present institution.

The second of what the faculty were told might total 15 cluster colleges, was announced at the 110th Founders Day Convocation which was held on January 6, 1961. The newest, Academic Vice President Meyer said, would feature an

Inter-American Studies program and be named for Elbert Covell, a regent and wealthy vintner from nearby Lodi.

The idea of a Spanish-speaking, Inter-American Studies college is widely believed to have been born the summer before when Burns and Meyer lunched with United States Ambassador Robert F. Woodward in Montevideo, Uruguay. As a matter of fact, U.O.P. faculty were informed about the possibility as early as 1959. In 1960 the President and Academic Vice President organized a six-week tour of Latin America which included the meeting with Ambassador Woodward. The idea was becoming popular that Latin America had been too long ignored by the United States and this Zeitgeist was about to receive form in President Kennedy's promise of an "Alliance for Progress" in the western hemisphere and President Burn's new cluster college. According to the two U.O.P. travelers, the "literally hundreds of people" with whom they talked isolated two primary problems for young Latin Americans studying in the United States: (1) Cultural shock, and (2) language. The new institution would address itself to both. Since the college was to be Inter-American, it also had to serve a recognized need for the American student component. The two administrators were well aware that American colleges and universities taught the Spanish language and literature but did not provide a background focused on Latin American economics, geography, history, business, and such other academic fields. These were to form the bulk of the curriculum to be taught in the Spanish language at Elbert Covell College. Thus, ethos, curriculum and the language of instruction would make possible real understanding among all partners in the Alliance.

At the unveiling to the faculty of the idea of the new college, Dr. Meyer explained that there were many reasons for the University of the Pacific to undertake the establishment of an institution based upon Inter-American Area Studies: California's close historical ties with Mexico; that a high pro-

portion of the population in the State is Spanish-speaking; that the Methodist Church had long been involved in an extensive missionary and educational effort in Central and South America; that the University was already committed to studies and held extensive library materials on Western Americana; that a new language laboratory had been established; and that a surprisingly large number of the faculty were already interested in the area, knew Spanish, and had close personal ties within Latin America.

He then outlined a 12-point program which had been set out by the Board of Regents for the development of the new cluster college:

1. To coordinate and expand our courses offerings into a well-planned and balanced curriculum in the field of Inter-American Studies.

2. To utilize faculty resources then available and, from time to time, procure additional faculty members in this field.

3. To strengthen library facilities as essential support for such a program.

4. To increase the use of persons from Latin America as speakers and visitors to the campus.

5. To develop a scholarship program that will make it possible for students from Latin American countries to continue their studies at the University.

6. To provide "experience opportunities" for the staff members of binational centers on the campus of the University of the Pacific.

7. To develop an "Exchange Professorship Program" that will make possible the bringing of professors from Latin American institutions to our faculty and to provide the opportunity for our

faculty members to teach in Latin America.

8. To encourage and conduct tours to Central and South America as part of the tour program of the University.

9. To investigate the possibility of establishing a "Language House" program in Spanish during the summer sessions.

10. As a result of the economic, potential, political significance and dynamic development of Brazil, to move as rapidly as seems appropriate to expand our foreign language offerings to include Portuguese.

11. To cooperate with Santiago College in Chile and Ward College in Buenos Aires (Methodist institutions) in expanding their programs through the development of a program of study at the North American college level and both institutions.

12. To designate the second of the Oxford-type cluster colleges being created at the University of the Pacific as a liberal arts college in which all instruction will be in the Spanish language, an academic innovation of major significance. This new institution, to be called Elbert Covell College, is now being constructed and will open its doors to the first freshman class in the fall of 1963.

"In this way," Dr. Meyer wrote in a progress report, "The Univ ersity has greatly widened the rage of its educational services and is making an investment in the future of Western civilization."

The Dean of Admissions was off during the Spring of 1963 to spread the word of the Spanish-speaking college and returned to report that the Latin Americans wanted practical subject matter. Potential students were interested in mastering American scientific and technological advances and preferred majors in Engineering, Science and Business Administration. He also observed

that Latin American students would require an extremely generous infusion of financial aid; so the University substantially augmented the number of scholarships available to them. In September, 1962, President López Mateos of Mexico donated over 3,000 volumnes written by Mexicans to the library. A year later and a month before the scheduled opening of the new college the Argentine Ministry of Education and Justice sent a shipment of 224 books and 64 engravings. The Pan American Society of San Francisco presented flags of the twenty-one American republics and Spain to President Burns. The doors of Elbert Covell College opened to its first freshman class on September 4, 1963.

It was at still another Founder's Day convocation that the third cluster college was announced. Callison College was to have a curriculum of Asian studies and include a mandatory year abroad. It opened in the fall of 1966. This third proved to be the last cluster college to receive the breath of life. Only one survives today. That one, Elbert Covell Collete, is the focus of this paper although backward glances will help explain what happened, and why, to its two sisters.

II

In structure, curriculum and ethos, Elbert Covell College was a composite of the College of the Pacific, Raymond College, and a Latin American university. As in C.O.P. the new cluster college taught traditional subject matter by the traditional lecture method; it utilized the unit of credit system, relied upon letters grades, and definitely was in loco parentis. Like Raymond College, Covell kept its classes small, required its students to live in designated residence halls (it's faculty did not live on campus but mature students were selected as Head Residents in dormitories.) It also had a two person administrative team: A Director (later called "Provost," and then "Dean") and a "Preceptor" or "Dean of Student Life" who later became known as "Academic

Counsellor." Greek social organizations were off limits and almost all socializing was "in house" at both Raymond and Covell colleges. Attendance was expected at weekly dress dinners. Covell resembled a Latin American university in the amount of attention students paid to campus politics, in the types of sports and social events which were popular, and, after the initial year, in the bulk of its faculty, made up of Latin American professors.

Academic Vice President Meyer had named four U.O.P. professors whose "training and experience give them competence in Latin American Studies" but only one of these, Dr. Arthur J. Cullen, the Director, remained with Covell College after the first year. It was difficult to obtain qualified university-level teachers who knew Spanish sufficiently well to spend their entire working days (and a good deal of their social evenings) speaking it. This problem helps to explain the kaleidoscopic faculty situation in the early years. At first, Covell College relied on a faculty largely made up to Latin Americans and this proved to be a most unstable compound. Differences in culture naturally resulted in differences in expectations: Some of the Latin professors resented the constraints put on them by a small Methodist institution; not a few objected to the frequent faculty meetings; constant contact with students, a hallmark of the cluster college, was unknown in Latin American universities; some few who were discipline-oriented came to believe that the College was not really interested in rigorous academic discipline since faculty appointments and budget allocations did not point in that direction. As the early years passed, so did the Latin American teaching staff. Cullen had difficulty in replacing them with Americans but continued to insist that all faculty members have had extensive living experience in Latin America. The predictable result was the hiring of many professors more for their ability to speak Spanish than for those attributes ordinarily sought for in college faculty members. This

situation was not lost on campus critics. Because Covell was organized on traditional academic disciplinary lines, C.O.P. department members wanted imput in the selection of Covell faculty but were denied it. Combined with this perceived affront the fact that many of those brought in did not have the terminal degree and were not encouraged to build either professional or social relationships with peer groups, doubts persisted and grew regarding the academic level of instruction at Elbert Covell College.

Quite naturally, curriculum changed to reflect changes in faculty.

Dr. Meyer had supposed that Latin American students would be encouraged to take part of their general program in the English-speaking divisions of the University once language proficiency permitted, but this was not to occur to any important extent. As far as the native Spanish speakers were concerned, the English language training was not sufficiently intensive to provide the fluency necessary for them to compete successfully against native English speakers in the early semesters. Covell College officially pronounced that it could teach everything necessary with its own personnel resources, yet the "departments" were sometimes only one-professor deep in the academic fields offered. The scientific and technological areas desired by the Latin American students were simply not available in Spanish at the fledgling institution, yet transferring to another division within the University of the Pacific jeopardized the much-needed scholarships. Neither did North American students wander far from their cluster college: Mixing outside the College was not encouraged and it was the rare student who defied the centripetal forces. Competing in Spanish required a good deal of time. Besides, they had come to the University of the Pacific to be totally immersed in the Spanish language and the Latin American culture and that is precisely what occurred. As a result, most American "covelianos" realized the goal of bilinguality, whereas

fewer Latin Americans did. As a concommitant, there was little "brain drain" since the Latinos tended to return home upon graduation.

The University of the Pacific instituted a Master's degree program in Inter-American Studies. The primary reasons why the graduate program was housed in C.O.P. rather than Covell turned on the widespread concern about the lack of academic rigor in Covell's undergraduate program and the precedent of Raymond being dedicated entirely to undergraduate studies.

Enrollment was a persistent concern. Latin Americans who could afford to pay their own costs ordinarily had attended secondary schools where they had studied some English and so did not consider themselves to need a Spanish-speaking college in the United States. Those with real financial need tended to misjudge the extent of that need and accepted scholarships which appeared to be princely sums in their countries but which proved to be insufficient in California. A number of these left Elbert Covell College without a diploma after having created all graduation requirements because of the large amounts still owing to the University. Even so, both student enrollment and the number of faculty members showed an upward trend during the formative decade.

The University of the Pacific rode out the vicissitudes of the turbulent decade of the "sixties" in relative calm due, no doubt, to its small size, the type of students it attracted, and the essential absence of federal government grants. There was not even an ROTC program to attack. Elbert Covell College was even more calm. Most of the Latin Americans, who from the beginning had set the tone of the cluster college, were much more interested in the politics of their home countries (which furnished sufficient raw materials to keep them occupied) and were much more intrigued with campus politics than they were with Vietnam and Cambodia. They had been told upon receiving their visas to refrain from involvement in host government politics and many of those of University

scholarships assumed, rightly or wrongly, that a false step might result in the financial aid being withdrawn. While a few among the faculty sought to increase student "awareness" about the issued of the 1960's they plowed sterile fields.

The early informational materials of the second cluster college listed as a first objective "To train men and women as Inter-American specialists*" and the footnote defined this as: "an individual who is prepared specifically in: One of the critical educational and technical needs of the Americas (the Sciences, Mathematics, Education, Economics, Business Administration, Home Economics, etc.); Latin American Area Studies; North American Area Studies; Spanish language skills; English language skills; and General Education requirements." However, by the 1964-1965 academic year the Sciences were limited essentially to introductory courses in Biology, Chemistry and Physics; the three Mathematics courses included Plane Trigonometry and College Algebra; and a few more courses were offered in Business Administration, Economics, Political Science, History and professional Education. Even so, academic majors were plentiful and many included courses taught in English at C.O.P. Thus, at the outset the tradition was established that Covell students could obtain any academic major in the University although the Covell faculty reserved the right to determine which of the C.O.P. disciplinary requirements would be applied to "Covell College majors" and advised all Covell students declared for those majors. This resulted in an increase of tension between the parent school and the cluster college because the C.O.P. professors, strongly oriented to their departments, considered that neither the Covell requirements for the major not academic advising was informed by disciplinary expertise.

A long-standing source of irritation had been the disinclination of the Covell administration to consult on appointments to the faculty. Raymond College was admittedly and flagrantly dedicated to interdisciplinary studies

a close and the halcyon days of expansion in enrollments and budgets--and with them the educational experiments and innovations--were coming to an end. A number of American educational institutions were shaken to the core by the aftershocks. The University of the Pacific and its cluster colleges were not spared.

The year 1970 began with the unexpected death of Elbert Covell College's Provost and ended with the death of the University of the Pacific's President. The two men who replaced them "knew not Joseph." The new President, Stanley McCaffrey, was not a product of C.O.P. nor of another private institution of higher learning and did not share the "pioneer or perish" attitude of his predecessor. The new Provost, Gaylon Caldwell, came out of a diplomatic background and much preferred consensus to confrontation.

During the interval between the death of Dr. Cullen and the arrival of Dr. Caldwell the Elbert Covell faculty took steps to assure itself a role in college decision-making by drafting a "constitution" which provided for faculty meetings not chaired by the Provost and establishing the right of a small group of senior faculty members to be advised before "personnel decisions" were made. These changes were perfectly acceptable to the new Provost who created his own revolution by striking down the vestiges of in loco parentis. Covell students were now permitted to live anywhere on campus--including Greek letter houses--or to live off campus under the same terms available to all other university students. (By this time Raymond had completely changed its original curriculum and ethos. Its faculty and students had long since fled common residence halls.) Caldwell did not attempt to revive the atrophied weekly dress dinners (primarily for budgetary reasons) and urged the students to take courses outside the College as better to mix with other students. He made it plain that Latin American scholarships were not dependent upon following any particular social or political line and pushed for more intensive instruction

and the names of its courses were as unusual, to one wedded to the academic departmental concept, as were the course descriptions of the wide-ranging forays into the intellectual world promised in Raymond's seminars and tutorials. But Covell used traditional course titles, familiar course descriptions, and the lecture method. Its faculty were hired for specific academic fields, so it seemed appropriate to the established departments that their imput be invited. However, the second cluster college, basking in the favor of President Burns and holding a blank check valid for five years on academic innovations, had n-intention of seeking outside help. The situation became the more exacerbated whenever the cluster college ventured into the curricular area of a professional school. For example, the School of Education had been long-established and enjoyed an excellent reputation. Yet Covell College had its own Education major, determined its own requirements, made arrangements privately for "professional practice" and even obtained certification for its graduates through the "back door" of proficiency examinations.

One can discern on the University of the Pacific campus during the 1960's a microcosm of the American society during that agitated decade albeit restricted pretty much to educational change. There was the same irreverance toward established institutions; the same impatience with the old ways of doing things; the same cocksure assumption that youth must be served; and the familiar penchant for ignoring costs. But as Norman Birmbaum is credited as enunciating: "Hell hath no fury like a vested interest scorned"[6] and traditionalists within the University, like their counterparts throughout the country, waited for the pendulum to swing.

III

The year 1970 began a new decade and marked, too, the beginning of significant changes in higher education in America. The Vietnam War was coming to

in the English language.

He quickly moved to effect a rapprochement with campus administrators and faculty members outside the College. In particular, he wooed the disgruntled Dean of the School of Education and, when a vacancy occurred, not only invited imput from that school but suggested joint appointment of the new faculty member. He successfully obtained the abandonment of the Covell curriculum in professional Education and arranged for Covell students to move into the regular School of Education trajectory, where they received the same professional training, teaching experiences, and the official teaching credentials. Only two of the courses required for certification by the State remained in Covell to be taught in the Spanish language but, for the first time, they were accepted at face value by the professional school. As opportunities came to fill vacancies he made certain that outside faculty members were consulted and many served on search committees. He invited departmental chairmen to name members for evaluations committees of Covell College faculty. He tried, without much success, to encourage his faculty to improve their relationships with campus peers. Caldwell also utilized visitors to the campus from Spanish speaking countries as a way to extend contacts with appropriate professors outside Covell College.

The most important, yet the most difficult, problem to address was that of faculty quality. Approximately half of the faculty were approaching the tenure decision at about the same time. Although some among them were superb teachers, others were not and the Provost, who had by now come to know his colleagues and, particularly, to understand the unusual closeness the cluster college ethos had created among them, was convinced that no evaluation committee dominated by Elbert Covell faculty members would come up with a negative recommendation on any of their colleagues being evaluated for tenure. There-

fore, he secured the solid support of the new advisory group made up of senior (and tenured) professors to make the terminal degree a requisite for tenure. He then hand-carried terminal letters to seven faculty members the same day. While this decision probably saved Elbert Covell College from being the first cluster college casualty, it had an unanticipated price: Increasing concern about the heavy clouds on the financial horizon led to the beginnings of budgetary retrenchment and the Provost was not permitted to replace all of those who were being let go. Colleges at the University of the Pacific use line item, rather than program, budgeting and Caldwell proved to be no match for the Vice Presidents who determined his budget. The logic seemed implacable: The unusually rich faculty-student ratio could no longer be tolerated (when faculty members had not been tenured in) and Covell College was defenseless without the quick tongue and the unyielding dedication of the founding Provost.

The University of the Pacific has adjusted to two Academic Vice Presidents since the 1970's began and the trend has been steadily away from pluralism and increasingly toward centralization. Control of residence halls slipped away from the cluster colleges, the Latin American scholarship fund was savagely cut (from $125,000 in 1970 to $54,740 in 1980.) The unfilled faculty positions were straws in the wind.

IV

All institutions change but the process occurs more easily, more frequently, and with wider fluctuations in small ones. This is clearly the case with educational institutions where the departmental structure encourages conservatism; where a large number of faculty members discourages abrupt or extreme shifts; and where traditions, once established, resist serious modifications. Then, too, the chief administrative officer can have a great deal more impact in small units than in large ones and the very nature of the ethos of a cluster

college both stimulates student imput and makes it more effective. The experience of the four liberal arts colleges at the University of the Pacific during the 1970's highlights those aspects which speed change as well as those which dampen it.

Because Elbert Covell College had copied the super structure and curriculum of the parent institution (although teaching in the Spanish language) and quickly established its own traditions, the changes which took place within it were largely outside both structure and curriculum. They focused, instead, on academic quality and so appeared evolutionary. The changes at its two sister cluster colleges were much more radical and were effected in both structure and curriculum. One suspects that these apparently more radical changes provide explanations why Raymond and Callison Colleges did not survive the decade.

Raymond College, like Covell, had only two Provosts. The first was the charismatic founder who had given the college its structure and defined its goals. When he left he was replaced by a person who appeared to be an attractive fund raiser. The innovative three year curriculum was expanded, by presidential fiat, to the traditional four years. Moreover, some of the faculty, in concert with the new Provost (who was alarmed by a decrease in enrollment) tilted the highly structured and rigorous academic program into a process which soon resulted in the scrapping of all required courses and in the substituting of individual contracts by students with faculty members. "High Table" disappeared, faculty and students abandoned common residence halls, and of the original innovations only the interdisciplinary courses and term letters were retained. The destruction of the original structure made subsequent modifications easy and, rightly or wrongly, Raymond College was perceived by those on the outside as lacking clearly definable academic goals. Although it continued to attract bright and articulate students the steady erosion in numbers contin-

ued and Raymond enrollment declined from 190.5 FTE in academic year 1971-1972 to 110.0 FTE six years later.

Callison College, during its briefer existence, was under the leadership of six different Provosts. Such frequent changes in leadership mitigated against cohesiveness in structure and curriculum. The Callison program had been viewed askance from the outset since, although it had been presented originally to the faculty as a cluster college fro Asian Studies, the administration had selected the Headmaster of a Methodist secondary school in South America to be the first Provost. Although this person had undeniable talents, he had no experience in the Far East. A core of comparative studies was developed but the academic rationale never appeared quite clear to observers from the outside and distrust grew regarding the scholastic integrity of the third cluster college. Campus critics were of the opinion that Callison selected its faculty on the basis of personality rather than to implement an intelligible academic plan. The requirement of a confrontation with a non-Western culture as the basis of the second year of a university program was trendy, but doubts existed that an American college sophomore is prepared to spend an entire calendar year in a culture so utterly different as India.[7] Nevertheless, as the last Provost wrote in her Summary Report prepared for the Accreditation team visit in 1976, the students had significantly shifted goals and changed life-style and so valued "experiential learning" less. She observed that the year in Asia was regarded by many potential students as an "exotic extra." Enrollment had dropped off rapidly, declining from an FTE of 239.4 in academic year 1971-1972 to a mere 120.1 six years later.

The "Cluster College Enrollment Trend Data" information booklet which was distributed in 1976 to the Special Committee to Consider the Cluster Colleges (hereinafter referred to as Task Force I) documented that over the same period

(academic years 1971-1972 to 1976-1977) the FTE at Elbert Covell College improved somewhat, from 178.6 to 194.0. This fact undoubtedly played a major role in the decisions which Task Force I was to make. Also, the student/faculty ratio in Covell College, which had been the lowest when the reporting period began (8.18 compared to 9.29 for Raymond and 9.08 for Callison) was the highest when the period ended (14.48 compared to 10.48 for Raymond and 6.53 for Callison.) All three cluster colleges had indicated significant erosion in the number of full-time equivalent faculty members over this same period. Raymond College slipped from 20.5 to 10.5; Covell College from 20.25 to 13.4; and Callison College from 20.5 to 13.7. Since it was part of Covell's structure to have its students (particularly the Latin Americans) move into classes in C.O.P. whereas Raymond and Callison students tended to matriculate for a much higher percen tage of classes in their own colleges, the reduction in faculty FTE did not have the same results, and was not felt so keenly in Covell as in the other two cluster colleges.

Task Force I was appointed by the President in 1976, charged to analyze the academic as well as the enrollment/fiscal problems of the cluster colleges and to recommend courses of action by which to solve those problems. The basic premise was that the limited resources of the University precluded supporting a wide variety of academic programs ("however desirable") unless such programs could generate their won sufficient revenue. Task Force I met almost weekly from early September through May. Members of Task Force I acknowledged that student enrollment patterns change rapidly and not necessarily in keeping with the intellectual merit but the very fact of such volatility dictates the need for institutional flexibility. The report of May 20, 1977, states as the first general conclusion that any changes in the programs of the cluster colleges should be made so that they could function as "relatively

independent" in the immediate future but be capable of being integrated into a single liberal arts college (i.e., the College of the Pacific) without undue disturbance to the programs if that integration should become advisable. The second conclusion encouraged and promoted the integration of existing programs within the University with those of a similar sort in other units. The third general conclusion urged dual faculty appointments.

Specifically, Task Force I recommended the merging of Raymond and Callison Colleges in to a single undergraduate unit charged with the development of a newly fashioned, joint curriculum. Elbert Covell College was to be retained as "an Inter-American, bilingual, bicultural four-year division of the University." Its faculty was to formulate a general education curriculum to be taught in Spanish which would conform to a new all-University requirement which was contemplated in the same report. The persisting irritation of building Covell majors on C.O.P. courses was removed by the provision that all duplication of majors was to be discontinued, with Covell working out arrangements with "other schools and colleges" for course work. Joint appointments of cluster college faculty with other units was to be made "where appropriate" by the end of the 1977-1978 academic year.

Several other long-standing complaints from C.O.P. faculty found expression in the document. Chief among these was that all liberal arts college faculty members "should hold appointments which reflect their disciplinary and professional expertise"--a provision aimed directly at the interdisciplinary arrangements in Raymond and Callison colleges. Further, and for the same reason, appointments were to reflect actual responsibilities. In the event that a tenured faculty member should not be appointed to a "pre-existing College of the Pacific department" termination would follow under terms of a procedure adopted earlier by the University of the Pacific. Finally, the President was

invited to appoint a second Committee to Consider the Cluster Colleges to begin deliberations on September 1, 1982 and Task Force I set out three options for consideration:

> (1) That when financial data of either or both cluster colleges, based on student FTE, predicted recovery of direct and indirect costs, such institution shoud be retained;
>
> (2) That if the same data indicated recovery of direct, but not indirect, costs the institution should be integrated into College of the Pacific; and
>
> (3) That if the date predicted lack of recovery of direct costs the college should be terminated.

The report of Task Force I was duly accepted by all elements of the University, from the Academic Affairs Committee to the Board of Regents and the two remaining cluster colleges undertook compliance. However, only eighteen months had passed before Task Force II was established. In his "Statement Concerning Cluster Colleges" of October 25, 1978, President McCaffrey explained that he had re-activated the Committee (four years earlier than contemplated) because of the nationwide trend away from innovative types of program as offered in the University of the Pacific's cluster colleges and that there had been a parallel decline in enrollment at Raymond-Callison College (a reduction of 75) and at Elbert Covell College (down 13 students.) As President, he pointed out, he had a responsibility to the faculty and students of the University as well as to the Regents to assure a total program which is educationally and financially viable.

When Task Force II finished its work in June, 1979, Raymond-Callison College had disappeared. The emphasis on interdisciplinary studies, which was conceived to be the "Raymond" contribution to the University, was to be continued in a Center for Integrated Studies within the College of the Pacific. In academic year 1981-1982 this Center could boast only two courses (Introduction to Human

Development, a lower division class; and an upper division course called Late Life.) A portion of the "Callison experience" found its way into C.O.P. within the new Center for International Programs which, at this writing, offers six academic courses. Three of these deal with the United States, two with international aspects, and one, offered in alternate years, treats the United States and East Asia.

According to the report of Task Force II, Elbert Covell College had completely implemented the recommendations of the first (1977) report. Specifically, only three academic majors had been retained within the College and the remainder were exclusively within the jurisdiction of the College of the Pacific. "Covelianos" who wished a C.O.P. major were now advised by C.O.P. departmental faculty. If Covell students chose a Bachelor of Arts track they could graduate from Covell regardless of the academic major; if they chose a Bachelor of Science degree plan they were obliged to transfer, since the remaining cluster college was not authorized to grant the B.S. degree. Those students who transferred, if they had completed the general education requirements of Elbert Covell College, could receive a Spanish-language certificate attesting to their having satisfied the Inter-American Area Studies core.

Task Force II recommended that the existing structure of Covell College be continued. It did recommend that the cluster college serve increasingly as a conduit to other academic programs within the University by focusing on a curricular offering limited to general education and a few elective courses which would be taught in the Spanish language. To this end, the faculty was directed to delete approximately ten courses offerings which would result in the eventual reduction of two FTE faculty positions. Specifically, Science was marked for reduction. The Dean was requested to devote more time to recruitment and none to teaching. The final curricular recommendation

restated the need to bring Covell general education courses into line with all-campus requirements once they had been determined, and expressed hope that students from other schools and colleges (who had a certain proficiency in Spanish) might be attracted into them. In brief: Although Task Force II noted some discouraging trends in cost-effectiveness, it recommended that the structure of Elbert Covell College remain intact and that the curriculum be preserved, although with some important reductions.

It is obvious from the case studies thus far that Elbert Covell College had been successful in harnassing tradition to serve innovation. Raymond and Callison colleges did not. It may be argued that Covell was not "innovative" as that term is commonly employed. Still, if the primary goals of teaching an area studies curriculum in a foreign language to students of two cultures who are thoroughly mixed in and out of its classrooms is not "innovative," it certainly presented unusual educational opportunities. On its own campus Covell was considered to be "innovative" if only because it was the second of three cluster colleges and was constantly lumped with its more experimental sisters in the minds of most faculty, administrators, and students.

Discerning observers recognized that, from the outset, Covell administrators had deliberately cultivated a sense of tradition and dedicated time and attention to the preservation of tradition. By the 1970's, at least, Covell consciously struggled to extricate itself from the "cluster college" label from a pious instinct that would have been applauded by Lindquist.[8] The trappings of Elbert Covell College were conventional: Graduation ceremonies were always cap-and-gown affairs for all faculty and students. Their hallmark was nostalgia. Not so in Raymond and Callison, where individual ingenuity was rewarded and iconoclasts were applauded. Covell professors tended to dress much more conservatively than counterparts across the campus and their students

never dreamed of addressing them by their first names--a practice encouraged at Raymond and Callison. Public meetings sponsored by Covell were marked by decorum and utterances in them were restrained. Even the dining hall reflected a much more subdued atmosphere than those of Raymond and Callison. While few students outside the College were attracted to Covell classes (because of the threat of competing in a second language) a great many "Covelianos" gravitated to classes in C.O.P. because of their disciplinary orientation. In this way C.O.P. faculty and students came gradually to know that their Covell counterparts were not much different from themselves.

Without doubt, the general tendency of the people who comprised Raymond and Callison colleges was to irritate their C.O.P. counterparts and, quite naturally, many in the latter group were eager to crush the upstarts. To this day there are College of the Pacific professors who believe that it was an avowed policy of the cluster colleges to annoy them and very few mourned the disappearance of Raymond and Callison colleges. While this view appears paranoid still the ways by which the two innovative "ribs" at University of the Pacific managed to scorn their begetter are clear even from the brief treatment accorded them here.

On the other hand, Elbert Covell College was never a threat to C.O.P. and it paid the original nucleus the compliment of imitation. Once Covell developed and improved its area studies program; once the established institution began to have imput into the seelction and evaluation of the faculty of this cluster college; and once Covell students moved increasingly into C.O.P. classes, complaints about the lack of educational standards in the Spanish-speaking school declined. They did not wholly cease. Also, Covell recruited a very different clientele. While the same could be said for Raymond and Callison, still their students might have been accommodated in

the larger school had the cluster college idea never been implemented at the University of the Pacific. The students attracted to Covell, on the other hand, had selected their university precisely for what this cluster college had to offer. Finally, Covell administrators were careful to be responsible to the parent institution financially, never going beyond accepted boundaries. The implications of the decision not to tenure in a large number of Covell professors was not lost on top-level administrators and some faculty. The general feeling that Covell was not an appreciable financial drain (and, if so, probably worth the cost) grew steadily and is clearly reflected in the reports of both Task Force I and Task Force II.

V

Just as philosophy had its "ancient" and "recent" accusers in the Athens of Socrates, so the last remaining cluster college has its "ancient" and "recent" accusers on the contemporary University of the Pacific campus. (And, one supposes, every alternative in higher education confronts a similar situation on its own campus.) The remainder of this study will be dedicated to a consideration of strategies for survival employed against these twin enemies. Elbert Covell College will be the case study.

The "ancient accusers" divide into two dissimilar groups: There are the traditionalists--not so much practitioners of tradition as champions of traditionalism; and their precise opposites--those who feel that innovative education is worthy of the name only after having discarded all traces of tradition. The former are opposed to change in any and all of its aspects as disruptive of true education; the latter are opposed to everything traditional in order to root out the old ways of educating so that the art can be "brought into the twentieth century." Those in the second sub-group are convinced that the traditionalists can never be persuaded as to the error of their ways and come

to believe that attrition is the final solution to the problem of their existence and persistence. This seems to be the conclusion reached by many among the faculties of Raymond and Callison Colleges. However, in an era when "few die and none resign" the lesson to be learned from the Raymond-Callison experience apparently is that time is on the side of the entrenched traditionalists since they outlived these two really innovative colleges. Many of the opponents of tradition on the University of the Pacific campus early decided that Elbert Covell College was not really innovative and therefore didn't deserve support. Covell College has made a conscious effort to woo and win the traditionalists.[9] It also attempted to convince the anti-traditionalists although apparently without much success.[10] However, this branch of "ancient accusers" has been weakened and divided by the events of the past several years and isn't much of a lively opposition these days. The choice was deliberately made to attempt to convince the traditionalists rather than the anti-traditionalists since Covell College's plan was to harnass tradition to serve innovation. The recommendations of Task Force I and II suggest that the strategy has been successful. If the hemlock is proffered, it certainly will be by the "recent accusers."

The "recent accusers" are those "bottom-liners" who consider cost-effectiveness to be the exclusive touchstone. However much violence this attitude does to the idea of a university, still it is a powerful and compelling one, particularly in an era of growing conservatism and persisting inflation. The first fruits of conservatism in higher education are reduced enrollments and a restricted pool of grant money. Reaction to inflation has tended to focus, in universities and colleges, on the need to realize over-all budget cuts. Thus, the "recent accusers" comprise a formidable foe to alternative educational institutions. Raymond and Callison did not escape from this campus enemy and

it may be that Elbert Covell will not escape either.

On September 8, 1979, Dr. Howard R. Bowen served as keynote speaker at a University of the Pacific Conference dedicated to the theme: "Planning for the 80's.: On that occasion he focused on three problems which loom large for all institutions of higher learning, but particularly for private ones. According to Bowen these are (1) tuition dependence, (2) the trend toward vocational education at the expense of liberal learning, and (3) academic quality. Points two and three were addressed by Elbert Covell College successfully during the 1970's but the first point remains a threatening problem for the University as a whole and for Covell College in particular. From the beginning, the University of the Pacific has been tuition dependent. Substantial endowments never have materialized and on those occasions when existence became a hand-to-mouth affair, gifts which might have been husbanded to create a useful endowment fund were liable to be siphoned off to meet current expenses. Thus, tuition-payers have always been the key as to whether the institution fared well or ill and body count became a tiresome ritual. Any institution which is tuition-dependent is in grave danger of resorting to the "two handy responses" that Arthur W. Chickering delineated in his introduction to Lindquist's book. Chickering described these as "inter- and intra-institutional cannabalism resulting from unfettered power politics based on vested interests, or slow bleeding and general anemia resulting from weakness of will and back-scratching compromises."[11] Certainly College of the Pacific experienced both of these in the 1960's when the cluster colleges were created and the latter learned it since.

From time to time during its history the academic reputation of the University has been in doubt. Part of this problem was directly due to the situation reflected in the subservient role the faculty played for so many years and, in

part, the problem can also be traced to the early tendency to relax admissions standards.

President Burns addressed himself vigorously to the solution of these problems but was successful in laying to rest only the academic one. And, the effort that improvement required suggests why doubts as to the academic rigor of the three cluster colleges (Raymond in its later years, Covell in its early years and Callison throughout much of its history) increased their vulnerability to the "ancient accusers."

The current administrators at the University of the Pacific are probably more realistic, but certainly less visionary, than were their predecessors where educational experimentation is concerned. At least twice in the past decade small institutions which asked to become affiliated with the University as "cluster colleges" have been refused entry because the financial cost threatened to outweigh the glittering potential benefits. The idea of a School of Nursing has repeatedly surfaced during this period but has always been repressed. On the other hand, a School of Business and Public Administration, which was carved out of the College of the Pacific and Elbert Covell College, proved to be an institution whose time had come judging from its phenomenal growth in student enrollment and its measured increase in faculty positions. The new school was created after an outside consultant made a report which was afforded ample campus discussion.

It seems to us that Covell College was a contradiction from the outset. It was conceived in part as an idealistic contribution to the goals of a popular American President's "Alliance for Progress," and in part for the mundane purpose of obtaining money. Because of changes completely contrary to its early concept, Covell only now is fulfilling most of the expectations of both its Latin- and North-American students. In the beginning Covell College spokesmen

insisted that it could provide the educational needs of its own students by itself but made meager provision for the science and technological fields the Latin Americans need and want. Today Latin students may begin their university studies without a knowledge of the English language and can move into whichever of the fields they want within the University as quickly as they master English. Mastery is accomplished through a truly intensive program of English as a Second Language. North-Americans continue to obtain a broad, educated vocabulary in the Spanish language which helps them become bilingual professionals although few of the present native English speaking students obtain the same degree of fluency in Spanish that all of their earlier counterparts did. A glance back to the original 12 points set out by Dr. Meyer when introducing Elbert Covell College leads to the conclusion that all of them have been addressed; most have become a traditional part of the Covell ethos;[12] and some few have been abandoned because of changes brought about by time.[13] One original promise has always been fulfilled: Every Covell student obtains an adequate grounding in area studies through completion of general education requirements. This is supplemented by the "living" atmosphere where the two cultures are thoroughly mixed.

Covell has survived into the 1980's, we believe, because of a metamorphosis which has made it into a solid, yet unique, area studies program organized as a college. Thus it has realized the prediction Dr. Meyer made at its founding to have "greatly widened the range of its [the University's] educational services..." Covell is the only college of its kind in the United States and it is to the credit of the University of the Pacific that it has supported this alternative kind of education. Because it is a college, Covell has been able to respond quickly to the very dissimilar decades of the turbulent "sixties" and the inflationary "seventies." It gives promise of meeting the demands of

the conservative "eighties." Each of these eras needs some explanation.

The idea of an Inter-American Area Studies program which used Spanish as the language of instruction and which mixed approximately equal numbers of Latin- and Anglo-Americans in its classrooms was Covell's unique contribution to a decade demanding change. The idea attracted a good deal of attention to the University of the Pacific. Newsweek featured the founding of the second cluster college and predicted: "If it fulfills its early promise, Covell may yet put the University of the Pacific on the educational may."[14] It is worthy to note here that although ethnic studies were a high priority item on the list of educational reforms during the 1960's Covell early decided not to join the trend even though the college was located in the heart of a large concentration of Hispanics in a state where approximately 16% of the population were native Spanish speakers. Rather, the founders insisted on an area studies program and, in so doing, anticipated by sixteen years the plea of Viron P. Vaky, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, for language and area studies rooted in strong disciplinary and comparative skills which would meet the need created by new global and economic relationships.[15] Covell College faculty were to be recruited from the top area studies graduate schools in the country but Mexican-American secondary students were not to be targets of special recruiting efforts.

The College, however, evolved an academically sound program in the 1970's which resisted the pressures for radical curricular change in a time when general education (and even academic major requirements as well) often appeared to be a smorgasbord of class offerings set out for student choice. Covell retained its original requirements of courses in the geography, history, politics and literature of Latin- and Anglo-America (along with a required laboratory science course.) A single change was effected in deference to stu-

dent insistence: One component was deleted (i.e., Latin Americans focused on Anglo-America rather than having to complete the Latin-American aspects as well; North-Americans were required only to take prescribed courses dealing with Latin America.) In 1979, Assistant Secretary of State Vaky proposed an "ideal inventory of skills and knowledge" to the Consortium of Latin American Studies Programs for developing area competence.[16] Entering the 1980's, Elbert Covell College is using his recommendations as a guide for thinking about curricular changes and general education requirements as it conforms to Task Force II. Paraphrased somewhat, the inventory is as follows: Solid grounding in the logic and philosophy of social, scientific and technological inquiry; familiarity with the issues of systematic analysis, the methods of social science analysis, and the analysis of political and international relations; understanding the logic and methods of comparative studies and the relation of behavioral sciences to political affairs; a good grasp of Inter-American history, culture and social structure which shape the way the peoples of the Western hemisphere think and how their institutions operate; and understanding of the principles of economics as they relate to development; and how these apply to the problems of modernization and social change which is Latin America's central reality.

In response to the ever-increasing problem of inflation, Covell scaled down its cash budget in order to reduce its direct costs. Personnel attrition accounted for the lion's share of the cuts, but no aspect of the budget escaped paring. In spite of the steady increase in the rate of inflation and the ubiquitous (although smaller) salary increases, the Covell budget of 1980 was astonishingly close to that of the 1979 budget.[17]

Covell College is reacting to student preferences for academic majors and professional degrees currently in demand by serving as a conduit for the

unusual types of students it attracts. North American students come to Covell because of the opportunity it affords them to "Become Bilingual Professionals" by combining area knowledge, language competency and cultural understanding far beyond what is ordinarily learned in foreign language classes, the analytical tools recommended by Vaky along with a strong disciplinary major. Latin Americans come because it is part of a private university, where neither the widely mistrusted United States federal government nor a potentially suspect state government controls educational policy, and where ability in the English language is not required. Most of the students who come to the University of the Pacific for the special advantages offered them at Covell College remain at the University and so contribute to retention, whcih is one of the ingredients of survival for every institution in the decade ahead.

The quick responses of Covell which permit it to take fullest advantage of changing currents in education are best discernible in contracts made with the government of Venezuela over the past several years. In 1974 Venezuela began its ambitious "Gran Mariscal de Ayacucho" program which envisaged sending approximately 10,000 young people annually to study at universities abroad. These were to be chosen primarily from the deprived masses in the hinterlands. Fifty-two of these found their way to the University of the Pacific during the first year and were enrolled at Covell College. The small Covell faculty was uniquely prepared for the unusual problems presented by these rustics-cum-university students: Every faculty member knew their language, understood their cultural differences, as well as caring about them as persons. The result was not merely teaching Venezuelans general education while they learned English sufficiently well to compete with Americans in Engineering and other difficult subjects, it was to prepare these provincials psychologically and culturally for the fierce competition they would face. Covell managed to save

all but two of the group for the purposes intended by the founders of the Ayacucho program. The Venezuelan government has not made public the number of failures among this first great wave of undergraduates but it is known to have been so very high as to be a source of considerable embarrassment. The Gran Mariscal de Ayacucho program has sent very few undergraduates abroad since that initial group but Covell always is the destination of a few. Instead, a much smaller number (i.e., an average of five a year) of Venezuelan teachers have come to the University of the Pacific in order to obtain the strong program in Special Education offered in the professional School of Education and the peculiar advantages afforded by Elbert Covell College. While learning English these teachers may take (in Spanish) courses needed to round out requirements for the American Bachelor's degree. It is difficult to imagine how the University could accommodate this new type of government-sponsored student without the cluster college, since the general education requirements of the College of the Pacific are so different from the courses taken by Latin Americans as to make it impossible for those in this special group to obtain the B.A. degree from C.O.P. even without the language problem or without the roadblocks and delays which could be expected from a much larger, more conservative and traditional faculty not especially interested in Latin America.

Attracting foreign students was a conscious goal of the University of the Pacific long before the declining pool of native students made foreigners attractive to many American universities. Elbert Covell College contributed importantly to this tradition since its existence by focusing on the recruitment of Latin Americans from throughout the continent and providing unique access to this large market. It also integrated them completely into its student body, thus creating the precedent for avoiding ghetto situations on the campus. The Covell tradition of demanding the same academic accomplish-

ments of its Latin Americans as from its Anglo Americans precluded any kind of "special consideration" given students from the oil-rich countries of the 1980's by some other institutions.

Because Elbert Covell has access to two special pools of potential students and channels those it attracts into the mainstream of the University, the "recent accusers" agreed during Task Force II to judge the cluster college on the basis of the number of students it enrolls rather than on the enrollment it maintains. It can be argued that, because students brought in otherwise would not matriculate at the University, Covell should be excused from the expectation that each school and college in the U.O.P. system pay for its share of indirect as well as direct costs in order to justify existence. Even if this were to occur, two important factors remain to mitigate against the success of this unique institution: In the first place, the failure to replace faculty members lost by attrition has reduced the attractiveness of the faculty to prospective students.[18] In the second place, the professional recruiters of the University have never been organized so as to take fullest advantage of the fact that the potential market for Covell is easily pinpointed. These are both matters within the internal structure that the Dean of Covell can argue about but not control. Each factor is a vicious circle: Faculty size depends upon enrollment, yet enrollment depends upon the attractiveness of the faculty. And, in the halcyon days when budgets were not so tight it might have been possible to hire a full-time recruiter who would concentrate on secondary school Spanish classrooms but nobody worried much about enrollment then, Today, when there is concern, the priority is not high enough to justify the investment.

In the final analysis, the viability of Elbert Covell College will depend upon luck as well as its contributions to the University. Its design (i.e., as an area studies college) provides the University of the Pacific with a tool

by which it can respond quickly to changes in the future while maintaining high standards in academic quality. However, there is a rhythm in the interest both Americans and their government have toward Latin America. The tide seems to be flowing South in the new decade of the 1980's. Nevertheless, dealing with Latin America is never certain because governments change quickly and the availability of dollars for foreign study depends to a very large extent upon the vagaries of international relations. Without dollars no foreign student can long remain in an American university.

In conclusion, we believe that the case of Elbert Covell College demonstrates that tradition was harnassed to serve innovation and that the bulk of the "ancient accusers" on the campus of the Univeristy of the Pacific have accepted the single remaining cluster college and support its continuance. We are persuaded that the "recent accusers" are willing to modify somewhat a hitherto rigid stance in order to keep the experiment alive. If they serve the hemlock it will be diluted somewhat by their tears.

This consideration of innovative colleges at the University of the Pacific began with the speech by President Burns which made waves on the campus when he announced the formation of cluster colleges. It is appropriate to terminate it with the hope that his successors will not rock the boat of the last remaining unique educational opportunity. Elbert Covell College has become a part of the Pacific tradition and will endure beyond the 1980's if the University shares Burns' conviction that "An institution becomes great by daring to dream and then bending every effort to make those dreams come true."[19]

FOOTNOTES

[1]Kara Pratt Brewer, "Pioneer or Perish" (Fresno: Pioneer Publishing Co., 1977) p. 119.

[2]Warren Bryan Martin, Conformity (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers, 1969) p. 27.

[3]Jerry G. Gaff and Associates, The Cluster College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers, 1970) p. 106.

[4]According to Newsweek, Burns had said: "The idea is not only educationally exciting, but it seems to attract financial resources. All of this makes it a natural way to grow." (September 30, 1963.)

[5]Gaff, p. 135.

[6]As quoted in Warren Bryan Martin, Alternative to Irrelevance (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968), p. 73.

[7]The Callison experience demonstrated that some are and some aren't.

[8]Who suggested that innovative models "should be designed to fit existing values, structures and behaviors as much as they can stand...." Without having read Lindquist, the Covell Dean arrived at the same "conservative formula." Jack Lindquist, Strategies for Change, (Berkeley: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978), p. 226.

[9]Some of the techniques have already been discussed: Covell College upgraded its academic standards; highlighted its traditions and decorum; deliberately sought to extricate itself from the "cluster college" label; and made few alterations in its structure and curriculum. Other conscious survival techniques included having administrators maintain a low profile in campus politics; including others at occasions often enough to escape the charge of being a "do nothing" institution but not so frequently as to be considered as hyper-active; and, in general, behaving in a traditional way designed to reinforce the idea that Covell's uniqueness lay in its language of instruction.

[10]This sub-group heard a rational argument that Covell is both unique and innovative, in that it teaches area studies in two of the principle languages of the hemisphere and that it combines students from Anglo and Hispanic cultures in its classrooms, residence and dining halls, as well as in intellectual, social, and recreational activities. It also grants a distinctive degree: The Bachelor of Arts in Inter-American Studies. There is simply nothing quite like it it America.

[11]Lindquist, p. vii

[12]These certainly include numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11.

[13]Number 5, the scholarship program did flourish but since has been drastically reduced; 6 was never an option since the U.S. Information Agency preferred

to do its own training; 9 was accomplished as long as NDEA funds were forthcoming but did not evolve into an on-going summer program when it was obliged to pay its own way.

[14]The "Education" section of the September 30, 1963 issue. A fortnight later (October 11, 1963) Time carried the story of the cluster colleges and traced the trajectory of the oldest college in California from Amos Alonzo Stagg's "model of a football foundry" to the promise of becoming "one of the nation's most interesting campuses."

[15]"New Directions in Language and Area Studies: Priorities for the 1980's." Edited and published under the auspicies of the Consortium of Latin American Studies Programs by the Center for Latin America at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (1979), p. 3.

[16]"New Directions. . .", pp. 111, 113-114

[17]The bottom line of the cash budgets are as follows:

1969-1970	$254,722	1975-1976	$332,023
1970-1971	253,856	1976-1977	309,076
1971-1972	328,065	1977-1978	325,402
1972-1973	328,065	1978-1979	316,758
1973-1974	315,904	1979-1980	335,553
1974-1975	315,515	1980-1981	205,451

[18]Grant and Riesman provide a splendid consideration of the kind of faculty which needs to be recruited in order to avoid having innovative institutions become "social units without intellectual substance." Their proposal also avoids the often-unacceptable cost to faculty members of losing visibility in their disciplines, mobility and tenure. Their suggestion is that alternative educational models attract "those grayer heads who are secure in their disciplines, who have achieved some reputation as scholars, and who are men and women of breadth of learning" without insisting that they keep renewed on the more technical aspects in their fields. Another group, advanced graduate students, would serve as teaching fellowing and, in turn, be exposed to the distinguished emeriti faculty. The third category consists of those drawn from "those mid-career faculty, typically in their thirties, who have recently been awarded tenure." Gerald Grant and David Riesman, The Perpetual Dream (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978) pp. 371-372. Covell College might well pump energy into its faculty by this means as well as strengthen depleted ranks without adding substantially to its direct costs by moving in the direction of "grayer heads" and young teaching fellows.

[19]Brewer, p. 212.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brewer, Kara Pratt. "Pioneer or Perish". Fresno: Pioneer Publishing Co., 1977.

Gaff, Jerry, and Associates. The Cluster College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers, 1969.

Grant, Gerald, and Riesman, David. The Perpetual Dream. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Lindquist, Jack. Strategies for Change. Berkeley: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978.

Martin, William Bryan. "Alternative Forms of Higher Education for California." Prepared for Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature. December 1972.

_____. Alternative to Irrelevance. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968.

_____. Conformity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers, 1969.

"New Directions in Language and Area Studies: Priorities for the 1980's." Edited and published under the auspices of the Consortium of Latin American Studies Programs by the Center for Latin America at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. 1979.

Newsweek. September 30, 1963

Pacific Review. January 1961.

Taylor, Harold. How to Change Colleges. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971.

Time. October 11, 1963.