Barb.

REACHING OUT: STATE COLLEGE FACULTY AND INNOVATIVE EDUCATION

Ingrun Lafleur

Dean of General Studies
Stockton State College
Pomona New Jersey 08240

Paper presented to
Evergreen State College
Conference on Alternatives in
Education, September 7-11, 1981

REACHING OUT: STATE COLLEGE FACULTY AND INNOVATIVE EDUCATION

What legacy for the 1980's and beyond can we derive and sustain from the ferment in education of the 1960's and 1970's?

Two state colleges in which I have worked can well represent developments and prospects of the last ten years. They contain enough similarities and differences to yield productive comparisons of the dynamics of experimental curriculum and pedagogy within the context of decade of changes. During this time, faculty and curricula have been subject to institutional pressures which reflect changes in public attitudes, in culture, in demography, in the student body, in the economy, and in the resources available to higher education. Yet it is precisely now, in a time of contraction, of shrinking resources (and attitudes) that we must continue to build on our achievements, respond to changing needs, and expand our ideas and attitudes.

William James College is one of the "cluster" (now called "federation") of colleges of Grand Valley State Colleges in western Michigan. Founded in 1971, its mission was to integrate liberal and career education in an interdisciplinary and "future-oriented" curriculum, to personalize learning for the individual student, and to exercise social commitment and community concern. Stockton State College, in southern New Jersey, also opened its doors in 1971. It was often paired in comparisons of educational innovations with Ramapo State College in northern New Jersey

(as in Gerald Grant and David Riesman, The Perpetual Dream. Reform and Experiment in the American College, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978, pp. 291 - 352)

and Ramapo's president, George Potter, had been a Vice President at Grand Valley State. Like William James College, Stockton State College also emphasized both the responsibility of students to design their own learning programs, and the responsiveness of the institution to student needs. Stockton, too, sought to provide a flexible, future-oriented learning environment with a blend of innovative and traditional approaches to skills, general education, liberal arts, and professional studies. There are some astonishing similarities between the initial efforts of both colleges as well as parallels on what has eroded in them since their opening, and in the kinds of challenges which face them in the 1980's. The differences between them, however, might enlighten us about the kinds of efforts which worked and which did not, the circumstances which provided for success or hastened erosion, and what lessons we may derive for the future.

It is singularly appropriate that we gather at Evergreen State College in Washington to evaluate the experiences of recent educational change and to formulate perspectives for the future. For in ambience and style, Evergreen approximates the small, elite private colleges which have frequently led the way in American innovative education (Antioch, Goddard, Earlham). Yet Evergreen is a <u>state</u> institution, and I believe that its innovation in <u>public</u> higher education, particularly in state and community colleges in the 1960's and 70's, which will have long-term social, political, and intellectual significance, adding to the continuous tradition of cultural and educational reform which is peculiarly American. I would like to use William James College and Stockton State College to demonstrate this.

We need not review here in detail the kinds of reforms and revivals American education has experienced from the time of Thomas Jefferson's design of the University of Virginia, through the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, through the progressive movement and John Dewey to contemporary reforms. The recent

(1980) Carnegie Foundation Essay, "A Quest for Common Learning" by Ernest L. Boyer and Arthur Levine charts three "national revivals" of general education -- after World War I, after World War II, and the most recent one of the 1970's. It compares these revivals as having the purposes of promoting social integration, developing the whole person, promoting education for democracy, and integrating diverse groups into larger society. I believe that populism, that is, a desire to bring more and more people into higher and higher levels of education, training for citizenship, and self-development have been characteristics of reform movements in education throughout American history.

We need not review here in detail the economic, political, and cultural developments which stimulated educational innovation in the 1960's and led directly to the establishment of William James, Stockton, and other state colleges. These developments included the expansion of economic resources, of production, consumption, and employment; the expansion of the college age population; the willingness of government to expend funds on social programs during the Great Society Era; the critique of American society embedded in the civil rights movement, the anti-Vietnam War movement, the women's movement, and consequent efforts through open admission and affirmative action policies to bring more and diverse groups into the process of higher education. Student protesters and young faculty recently out of graduate school produced critiques of the traditional higher education establishment and its place in American society, while advocating "liberating" innovations. These included, of course, measures such as the eradication of most curricular requirements and the expansion of elective courses; the emphasis on sharing power with students both through policy making and sharing in governance as well as having them design their own courses and programs; the elimination of competitive grading systems; the

rapid generation of new courses on themes and issues relating to the daily lives of students or to current social concerns; the validation of a variety of modes of learning, both affective and cognitive, and the emphasis of experiential learning, "life experience," and independent study. Stockton and William James Colleges experienced all of this. We also need not review the kinds of "backlash" we have experienced in the last five years -- the return of requirements and traditional lecture modes of education, the trend toward career specialization, the reactionary education context of much of the basic skills movement, the pressures to reduce the costs of instruction and to exploit the labors of untenured, underemployed, and adjunct faculty. Stockton and William James Colleges have participated in all of this, too. One of our purposes in gathering together to examine ourselves should be to find ways to counteract this backlash. I remain optimistic, however, that we can retain and replant many of the fruits of our labors of the last generation because of the peculiar elasticity and resilience of American culture. Radical critiques, alien ideas, and foreign groups may be repressed, but they tend either to leave a residue which can revive again, or they are coopted and assimilated again, or they are coopted and assimilated into the mainstream to provide a base from which one can build again. Thus, immigrants have been assimilated, and counter-culture radicals have, in the great tradition of American enterprise, merchandised their ideas and profited from their wares. Thus I would hope that a residue of concern with social justice will remain for continuing movements for social reform. What we need to do is to find, mine, and nurture what remains valuable from the 1960's and 70's and apply it to the future, making it part of that tradition of continuous reform which reaches back to Jacksonian egalitarianism through the ideas of Dewey. This tradition of educational reform has meant, as I have said, the expansion of education to

more and more people, education for practical use, education for citizenship, and the development of the individual's ability to choose among alternatives. I believe that our experiences, particularly at state colleges in the 1970's, contribute particularly to this profoundly democratic tradition.

Many of the concepts and structures initiated at innovative state colleges in the 1960's and 70's will, I believe, contribute to that mainstream tradition of continuing reform which flows beneath the froth of rhetoric and ephemeral experiments. William James College and Stockton State College partook of their share of frothy rhetoric and ephemeral experimentation, but both have made contributions which deserve to be preserved or tried again, or built upon.

I intend to focus on the faculty as the motor force behind each of these two innovative programs, for ultimately the faculty must be the determining force in directing the curriculum and shaping the ethos of an educational enterprise. I still believe that students must participate in designing the educational process. Nonetheless, as student protesters were told in the 1960's, student generations and demographic cohorts indeed come and go despite laudable attempts to transmit student culture from one generation to another. Neither is the administration a more permanent force in shaping policy. Certainly some of the most imaginative innovations in the 70's did come through forceful revolutions from the top, often against the will of a defensive, cautious, conservative, traditionalist faculty. Both William Birenbaum as president of Staten Island Community College in the 1960's (he is now chancellor at Antioch) and Richard Bjork at Stockton (he is now chancellor of the Vermont State System) were examples of energetic chief executives who ruled often through administrate fiat against the inertia of traditionalists and a core of innovative faculty who nonetheless resented the authoritarianism and arrogance of the administration.

Yet it was they who were the chief supporters of educational reform. Certainly, innovation does require initiative, leadership, and support from the administration. The last few years, however, and the "positions available" section of the Chronicle of Higher Education demonstrate, however, how frequently and rapidly top administrators are toppled, shifted from one institution to another, or drastically change their stance and policy in response to institutional, political, and economic pressures, or through personal whim. So therefore, despite vagaries of faculty attrition, periodic disillusionment and "burn-out," I maintain it is the faculty which can and must provide purpose, ethos, method and continuity to an educational enterprise. Despite a great range of differences among them, it was a core of faculty members both at William James and at Stockton who provided the impetus for innovation and shared common critiques of traditionalist education. They were often critical of the education they themselves had received in elite graduate institutions. They were eager to break out of the mold of constricting bureaucratic structures to try new courses, techniques, and projects. Some of these faculty members have over the years been criticized for wanting mainly to do their own thing, to teach what they were interested in without concern for what they had been trained or hired to teach, or what the needs and interests of the curriculum as a whole may have required. Some of these accusations were at times warranted. Nonetheless, I would assert that these faculty members, usually well-credentialed and trained at elite universities, young, creative "refugees from the 1960's" sustained more or less consciously profoundly serious goals in choosing to teach at state colleges where they would serve a non-elite student body. Those who had a choice, and many who came in the early 70's did so, took jobs at state colleges because they were committed to teaching, because they considered much of the required, mechanical publish

or perish syndrome to be trivial or irrelevant excess. They opposed traditional educational structures because they wanted to create "enabling" kinds of structures and institutions, institutions which would enable students and faculty to engage in continuous learning, in personally satisfying, intellectually enriching, and socially useful projects. I maintain that the faculty who initiated these innovative programs in the early 1970's wished to "reach out" on several different planes and in several different dimensions which differed substantially from their own undergraduate and graduate school experiences:

1. They wished to reach out to students and make a difference in their lives, rather than only considering themselves to be authorities and experts who had the slightly demeaning duty to initiate the unworthy into a specialty or into culture;
2. They wished to reach out beyond their disciplines to integrate areas of knowledge, to solve problems, and to explore themes of significant intellectual interests;
3. They wished to reach out to society, often through their local communities, their sense of commitment to society included not only a desire to work with students at all levels of preparation, but to engage in education which would significantly affect and change society.

Stockton State College and William James College shared some characteristics with each other, characteristics which were also representative of much of innovative education in the 70's, although the people who worked in these colleges tended to look upon their institutions as unique. Indeed each did have its own individuality, community culture, and administrative style; each succeeded and failed in somewhat different ways, and it might be useful to compare the kinds of variables which led to

greater or lesser success. Surely included among those must be not only their curriculum and their faculty, but their environmental setting.

William James College was the third of what was intended to be a cluster of colleges at Grand Valley State Colleges located on an 876 acre campus in rural western Michigan, literally in the midst of cornfields relatively isolated from settlements or towns. The campus itself is quite lovely, with a series of well-designed and award-winning buildings along revines near the meandering Grand River and plunked down upon a rather dreary, flat countryside. The college is located 12 miles west of Grand Rapids in Kent County which has about 300,000 inhabitants. Its campus is centrally located between that "furniture city" and three towns 20-25 miles away along the shores of Lake Michigan -- the suburban resort towns of Grand Haven and Holland and semi-industrial Muskegon. Grand Rapids and Muskegon both have fine junior or community colleges. Michigan State University, the University of Michigan and Western Michigan University in nearby Kalamazoo operates some extension services in Grand Rapids, and the area boasts of several well regarded religious institutions -- Dutch Reformed Hope College and Calvin College and Catholic Aquinas College. Area community leaders, however, apparently wanted their own secular, distinctive state-affiliated, high-quality liberal arts college which would also provide some professional training. Grand Valley thus was planned in 1960 and enrolled its first class in 1963 in the unit which became the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). In the late 60's it was decided to attempt a distinctive cluster college approach, beginning with a very liberal honors college which became the Thomas Jefferson College in 1968. The college was unabashedly experimental, attracting a relatively elite student body of self-motivated, independent and creative students. There were no requirements and the curriculum was designed by faculty

and students each term; it was thought to be the place where the area hippies could be isolated with courses in astrology and independent studies which gave credit for maintaining silence for three months. Both faculty and students tended to be highly individualistic and concerned with self-expression.

William James College was planned in 1970 as the third college in the cluster. Its mission was shaped by the results of a market research survey which concluded that potential students and community people were concerned with getting the kind of individual attention and opportunity for personal growth which large state universities did not provide, with getting jobs after college, and with the certification of a nice, liberal arts degree. So Grand Valley decided to launch a college which would provide an interdisciplinary curriculum combining career studies and the liberal arts, focusing on training students for entry level jobs as well as some pre-professional training. It was hoped that the college would ultimately enroll 1,000 students. The college had small classes, almost no graduation requirements, but by comparison with Thomas Jefferson it was more structured into four degree programs, and the tone was more oriented to social commitment and community service than was the emphasis at Thomas Jefferson. In 1974, a fourth cluster college, appropriately named College Four was opened. Its distinctive approach was to develop competency outcomes through mastery learning modules which could be administered on the campus or in a variety of local settings. During its first years, College Four received many grants but had few students. Eventually it shifted its focus to a series of more traditional learning modes and developed a variety of pre-professional and semi-professional career tracks from Hospitality and Tourism to real estate and insurance as well as liberal arts courses. To some extent, it stole the thunder of William James where faculty were concerned with liberating educational theory, collective decision making, and training

and encouraging students to be change agents in the political, social, and environmental arena. College Four also acquired a partial endowment, and the name of the endower, Russell H. Kirkhof, a local self-made business man who had never gone to college, but left the college in its will. The college began to thrive thereafter, although the age of the expansion of clusters at Grand Valley State Colleges was over. Like many other state colleges, Grand Valley had nurtured dreams of becoming a state university with graduate professional and liberal arts programs including law and perhaps medicine. Governor Milliken wisely vetoes the university idea in 1978 (it had been opposed by Grand Valley undergraduates as well) and the college today offers masters degrees in business and finance, social work, health science and education to serve the local area in those fields.

Grand Valley has been suffering enrollment problems during the last three years, falling considerably behind its projected enrollments, and having to compete with the other state colleges. The state college system is not centralized, and thus each campus must develop its own ability to attract and retain students, leaving some of the physical plant across the state empty.

My discussion of William James and of Grand Valley as a whole will focus on the period when they flourished most successfully, the period of about 1976 to 1979, when Grand Valley enrolled almost 8,000 students, Thomas Jefferson 500, and William James 700. Thomas Jefferson College was phased out in the academic year 1979-80 following declining enrollments and bitter faculty conflicts.

Unlike Stockton State College, then, William James College was a cluster of several colleges including a large, disciplinary, traditional college of arts and sciences, and a part of a campus, Grand Valley State Colleges, which had considerable autonomy within the state system of colleges in Michigan.

Further, William James had a small faculty and student body, and had a particularly mandate or mission to provide interdisciplinary education which would fuse career studies and liberal arts. The college emphasized, as I shall explain later, individualized study plans, courses which focused on projects and problems, a commitment to community service, and a loose, collegial governance structure. For survival it had to compete with other campus units, other local colleges, and, in its later years, struggled for resources in a sharply declining Michigan economy.

STOCKTON - THE SETTING

A New Jersey state referendum in 1968 called for the establishment of two new state colleges, Ramapo in the north and Stockton in south Jersey. Ramapo has developed in some respects like a combination of Thomas Jefferson and William James College -- its faculty and students have in the past emphasized radical lifestyles and individualistic self-expression, and the administration was relatively collegial and permissive under the leadership of president George Potter, who, as I have noted, had been a vice president at Grand Valley. South Jersey community leaders had wished to develop a high-quality liberal arts college to serve the needs of southern New Jersey. A Board of Trustees was appointed in 1969 and an administrator who had worked within the New Jersey state college system, Richard E. Bjork, was chosen as president, a post he held until 1978. Bjork organized a group of administrators and chairmen to organize the curriculum, plan the building of the college, and hire the first cohort of faculty. The group seemed to want a college unburdened with traditional administrative and curricular structures, and with a modern, forward moving feeling which would focus on young, innovative faculty serving a student clientele who would, as adults be able to make choices among the offerings provided at the college. The first administrators and faculty developed a curriculum divided into somewhat interdisciplinary major degree

programs, and a more experimental general education program, now know as the General Studies program. A campus was found in the southern edges of the New Jersey Pinelands, an undeveloped and ecologically most interesting and delicate area. It contains 1,600 acres of fields, lakes, and a 400 acre outdoor research laboratory. The campus is located 12 miles from Atlantic City, among small hamlets, farms, and developments in a rural area close to the coastal resorts of southern New Jersey. The area had been sparsely populated, with the declining, slum-ridden resort of Atlantic City which is now experiencing a somewhat dangerous speculative boom because of casino development. While blacks are the majority in Atlantic City, they make up only 9 percent of Stockton student body, although the Board of Trustees is concerned to increase both black and hispanic enrollments and faculty hiring. The college is located about 50 miles from Philadelphia and 120 miles from New York City, thus making it a highly desirable area for graduates of elite eastern universities. In the suburbs and small towns of Atlantic County there is a surprisingly diverse cross section of ethnic groups -- Italians, Jews, Slavs, even Mongols. There is a significant number of elderly people who have retired from the New York City area.

The campus itself is, I think, stunningly beautiful in its natural environment, and consists of one long building with interconnected wings. The design has won architechtural awards, although many faculty and administrators consider it to be cold or drab. Within the context of the green of the trees and the blue of the lakes and skies, however, I think it is a stunning example of modern, functional, "democratic," architecture, most appropriate for the mission of a state college.

At one time, it was envisioned that the college would expand to 7,000 students, it is now budgeted for an FTE of 4,000, and has a headcount of 4,800 and a faculty of 173. The admissions and recruitment effort of the college is very well organized,

and the college has no problem attracting students -- the entering class of 900 was chosen from 3,000 applicants. The state colleges of New Jersey are much more tightly organized under a Board of Higher Education and state college systems chancellor than are the more autonomous state colleges in Michigan. The Board of Higher Education has tried to assure that enrollments would be evened out throughout the state colleges in order to make best use of educational plants and resources in the state, and thus have put a limit on enrollment which Stockton is permitted to take. The scientific, professional, and personable admissions staff of the college has little problem in maintaining the mandated enrollment. Stockton is on its way to becoming the only state college which will be primarily residential and takes its students from all counties throughout the state, with only 17-21 percent of its students coming from Atlantic County. Because of gradually increasing SAT scores, it may become the most selective of the state colleges, especially as tight economic times force New Jersey students to remain in their home state, whereas previously New Jersey had been famous for exporting students to faraway states. This increasing selectivity may cause its faculty and administrators to evaluate their style and mission.

Stockton and William James differ, then, because William James is smaller, can offer limited programs, and is part of a cluster college system. Stockton, on the other hand, is a unified college, tied more closely with a state system, but containing a diversity of faculty and administrators which provide it with debates about the nature and future direction of its mission and academic offerings. William James has recently experienced declining enrollments and economic problems, but these reflect

conditions in the state, whereas Stockton, while experiencing some financial pressures, has a certain guaranteed framework from the state and an extremely healthy enrollment situation. They are similar in that the faculties of both colleges were young and wished to develop experimental and enterprising curricula, reaching, as I have said, beyond their disciplines to students and to the local community.

What kinds of programs did the faculties of these institutions devise for their students? How did they set about the project of reaching out beyond their disciplines, to their students, and to the community? How effective were their efforts, and what remains of them?

William James College - Transitions: Faculty, Curriculum, College Ethos

The brief history of William James College may be divided into three phases--the first (1971-74) of exhilaration, exploration, unrestrained freedom, and confusion; the second (1975-79) of consolidation and articulation; and the third (1979 to the present) of continued effort, but erosion produced largely because of external pressures.

I interviewed for a position at William James College in the spring of 1972, the year I received my Ph.D. in history from Columbia University. When I examined the first year materials and list of courses from William James College I was hard put to understand why they wished to hire a European historian, or, how their list of courses--ranging from oriental religion to "lifestyles" --belonged in a college emphasizing career training The faculty explained that they were looking not for specific training in a particular specialty, but for a generalist who was excellent in his or her field, but had broad humanistic interests and practical experiences.

The central administration of Grand Valley had originally granted William James College a broad range of autonomy, and the first seven male faculty members (a literature person, two sociologists, a physiological psychologist, a geologist, a mathematician who had led in the development of Thomas Jefferson College, and a computer-systems analyst) recruited an additional eleven faculty for the second year. These included seven women, among them the woman dean, Adrian Tinsley, and they included variety of backgrounds--history, ecology, chemistry, law, graphic design, social work, geography/environmental studies,

journalism and history. The faculty believed that the full-time teaching staff should be a core of broadly-based liberal arts people preferably with some practical experiences (law, journalism), and of practitioners with a strong liberal arts background (such as a designer whose undergraduate major was sociology), and that more specialized technical courses could be taught by adjuncts who would be practitioners from the local community. The full-time faculty would be broad enough to move from one area to another as needs and interests shifted, for they were, above all, to be a community of learners and inquirers who would themselves be able to shift to new fields. (Some of this ethos was manifest in the permeable degree programs at Stockton as well, but it was never so loosely conceived). Further, the faculty felt uncomfortable with a simplistic definition of "career" in their charge to be a career-oti nted liberal arts college. They interpreted career in terms of vocation, not in the narrow, "voc-tech" sense but in the sense of calling, or life-work (bringing one's life and work together) in the sense of doing work that was personally satisfying and socially useful, to be aware of the significance of one's actions, of the conditions, potential and limitations of one's job, work, and career. Of course, this may have gone far beyond what the central administration of the college had in mind, or what entering students expected when they enrolled in a career-oriented college.

Unlike Thomas Jefferson, William James College contained some curricular structures from the beginning. There were to be four interconnected, interdisciplinary concentration programs. Back then, they were deliberately not called majors, for a major was a set of sequential, required disciplinary courses not necessarily tied to the student's individual life or general education. The four concentration programs were first called

Social Relations (psychology, social work, history, etc.)
Environmental Studies (later, Urban and Env. Studies)
Arts and Media
Administration and Information Management (the management, indeed of administrative structures and information networks and technology)

The concentration program was taken to be a focus, or structure for courses, but faculty could be affiliated with more than one program, and courses, too, could relate to more than one program, depending on the intentions, goals, needs, and interests of the individual student. Thus a course in environmental design could serve both the student in the environmental studies concentration and in the arts and media program, but conceivably could aid those concentrating in social relations who wished to be concerned wi h the physical environment of work and play spaces, or the administrator of a social agency who was concentrating in the management program. Conversely, a course in public administration could serve not only those in the information and administration management program, but all those who wished to become administrators in the s cial agency, arts, or environmental fields. A video course could provide communication or demonstration skills not only for the arts and media student, but for the environmentalist, social worker, or manager. Courses, since they could serve more than one program, were not listed in the catalog or course schedule under any particular categories at first, so that students would be forced to read the entire list of courses, as part of the process of designing and planning their own course of study. With seven faculty and about twenty courses each term the first year, this was not too difficult, but it became mo e and more bewildering and cumbersome. Later courses were listed and cross-listed under program categories, and sub-categories were developed within each concentration, with lists of suggested courses. These sub-categories were at first dubbed "emphases," but in the latest Grand Valley catalog, I noticed, alas, that they were indeed called majors, and more rigid sequences of courses had developed.

Nonetheless, taken together, the four original concentration programs formed a practical, intellectually cunning and delightful interrelationship, well suited to the mission of the college. They dealt with interrelated current problems and continuing future concerns, appropriate to a college which professed to be

person-centered, career-directed, future-oriented and committed to social action. It was an intellectually bold design, for almost all the problems of pressing concern for humanity in the seventies, today and tomorrow could be encompassed in these four problems or areas of concentration. Unfortunately, as we shall see, the college was not able to get a large enough group of faculty who were both conceptualizers and technical experts, or a large enough student body to support such a faculty, or the economic resources to provide the tools for making full use of the potential of the design. The design was socially courageous as well, because it proposed to take students who were often ill-prepared for basic college work and bring them up to a high degree of social and technical sophistication with the aid of a generalist faculty aided by local practitioners. To a significant degree, however, as we shall see, the college did succeed with its students, but the sohpisticated, subtle, interdisciplinary interrelated design was worthy of postdoctoral programs in conception.

The college was, however, to be a future-oriented liberal arts college,and there was a fifth program, not a concentration, which was to be common to all students and to which all faculty were committed as well, no matter what their specialty. This was the Synoptic Program (and do not the synoptic gospels contain four versions of Christ's Tru th?) The Synoptic (both synthesizing and overview) was considered to be both the core and the outer rim holding the college together, although articulating what it meant was by turns a vexing and exhilarating exercise. The Synoptic Program was meant to provide liberal arts breadth both to the student's individual curriculum, and to provide common themes and activities for the whole college. Any course in the college could be regarded as a synoptic course for the student, either because it provided another dimension or perspective on the concentration, or because it was distant from it and provided breadth, or because it fulfilled particular gaps in a student's knowledge. For th college as a whole, the Synoptic Program also meant the pursuit, at first every term, an then once a year of a particular theme in common by all students and faculty. This could be a topic or problem, or the life and

work of a "visionary thinker." These have been especially successful not only in uniting students and faculty in a common intellectual endeavor (for during the term, common readings an workshops are held before and after the major synoptic event, conference, or guest visit of the Synoptic Lecturer) but in building the ethos of the college among students who might have entered with narrow career-training expectations. There have been conferences on the life and works of Piaget, of William James himself, and one-week residences by people ranging from economist/philosopher Kenneth Boulding to writer Tillie Olsen.

It must be stated, however, that in the first two years of the college, these were but gleams of ideas, or motes in the eyes of the original faculty members, and the courses themselves were an astonishingly eclectic collection, or jumble, of whatever most faculty happened to feel like teaching, or courses which groups of students had gotten together to ask for, and any offering could be justified on the grounds that it was "synoptic," since no one really knew what that word meant. Within the classroom there was much emphasis on active, participatory learning with problems and projects developing in accordance with the particular composition of the class and its instructor, the design would emerge in the course of the course--and this did indeed produce an enterprising student body, even if energies were sometimes dissipated by going in all directions.

Much energy was dissipated in the first years in designing the governance and processes of a new college. College of Arts and Sciences professors carped that Thomas Jefferson College and William James College were always "re-inventing the wheel" or that William James College was so concerned with democracy that to assure aboslute rights individually to everybody it was either paralyzing the operation, or imposing a new tyranny of the least common denominator. With all its faults, however, I think there's a lot to be said for re-inventing the wheel, and some part of college ought to be about it at all times, to demonstrate palpably to students how conceptual structures and social structures originate and develop.

The "person-centeredness" of the College was taken seriously, with respect to students designing individually tailored study plans (to be discussed later), with respect to students participating in the design and evaluation of courses, but also with regard to college governance and faculty evaluation. William James faculty and students, much more than at the educationally or culturally more radical Thomas Jefferson College, were committed to participatory governance. All decisions, great and small, were made by groups an committees overseeing faculty salary policy or student extracurricular activities. The main policymaking or governance body was the William James College Council, which acted like the unruly sov ets of spring and summer of 1917, in that there was no distinction made between legislative and executive roles, between policymaking and administration. The Council consisted of all faculty members plus a representation of elected students who would equal one-third plus one of the council. Since decisions required a two-thirds majority, st dents could theoretically form a bloc to prevent any action they disliked. The ideal was not to have too many votes, however, and to operate by consensus, which meant talking each other to death. All college committees had student representation as well.

The personnel and faculty review policies were designed to enhance self-development and community rather than competition and hierarchy. Just as students were graded by credit or no credit (which in effect meant no report), faculty held no rank- there were no internal or external instructors or assistant, associate or full professors--only faculty members, and there was no tenure either. The salary committee, further, tried to equalize salaries as much as possible, giving practitioners who held no terminal liberal arts degrees, equivalent credit for professional non-academic experience, and rightly so. Instead of tenure, the college devised a system of annually renewable multi-year contracts, beginning with two years and continuing to five, and this would give, theoretically, adequate notice. In practice, it was very difficult for anyone to be fired, for the

processes of faculty review were cumbersome and laden with safeguards to secure faculty with repeated chances for improvement, just as students were given repeated chances to complete projects and courses. William James was considered to be a community of learners, emphasizing mutual support and trust. Indeed, the very few faculty who left the college during the initial seven years or so, be fore economic necessity made it respectable, were considered deserters. (Could you teach anywhere else?--a colleague once asked me.) Hardly anyone was ever fired (a major distinction from the Stockton process and atmostphere) though a few people were gently phased out over the years. Nonetheless, this produced a kind of laxity among the faculty, a lack of rigor in the classroom, and lack of intellectual renewal. It was not considered particularly part of the group spirit to attend professional conferences or to publish in one's field, although faculty later did develop important public projects and interdisciplinary spheres of activity. The muscle tor of the faculty tended to be slack sometimes, conversations obsessed by college politics and processes, rather than current intellectual issues There was a sense of isolation from the world beyond the college and the local community. The great advantage, however, was that there was buil t, despite differences among faculty, or among faculty and students, a greater sense of trust, of community and collegiality, and there was a greater absence of malicious gossip or petty power plays and paranoia than at any institution I have ever encountered. Faculty team-taught, shared their course experiences, materials and information with relative ease and worked together on common projects. There was no blood-letting, but there may have been some anemia.

It was, like Stockton, a pretty free-wheeling place during its first three years, with courses see mingly offered at random, and students and faculty overwhelmed by time-consuming processes.

The faculty were intensely committed, and overcommitted--there was a trmendous expenditure and duplication of effort, and by the mid-seventies some problems became obvious. Many of the students were confused by the ethos and processes of the college and by its freedom and seemed to want more direction; faculty were divided into the humanists who developed educational theory and advocated the most radical educational approaches, and the technical practitioners who advocated more sequencing of courses and rigorous examinations rather than emergent design--although in practice they fostered student initiative and student projects. (This was somewhat reverse of the situation at Stockton, where the humanists tended to be educationally more conservative and the scientists more expan sive. Peter Elbow, a teacher and writing expert from Evergreen who was called in as a consultant in May 1974, and again in 1978, pinpointed some of the difficulties. As Elbow commented: "I see you all -- teachers and administrators alike -- as too busy and hassled. Always a bit tired. Always on the run. Seldom able to reflect on what you are doing. I gather that people are doing less and less preparation for class." He found that even within three years there had been a retreat from transdisciplinary courses to those more directly related to instructors' fields, but yet that faculty were not getting enough time to do their own research and professional work, or energy for productive faculty interaction or private, personal or family life. The same comments could have been made about Stockton or other small, alternative colleges. Even in his 1978 report, however, Elbow cautioned William James, "Get rid of flakiness," and advised the college to become more task-oriented and hard-nosed without giving up its radical nature. "Don't hang loose for the sake of hanging loose," he wrote. Elbow noted that people wandered

in and out of meetings, and all sorts of egocentric behavior which might violate the rights or freedom of expression of others was tolerated. He also advised the College to conceptualize better what it was doing.

Between 1974 and 1979 William James College expanded to its largest size, reaching almost 750 students and 35 full-time faculty. This was a time of consolidation, clarification, and effective work among students and the local community. The consolidation was stimulated by consultant reports like those of Elbow, by the need to compete with the new Kirkhof college and the increasing tendency of Grand Valley as a whole to emphasize careers and liberal arts, stealing William James' thunder, and a greater sense of community developing among faculty and students. Most helpful was an 18-month, $200,000 1977-9 grant from the Office of Education to make William James a model of the infusion of liberal arts into career education, providing resources and time to do more long-term planning. I would like to examine the college during this period of consolidation, for this has the most important lessons for our own planning in the 1980s.

By 1978 William James College was still pretty much an open admissions institution. It wished to encourage the enrollment of independent, self-motivated students who were to some degree "turned off" by the bureaucratic structrues of traditional departmental institutions, and who could move rapidly from a low level of academic preparation to a sense of"empowerment"--of being self-confident, able to write and speak and present oneself effectively, learn quickly, and work creatively and with a sense of social commitment. Some of us called it "hustle"--a hustling to learn, to engage in projects which were both self-satisfying and socially usefull, a presaging of their later work experience. We catered to older students, and to people in personal or career transitions. As one of my former colleagues, Barry Castro, noted in 1979 (William James: A Report on the Prospects for Integration of Liberal and Career Education at an American College--given at Sarajevo, Yugoslavia in March, and to the National Conference on Career and Liber Education at William James in April), the mean student age in 1978 was 25, many had been out of school for some time and worked part-time, about half were transfer students, and over a quarter were married, and 54 per cent

were women. Almost 97 per cent of them were residents of the state of Michigan, mostly from the Grand Rapids area. They were then, and are, "overwhelmingly of working class and lower middle class backgrounds," contrasting somewhit with a slightly higher level at Thomas Jefferson College.

By 1978, as we have said the expanded faculty consisted of educational and political/social radicals who had themselves gone to elite institutions (some of them were disenchanted by them and did not finish the Ph and about one-quarter who had been active practitioners in various fields ranging from graphic design and urban planning, and including social work, film, video, photography, business, law and systems analysis. Quite distinctive and significant were a group of high energy and assertive women faculty members, both practitioners and academics, who participated intensively in new courses and projects, in the administration of the college, and in reaching out to the women';s community across the college and in the local area. With the demise of Thomas Jefferson, and the economic difficulties of the State o Michigan and hence William James in the last few years, many of these women have gone either into private collective work in the City of Grand Rapids, have moved on to other colleges and universities, or have come West--to Seattle and Evergreen. But William James faculty who were practitioners rather than academics came, in Barry Castro's words, "because the Colllege was an opportunity to maintain contact with the work they had been doing, to see that work from broader and more various perspectives, and to continue with their own education." They shared with the humanists an attraction to the relative autonomy of a faculty position, an interest in making themselves relevant to the local community, and a willingness to put themselves in unfamiliar and vulnerable positions--such as sharing their teaching experiences. Of the whole faculty, the average age was 37 and only one of the faculty was over forty-five. One-third of the faculty was female. At Stockton, too, much was made of the relative youth of the faculty--the institution has a good number of tenured full professors in their late thirties, and of a good proportion of female faculty.

Out of the welter of abstractions which Peter Elbow found in 1974m there emerged a more sound, coherent and yet still subtle and radical theory of the college and its mission. Much of this

theme was worked out by Professor Robert Mayberry, in contrapuntal collaboration with Dean Adrian Tinsley, who had been a fellow graduate student at Cornell. The main thrust was taken from William James, the sense that knowledge was related to action, a thesis to which all faculty professed adherence, and that the liberal arts were practical, and career education should be done in a liberally educative manner. Briefly stated, he called the William James theoretical base the two P's and the three I's. It was taken from the pluralism and pragmatism of William James' philosophy. Pragmatism, as the College Mission Statement proclaimed, means "seeking to recognize the primacy of experience and concrete action in the learning process." I meant to the faculty that knowledge is developmentally related to action and should be assessed by its fruits or outcomes--"no impression without expression," they quoted William James. By pluralism was meant seeking to understand the world from many different perspectives in a non-reductive, multidimensional way. The three I's referred to the assumption that the college's programs were meant to be integrative, interdisciplinary, and individualized. Students were asked to integrate knowledge with their own experience through active learning--classroom projects, independent studiies, internships. Courses and the four programs were interdisciplinary. Indeed interdisciplinary courses were embedded in interdisciplinary concentration programs. A video course, for example was not only a part of an intermedia program, using audio, film, photography but part of a larger arts and media program. And students continue to construct individualized study plans with the aid of their advisers.The relationship of the individual student with the curriculum, the interrelationship of the curriculum, and the social-action orientation of the college can be demonstrated by showing how each of these concentration programs described itself. By 1978, of course, faculty tneded to be primarily associated with one program, although some permeability remained, and within each program a series of emphases developed with recommended lists of courses, as did cautious phrases advising students which courses were more advanced than others, and what part of a sequence they served.

The role and mission statement of the ARTS AND MEDIA concentration program reflected the ehtos of the whole college:

Courses in design, language arts, and media are taught in the Arts and Media Program within their political and social contexts. (emphasis mine.) Students are not trained simply as technocrats; rather they are prepared to understand and act upon the "real world" in which communications media exist. The program's aim is to equip students both as producers of arts and media and as consumercitizens. (emphasis mine)

In courseowrk, internships and other on-the-job experiences, students must integrate theory and practice in the communications medium in which they work. Problem-soving is the...major educational mode.

This program offered emphases, which now have become majors, in environmental design, product planning and advertising, and space planning. The media track included work in film, photography, video, television, audio, and multimedia production. Language arts was both a service area to the college but also offered technical and creative writing, journalism, literature and oral communication. Students had opportunities, through project courses and internships to work in the local public radio and television stations, commerical radio and television, local newspapers, advertising, and as commercial artists. The arts and media program has become the largest program in the college, threatening to overwhelm the rest. Because of competition for programs with other campus units, and because arts and media was unique to William James, the other programs which have some duplication elsewhere on the campus have declined at the pense of arts and media. This has also come to mean that more and more, the general Grand Valley admissions office advises students into the various clusters on the basis of program rather than ethos or pedagogical approach; this has seriously affected the original concept and design of the college, although faculty work hard to foster the ethos of participative, interdisciplinary learning.

The SOCIAL RELATIONS PROGRAM at William James was for a time the strongest program at the college--William James was, after all, a social scientist, the college had a strong commitment to community action and service, and a strong core of faculty were interested in social science-humanities related

fields. Students in the early and mid-seventies were interested in personal growth and the helping professions; for many, I think, an alternative college with its individual attention, was a form of therapy not usually available to lower-middle class people.

The Social Relations Program "aimed to apply the perspectives of the social sciences to a variety of social contexts." Again, note the social context emphasis. The Program description read "our central assumption is that a clearer vision of the social world is an essential precondition to the ability to act responsibly and effectively in it. The kinds of courses which faculty offered fell into six areas (the categorization, of course, as at similar institutions, varied from year to year): Social Thought and Analysis, Psychology, Human Development, Social Work, Counseling, and Women;s Studies. The Social Relations-associated faculty was especially interested in working with the Management program to develop cooperation with local firms such as Donnelly Mirror and Herman Miller (furniture design) which used participatory management styles, and developed courses in organization theory, micro-politics, community action programs, and a summer program on participatory management in Yugoslavia.

Also emphasizing community concern and involvement was the Urban and Environmental Studies Program, again stressing the William James College themes of viewing problems in a social context and encouraging students to become change agents. The program was founded "on the premise that environmental quality can be sought and achieved only through political action and social change." It hoped to provide students with skills to employ "multidisciplinary approaches to environmental problem solving," to clarify existing values while promoting humanistic perspectives, and to analyze and communicate information to the general public and environmental professionals. Students were involved in environmental assessment, natural systems management, city and regional planning, organic farm experimental projects, local community planning contracts, and building a community neighborhood house in Grand Rapids. Social action and self-reliance were twin themes of the program.

The fourth program, which had the potential for being closely and organi cally allied with the others, and the most exciting future potential, was originally called the Administration and Information Management Program, which had changed its name to Computers and Management, but is now being phased out with the current class. Changing the name of the program was a major mistake for the college, signalling the demise of the program and much of the program interrelatedness of the college, and the trend among campus units to be program rather than pedagogy oriented. The name Administration and Information Management was conceptually fraught with meaning about communications, symbol structures, technology, human interactions and information networks--and could connect well with the other three programs and some future ones as well. However, competition with the College of Arts and Sciences and the emerging Business School, combined with concern about declining enrollments, and the more conservative attitudes of buisness students, hastened its demise and caused irreperable damage to what had been conceptually a brilliant design. The Computers and Management program had hoped to build emphases in computer sciences, participative management, small business management, data processing, social agency management, management analysis or operations research, as well as something called community management.

Thus, William James has become somewhat crippled in its programs and has been identified more and more with the Arts and Media Program. Within those concentrations, students now major in sequences of courses. However, even today, students prepare individualized study plans, and they must justify the career-liberal arts relationship of 60 out of 120 credits (this is certainly quite liberal). A fourth program called Liberal Studies has replaced computers and Management. There are still few formal requirements and the students really must consciously design their own curricula. I think it has been possible to sustain this flexibility and freedom in quite this radical and effective manner because

students are provided with substantial aid and support in constructing their study plans. While the plan is indeed individualized, and a student can take almost anything if he or she can justify it, they must consciously explain why they take what they take, and are given significant help in doing so. The support structures are guidelines, or a series of questions students must ask themselves, rather than specific required courses--for a variety of courses could help the students respond to those questions--or non-class learning experiences as well. Further students take two one-credit advising courses which examine their programs and education in general, at the beginning of their college careers, and mid-way through. Some students prepare protfolios, and all must have writing samples.

Thus, while most of the students who enter the college are (again in the words of Barry Castro, 1979) "unsure of themselves; of their reasons for being at this or any college; of their ability to learn; of whether circumstances will permit them to persist long enough to graduate... We ask them to accept a great deal at our word, and offer them the veryminimum of negotiable currency: no grades, no institutionally supported majors; and no departments. We don't dress very formally, don't use many of the classroom modes to which they are accustomed, and tend to teach out of our specialties. Our friendliness and commitment to good teaching may promote both short-term gratification and long-term anxiety..." But I think the college was correct when it tried to define what the faculty hoped students would learn at the college, what is called in education jargon, student"outcomes":

1. Reading, writing, speaking, listening, seeing and analyzing skills.
2. Taking onself seriously as a thinker (economic, social, political, philosophical, aesthetic, analytic).
3. Taking oneslef seriously as a participant(community service, family life, social change).
4. Intiative and assertiveness, and yet ability to deal with ambivalence.
5. Understanding organizational structures.

The key concepts as stated by Dean Tinsley as a result of faculty discussions during the Office of Education Grant, were empowerment and membership

These concepts are practiced during students' college years by both students and faculty; when alumni have returned to the College, a substantial number show a similar sense of energy, enterprise and community commitment. During their college years at William James, students and faculty studiesd and worked agencies and in the helping professions, in hospitals and crisis intervention centers; they interned on campus radio and television stations and work d in commercial ones; they helped local communities write planning documents and environmental impact statements; they formed film and video collectives which contracted their talents out to various firms which needed communications projects; they formed feminist communities which renovated houses and planted gardens; they did computer programming and systems analysis for local firms; they worked for advertising agencies, public relations firms and architects; they became consumer advocates, environmental activists and worked as union organizers; they did ecological surveys, designed solar-heated buildings, developed zoning plans, and consulted with firms on participative management--with faculty members actually working "on the assembly line" to study the process.

William James has tried to keep track of its alumni by inviting them back to the college as models for new generations of students (and it is the "change agents" who most often seem to return), by holding alumni conferences and by distributing periodic questionnaires. In spring 1980 the college published results of a fall 1979 survey. Of the 232 William James College graduates who responded, 76 per cent were "extremely" or "very satisfied" with their overall educational experience (as reported in the Grand Valley Forum, March 10, 1980). Eighty-eight per cent of the respondents indicated they were employed, and 67 per cent said their current job was directly related to their William James degree. As Dean Adrian Tinsley noted, "there was general consensus among respondents concerning the college's strengths. These were itdentified as: 1)the flexible curriculum 2) the close relationship between faculty and students; and 3) the ungraded credit/no credit evaluation system." However, some respondents wanted more structured academic programs, and some a grading system.

Since 1979, Thomas Jefferson College has been abolished at Grand Valley State Colleges, and the concept of cluster colleges has eroded. The institution as a whole, including William James College has experienced declining enrollments. The students tend to seek campus units more on the basis of programs tather than college style and ethos, and at William James, the loss of the administration-information management program, the dominating position of the arts and media program, and the move to more requirements an the use of terms such as "majors" seems to indicate increasing traditionalism; the college has lost some of its early cohort of strong, interdisciplinary faculty, particularly many of the women faculty who were administrators in earlier periods.

From recent reports, however, faculty morale is high, for innovative colleges seem to have reservoirs of renewal; new faculty have been chosen, new programs are being planned, and direct community involvement continues. The college is holding steady with an enrolment of 500 students which might go up slightly as recruitment efforts intensify, and the enrolment is distributed approximately into 280 students concentrating in Arts and Media, 145 in Social Relations, 50 in Urban and Environmental Studies (which has remained surprisingly low considering social needs and interesting environmental problems in the area), and 25 in the new Liberal Studies concentration, originally designed to accommodate students from Thomas Jefferson College.

William James College, like so many other innovative institutions of the late sixties and seventies, is at a crossroads, and so is Stockton State College.

Stockton State College - Transitions: Faculty, Curriculum College Ethos

The initial curricular design for Stockton State College was planned, so to speak, "from above" in 1970 by a group of men who became the first executive and academic administrators of the college. They included its president until 1978, Richard Bjork, Wesley (Wes) Tilley, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and several "chairmen" who became deans of the several academic divisions, among them Professor Kenneth Tompkins (a conference participant), the Dean of Experimental Studies, which later evolved into General Studies. When the college opened its doors at the Mayflower Hotel to 1,000 students in 1971 the college was already what it calls itself today, "a blend of the innovative and the traditional," but of course at that time the tone was set primarily in favor of the innovative, and during its first years the college cast the image of experimentalism and radicalism (or even free-wheeling fun, a party school) in its educational approaches and in the life styles of its teachers and students. The college stated unabashedly that it sought to offer an alternative to traditional forms of higher education. Its logo symbolized "humanity supporting the environment--with two abstract trees or human beings with arms upraised, and a square, the architect's sign for the earth. The 1971-2 Prospectus, a college publication for student recruitment, was illustrated with I ching "images" or "hexagrams." with the explanatory note, "Just as Stockton State College realizes the value of preserving the beauty and potential of its natural surroundings. so does the I Ching draw its centuries of wisdom from its roots in nature." A chemistry professor cast the I ching again in July 1980 to mark the college's second decade, but by this time the ritual did not receive college-wide understanding or attention. However, in the early years there was a rich diversity of courses and pedagogical approaches, and students were given considerable freedom in course selection.

An early statement on academic advising stated that "students will have major responsibilities for designing the parts of their educations. They will have special responsibilities for designing their general and liberal studies programs since they are intended

for exploration, stimulation and growing curiosity." A preceptor was to help students in the continuing design of their programs, and approve the plan of study; however, "if he does not, the student may still proceed on his own judgment." From that time to the present, although to a decreasing degree, there have been courses ranging from "Man Laughing," Accidents: Cause and Prevention," "Self-Discovery and Group Interaction," "Aggression," "The American Immigrant Experience," and "Optics for Artists." From that time to this, although to a decreasing degree, there have been independent studies, internships, seminars, tutorials and project courses. From that time to this, students could choose to be graded H - for high achievement, S - for satisfactory performance, and N - for no report; but today there is a parallel A-F system, and the old system is little used by students and some faculty seek to abandon it altogether as a grading alternative.

From its inception, Stockton's organization and ideology contained three types of internal contradictions or sets of polar opposites. The tensions between them have led both to significant erosion of some of the original structures and ideals and, as well, and to continued energy and creativity, permanent self-criticism, a diversity of curricular approaches and pedagogical styles, and a series of imaginative and effective compromises. The contradictions were embedded in --

1. the types of faculty recruited for the institution and faculty personnel policies;
2. the attitudes toward students, their role within the institution, as well as the governance and administrative style of the institution;
3. a curriculum bifurcated into a general education and liberal studies portion, and a more structured set of degree programs in arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and professional studies.

The current president of Stockton in a short essay on "A Ten Year Milestone" in 1980, noted "Stockton professors have been cited by independent assessors for their excellent credentials and high intellectual caliber, and have been compared favorably with the

teaching staffs...of Oberlin, Reed and Dartmouth Colleges. A relatively young group, many of the faculty did their undergraduate work in the 1960s and received their graduate degrees in the 1970s... Despite their comparative youth, almost all of the faculty and staff had some kind of professional experience prior to coming to Stockton, whether gained in an academic setting or in private industry or government."

Like William James, then, many of the faculty were young and had nonacademic professional experience. However, from the beginning a larger group of older faculty was hired at Stockton,* and from the beginning there was a significant portion of faculty who did not share the critiques of traditional education propounded by the majority or join their enthusiasm for experimentation and the elimination of traditional academic structures. That portion has been joined by other faculty members who are disillusioned by or embittered by the experimental efforts of the earlier years. Significantly, the small core of traditionalists is found in the academic division of arts and humanities and in professional studies, while those committed to innovative curriculum and pedagogy are concentrated in the divisions of natural sciences and mathematics, and in the division of social and behavioral sciences. Throughout all of the divisions, however, there is a mix of traditionalists and liberals. The scientists are particularly committed to a transdisciplinary curriculum, to designing courses beyond their own disciplines and specialties, and to using interdisciplinary themes and topics to explore knwoledge, and to recognizing and validating a variety of modes of cognition--the affective as well as the cognitive. The social scientists have particularly supported the innovative curriculum through their political savvy and their commitment to participate in college-wide efforts to develop basic skills. They differ from the William James faculty in that (a) they have been accustomed to working more individualistically in developing courses, (b) they insist on much more rigor in the work

*approximately 23 of the 173 full-time faculty are over 45, or 13 per cent. At William James it was 4 per cent.

produced by their students and in their evaluations of them, and (c) they have been much more active in keeping abreast of their disciplines and intellectual life in gen ral, have participated more regularly in professional work, and have published in their fields and beyond. Stockton faculty, however, seem not to be aware of how well they stand up in their research activities by comparison with other state colleges throughout the country, and neither is the Stockton administration.

Perhaps the most significant difference between William James and Stockton is that while at William James, faculty had no rank or tenure but were given annually renewable multi-year contracts, at Stockton faculty have instructor and professorial ranks and further, the college requires now terminal degrees for tenure and enforces a tenure quota. Faculty review is much looser at William James; student evaluation instruments have been shoddily constructed and the review and reappointment process has been so byzantine as to produce very little forced turnover. At Stockton, student evaluation of teaching is thoroughly administered with a numerical and essay component, and is taken very seriously; and the faculty review procedure is meticulous and painful,although at both institutions students sit on faculty review committees. Stockton's policy is to have no more than 66 per cent of its faculty tenured throughout the college, and each program has a "trip line" of 50 per cent at which point the program must evaluate its direction and process. With the exception of Ramapo, the other New Jersey state colleges are tenured between 80 and 100 per cent, while Stockton has 75 tenured faculty members out of 173. Several programs are very heavily tenured (History with 72 per cent, Literature and Language with 80 per cent,Physics with 71 per cent, Biology with 71 per cent and Political Science with 67 per cent), while others are quite open (Nursing and Public Health have none tenured, Business has 19 per cent and Informat on Sciences 13 per cent). Some of these programs, of course, are much smaller than others, but if the goal is to provide for flexibility, we can see that there is great imbalance. For innovative teaching there are positive and negative implications to both the Stockton and the William James systems. At William James, faculty stability and

equality meant positively that the accent was on cooperation rather than competition, mutual trust rather than gossip or nasty political maneuvering, mutual trust in course development and policy matters, review for the purposes of improvement rather than punishment, values which the faculty sought to instill in students as well. Negatively, the system was somewhat flabby, making it difficult to exclude less effective teachers, providing little stimulus for externally visible growth in terms of research or intellectual development. Conversely, at Stockton, there has been continued infusion of new blood, a pressure to increase the quality of faculty qualifications and performance, and a greater intellectual worldliness. But on the other hand, students to are urged to "compete more effectively," arbitrary tenure decisions are sometimes made and good teachers lost, faculty must worry about changing standards for tenure and promotion, there is constant political infighting, hiring on the basis of one's one tenurability rather than quality of faculty, and a sense of paranoia and mistrust, particularly during the hectic faculty review season.

If William James considered itself "person-centered," Stockton, too, as recently as the latest college Bulletin declared that "Stockton is more responsive than traditional colleges to the needs of students." Today students no longer enjoy practically unlimited freedom to design their own study plans; the prevailing view is that students want to be told exactly what to do. But even now there are significant opportunities for students to choose and design their own courses, take initiative in formulating independent studies, internships, academic and cocurricular projects, and in influencing personnel and other policy decisions. The Stockton focus on students was shaped not only by the libertarian views of Vice President Tilley and Dean Tompkins. President Bjork took the decisive position that students should be treated as adults, as clients whom the college must serve, indeed as consumers in the educational enterprise--and this had both positive and negative implications both for educational innovation and democratic academic governance.

Adult students were to be responsible for their own education, for designing their own curriculum, and for their way of life at the college. As late as 1979-80, the Stockton Bulletin announced that:

> As citizens, members of th campus community enjoy the same basic rights and are bound by the same responsibilities to respect the rights of others as are all citizens. Among these basic rights are freedom to learn; freedom of speech; freedom of peaceful assembly, association and protest; freedom of political beliefs; and freedom from personal force, violence, abuse, or threats of the same.
> As a citizen, each member of the campus community also has the right to organize his/her personal life and behavior, so long as it does not violate the law or agreements voluntarily entered into and does not interfere with the rights of others or the educational process. The College is not a sanctuary from the law and the College does not stand in loco parentis for its members.

This was demonstrated in the type of student housing provided on the campus, which consisted of garden-style apartments with two bedrooms for four people. To quote the Bulletin:

> College personnel are not responsible for supervising the life styles of residents. Therefore, it is the responsibility of students living in each apartment to agree on practices which will provide satisfactory living and study arrangements for them as roommates...Campus housing is located about two miles from a food market, shopping center and bus line. Therefore, while ride-sharing can usually be arranged, it is helpful to own an automobile.

The college does not provide counseling services, and until recently did not have a health service. This year, more traditional dormitories including a board plan are being built. While students should be treated as adults if that means mutual respect among all members of a college community, to Bjork this apparently meant that you could plop several thousand people in the midst of the pinelands without providing human services such as health, food, and counseling. And a laissez-faire attitude in student housing, with its concentration of energetic young adults often made life difficult for quiet, more studious types--this, plus the existence of a pub on the main campus (but no food service on weekends) contributed to Stockton's ear y reputation as a "party" school.

As I have indicated, and as has been recalled to me by old-time faculty members, President Bjork believed the college should be run on a business or industrial model, in which the students were the clients or consumers, the administration was management--and the faculty were the employees. Management and the Board of Trustees existed to serve and satisfy the customers. Of course this tended to support innovative education, for don't customers always demand something new, something effective, something that has been tested in the marketplace? Courses were indeed offerings, and the students were the customers buying them. Faculty had to sell their courses, advertising them so that students could sign up, and only those were given which had sufficient enrollment. The invisible hand of the market would automatically serve the needs and interests of the students, and faculty would be more active and creative in designing courses instead of offering up the stodgy or the mechanical to a captive audience. The customers were also given the right to evaluate the product through student evaluation of teaching in every course. Finally, students also sat on policy-consulting and faculty review committees. It is clear, however, that much of this student influence was to be brought to bear through the passive mechanism of the market rather than through conscious discussion among a community of learners. During Stockton's first years, a feisty faculty and student body nonetheless challenged the chief manager and bypassed some of the institutions he created, acting instead through a Faculty Assembly and a union affiliated with the New Jersey Federation of Teachers. Bjork earned a reputation for ruthless personnel policies on the administrative level, with the frequent, arbitrary, and sudden hiring and firing of staff, of vice presidents, and of deans. He developed a faculty review procedure which even today makes the halls of the college electric with nervous tension during the months of October and November, leading not only to the forced turnover of a relatively large cohort of faculty each year, but voluntary last-minute resignations. There is a considerable loss of energy as new faculty must be recruited and trained each year, and there have been negative effects on policy continuity and community building, and the slow, uneven development of more democratic college governance.

Perhaps a more positive consequence was that a powerful "revolutionary from above" helped for a time sustain innovation and build an ethos of service to students. There has been no faculty lethargy, and over the years of struggle over the administration and over innovative education, an energetic core of faculty has developed which sees intensive work with students and an innovative interdisciplinary curriculum as its own prerogative, mission and sacred duty.

The third source of tension and potential contradiction lay with the peculiar, and fertile blend of the traditional and the innovative in the curriculum. Stockton offered degree programs or majors in the liberal arts, sciences and professional studies. The planners of the college believed, however, that innovative general education would wither, and be what the recent Carnegie essay calls "the spare room" if it were not given a curriculum and administrative support structure of its own. Most undergraduate programs in the United States strive to provide both breadth and depth. At Stockton, depth would be provided through the degree program courses for majors, and breadth through a separate curriculum of general and liberal studies, and this at first contained the most radical and experimental pedagogy of the college and remains the most innovative and interdisciplinary. Not only are all students required to take courses in general education, but all faculty are commonly responsible for the general education of their students--they are hired as generalists as well as specialists--and they not only are contractually obligated to teach in this curriculum, but are the main political supporters of it, against administrators and some faculty who wish to return to more traditional requirements based on the distribution of introductory survey courses from the various disciplines. The Stockton General Studies curriculum is one of the most innovative and rigorous I have examined, because, first, the ultimate locus of innovation and integration is the faculty member who brings breadth, vision, perspective and critical thinking to his or her course and that faculty member tneds to be both superbly qualified and energetically commited, and, second, because mechanisms have been devised over the years to facilitate collective discussion and review of curricular ideas and standards.

Before outlining this curriculum (and my colleague William Daly presents its features more extensively elsewhere), I must emphasize that the curriculum of the 23 degree or major programs organized into four academic divisions is not entirely traditional, either. The programs range from disciplinary titles such as History, Chemistry and Economics to interdisciplinary programs in the arts and environmental studies, to those which have multidisciplinary bases such as biomedical communications, business, public health, criminal justice, gerontology, and social work. These programs are organized into cross-disciplinary divisions of Arts and Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and Professional Studies. Further, the programs are permeable--faculty members may belong to more than one program--the environmental studies program lists chemists, biologists, historians, geographers, physicists, and the programs are chaired by a coordinator who represents the collective planning of the faculty rather than a chairman who follows the dictates of the administration. Some of these programs have very minimal requirements, leaving it up to the students to design their major (such as Political Science) whereas others (such as Business) prescribe the course of study in detail, emphasizing rigorous courses in calculus and managerial statistics. And even within these programs one finds interdisciplinary and thematic courses such as rural development, handwriting, and "Crimes against the Environment."

From the beginning, therefore, the Stockton curriculum was divided into major degree programs which would provide students with externally sale-able majors but often had an interdisciplinary base, and a separate curriculum of general education which would assure both faculty-wide participation as generalists and a sense of the vital importance and continued visibility of general education. Vice President Tilley set forth some of the initial principles.

He believed that every student should have a wide range of experiences, and that this depends on the presence of instructors who engage students not because they are specialists but because they are "learned men." The curriculum was to prepare students not for specialized study but for "intelligent exploration and productive

independence." Courses were to "represent the belief of the academic community that it is valuable for amateurs to reflect on, talk about, and inquire into the artistic, scientific, and intellectual questions of contemporary civilization." The Division of General Studies was to explore a range of inter-disciplinary programs including foreign area studies, period studies, topical studies, and methodological studies, and draw together faculty and students to propose and produce new programs, and, finally provide opportunities for pedagogical experimentation. Thus, as I have mentioned, in the first years there was a nontraditional grading system, clusters and groups of courses and faculty and students organized into learning communities or collegia, student designed courses and study plans, and an emphasis on affective and experiential learning.

As at William James, this creativity and openness for both faculty and students required massive investments of time and energy. Students increasingly used their freedom of choice to construct very specialized programs instead of breadth, and they were often not prepared in terms of skill and knowledge about areas of study to make the most broadening choices.
spent energy devising more and more complex taxonomies for organizing courses into a bewildering array of categories. The 1975-76 College Bulletin, for example, listed courses under the following headings:

AREA STUDIES
    General: (then a list of courses)
    American: (followed by a list of courses)
ARTS
    General: (followed by a list of courses)
    Media/Visual: "
    Music:
    Theatre:
COMMUNICATION/STUDY SKILLS
CRITICAL THINKING
EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING
    General: "
    Consciousness of Self: "
    Group Interaction: "
GLOBAL ISSUES
GROUPS
    General: "
    Women:
HEALTH
HUMANITIES

HUMANITIES (continued)
General: (followed by a list of courses)
History: "
Literature/Language: "
Philosophy: "
Religion: "
MANAGEMENT
Administration/Business: "
Information Science: "
Urban Studies: "
MATHEMATICS
NATURAL SCIENCES
General: "
Biology: "
Environmental Studies: "
Topics: "
SOCIAL SCIENCES
General: "
Anthropology: "
Criminal Justics: "
Economics: "
Political Science: "
Sociology: "
Psychology: "
Topics: "

At the same time, each individual course, which ranged from American Dialects and The Western Movie to The Law in Your Life and Ritual in Human Experience, was subsumed into the following functional categories: General Disciplines, General Integration and Synthesis, General Life-Skills, General Methods of Inquiry/ Skills of Communication, General Self-Development and General Topics.

Within the last five years, the innovative and transdisciplinary General Studies Program has lost some of its open-endedness and involvement of students and creativity, but it has also lost some of its "flakiness," administrative complexity and conceptual confusion. A series of reforms have been made which provide both structure and flexibility to the program, and in struggling for retention of cross-college commitment to a transdisciplinary general education program against some more traditionalist or elitist faculty and administrators, a core of supportive faculty from all across the college has been developed which considers the curriculum, its goals, and its methods to be its own, and central to the mission of the college to provide a diversity of students (access) with a variety of high-quality educational experiences.

The central assumptions behind the common commitment and shared responsibility of the faculty to transdisciplinary general education still are:

1. In a rapidly changing world, mastery of specialized substantive bodies of knowledge alone provides neither the capacity for continuous learning, and the ability to adapt to changing circumstances, nor the breadth of learning necessary for active and informed roles in the decisionmaking processes affecting self and society. The educational basis for those capacities must include some broad understanding of the relationships among specialized bodies of knowledge, and will enable students to be better specialists by drawing on bodies of knowledge related to their specialties, as well as to move into a different occupat onal specialty if circumstances change.

   (Here we see an approach somewhat resembling the William James doctrine of the relationship between career and liberal education.)

2. Because of the rapid pace of technical, social, and cultural change, we cannot identify a single common core of factual knowledge and specific disciplines which all educated people must share. The goals of breadth of education are not well served by requiring students to take introductory or beginning courses in other disciplines. Breadth of education is different for different students, though all should be engaged broadly with a variety of areas of knowledge.

Three kinds of efforts have been made to provide students with capability for choice, with structure and with flexibility, and they are all based on a cross-curricular and cross-faculty effort:

1. The advising system has been regularized and made organizationally more effective. A special group of preceptors volunteer to advise freshmen, and engage in workshops to sharpen their technical and counseling skills.

2. Stockton has developed one of the most effective Basic Studies and Skills Development programs in the area. It is based on the assumption that:

   a) a core group of specialists in writing and quantitative skills will recruit and train faculty from throughout the college to rotate in teaching basic skills courses. and in integrating skills into their other subject-matter courses. Most developed is a Writing Across the Curriculum Program in which faculty in mathematics, business, social sciences and humanities join in workshops and evaluative and discussion activities to use writing more effectively and intensively in their courses

rigorous
b) . standards are set and enforced by the faculty collectively, and intensive care, support, and attention is provided by the faculty individually to students, with the aid of peer tutors in a Skills Development Center.

3. The General Studies Curriculum has been organized into five curricular categories, with guidelines establishing the kinds of knowledge or modes of inquiry pursued in each category. Students may choose specific courses within those categories, and faculty collectively set the guidelines, and in periodic workshops, collectively discuss and review the courses.

(Here we see Stockton faculty beginning to move in a more collective direction, similar to the course demonstrations which also take place at William James. At Stockton, however, the presence of rank and tenure sometimes make it more difficult to establish the trust and rapport which exists at William James.)

The five categories of courses are

General Arts and Humanities (GAH)

General Natural Sciences and Mathematics (GNM)

General Social Sciences (GSS)

General Interdisciplinary (GEN)

General Integration and Synthesis (GIS)

All of the great varieties of courses previously offered can theoretically fit within these categories, although there has been some retreat into discipline-related and survey courses--all institutions need constant vigilance and revitalization to keep a rich and innovative curriculum. Students must take two courses from the first three categories and one from the last two to fill their minimum General Studies requirement, and then can elect some over and beyond that requirement. The General Integration and Synthesis category is designed for juniors and seniors, for the assumption is that transdisciplinary liberal arts education should continue throughout the student's four years.

Please observe, again, that there is now a more rational structure which does not really inhibit the offering of a great variety of courses. Within these categories, the GEN and GIS categories provide for the greatest experimentation and crossing of traditional boundaries. The General Interdisciplinary

category provides both for the offering of courses which develop generic skills and topics which are not always traditionally offered in a college curriculum, such as courses on Chess, Personal Finance, Wines, Aviation, or Vegetarianism, on the assumption that there should be open spaces in a college curriculum to explore a variety of topics from both a critical academic and experiential point of view.

The interdisciplinary efforts of the college are promoted by the structural ability to phase in and out of the curriculum clusters or seque nces of courses around certain themes, and these are called Topical Concentrations in which students completing five coherent sequences of courses on a particular topic may receive certifications. Currently Women's Studies and Jewish Studies are in place, and other sequences are being considered in Communications, American Studies, and Energy.

Happily, there also remains the possibility for self-motivated students to design their own plan of study individually for a degree in Liberal Studies. The Liberal B.A. is an option for students whose career interests, educational goals, or educational philosophy are not met by any of Stockton's existing degree programs. Students may design a complete 128-credit inter-disciplinary program suited to their individual needs and plans. Students must prepare a proposal of interdisciplinary studies which can be organized around a particular goal, a career, or theme or topic. The student's course of study, which usually contains an extensive and intensive senior project is aided by an individualized committee of two faculty sponsors/advisers and the Dean of General Studies. Only about adozen students have received these kinds of degrees in recent years, but there are about thirty planning them now, and the program may see a revival.

Thus much remains, I believe of the initial assumption of Stockton that the "central learning experience of the university consists in bringing together, and adjusting, the backgrounds and interests of the faculty and the needs, interests, and capacities of students." The faculty have begun more and more to reach out to each other. They reach out beyond their disciplines, because any faculty member may teach in any of the five General Studies categories or sponsor a Liberal B.A. or participate in the

creation of a Topical Concentration. They reach out to students because they discuss pedagogy and skills in workshops, spend an intensive amount of time with student papers and projects and in sponsoring independent studies, and have developed an effective basic studies and writing across the curriculum program. The Admissions Office recruits students from throughout the state. While there has been a recent effort to increase the quality of students and their S.A.T. scores, and the college is becoming more selective, it provides special admissions categories to encourage able students who have not been prepared in a traditional academic manner. One of the most successful and dynamic programs of the college is its summer Economic Opportunity Fund Program. Lasting eight weeks in the summer session, this intesnive program takes 100 high school students from throughout the state who have been academically or economically disadvantaged. The students are given intensive mathematics, reading, writing, speaking and science courses, again by a core of specialists aided by faculty from across the college, who join with peer tutors in engaging in physical exercise in the morning (including running around the college lake), through classes, lunches, study halls, and softball games--an academic boot camp. They are then automatically admitted into the college in September.

The Economic Opportunity Fund Program, them, involves faculty from throughout the college in reaching to high school students from communities in all counties throughout the state. Community involvement, and service to the community was an effort which President Bjork encouraged from the beginning, and this has become a tradition with Stockton faculty, both involvement with the local area community and with their professional community of scholars. Thus, faculty members have indeed published in their own and related fields. Recent examples are books on Anarchist Women, on Juvenile Delinquency, and specialized articles on paleontology and zoology and byzantine church history. Faculty members have studied and consulted at the American Antiquarian Society, at the Jung Institute and University of Zurich, or taken Fulbrights in India. Most significant, however, has been their work individually, with colleagues, and with students in the local area. Several faculty are involved in local politics

and were local delegates to national political conventions.

A professor of business law in the Professional Studies division changed fields, and joined the Arts program, recently receiving a Guggenheim Fellowship to tour the country to do a photographic essay. Conversely, a professor of German learned computer programming and systems analysis, joined the Information Sciences program, but has left academic to earn more money in industry. Environmental Science professors are active in local planning boards, environmental commissions, a Center for Environmental Research, and science museums. A professor of genetics received a National Science Foundation grant to study Pine Barrens Archeology. Several social science professors took note of the rapid economic and social changes occuring in Atlantic City because of the development of the casino and tourist industry and began an Atlantic City Social Change Project. They have produced a collection of studies on the history, sociology, economy and demography of Atlantic City and another on Aging in the local area. Since there is a large proportion of retired persons, the Gerontologt program has special significance for the area, as does a summer Elderhostel college enrichment program for senior citizens. A Speech Pathology clinic and a teacher education program and a local extension of a hospital also serves the local community. A most direct and very recent example of reaching out to the community is the college sponsoring a Community Justice Institute and Center. The Community Justice Institute is sponsored by the division of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and supported by a State Law Enforcement Planning Agency Grant and the local Bar Association. The Community Justice Project develops new alternatives to attempt to resolve community problems and monitors the results. It offers on-site mediation centers and gives training in mediation and conflict resolutions. The approach is to try to resolve interpersonal disputes through means other tha litigation.

The combination of structure and flexibility at the institution and in the curriculum makes possible faculty development, student enterprise, and community service.

Comparative Assessment

Much as I love it, I do not project a strong future for William James College, but would like to evaluate its successes and its weaknesses. I think the curricular scheme, conceptually, of four interrelated, interdisciplinary programs dealing with pressing social and technical issues, with courses and faculty belonging to more than one of those programs was brilliant. I think it did not work out because the college never achieved the critical mass of expert faculty members, a diversity of students including those of higher preparation, and the technical resources to implement this conceptual scheme. The college was very weak in mathematics and laboratory experiences for students and thus could not hope to achieve the sophistication required for a scheme, which, as I have said, was worthy of a postdoctoral program. The college also thought big, and was too bold, and allowed interesting little programs, such as tourism or public relations and adve tising to be taken up by Kirkhof College, while William James was busy with paper conceptual schemes and wrangling about administrative and governance processes. The college's theme--the relationship between career and liberal arts, put most simply, became a theme of all colleges in the seventies, and the College of Arts and Sciences moved more and more in this direction. William James College members were not not ruthless enough or diplomatic enough to defend their turf vis a vis the other units and the central administration of Grand Valley, and thus the central administration and the admissions office more and more forced admission by program rather than by style of a college. William James retained far too long the unnecessary flakiness, instead of examining what was important to the radical ethos of the college and what was mere superficial froth; a stronger personnel and faculty review or faculty accountability policy would have been more useful. The college did not set aside enough time for planning of future programs, faculty development and grant getting to make it more of the independent force which Kirkhof college became.

In many important ways, nonetheless, I think William James was a terrific success. I think aspects of its ideology and conceptual scheme--the four concentration programs, pluralism, pragmatism, and integrative, interdisciplinary and individualized education could well be useful to other colleges, an indeed the idea that the liberal arts are practical and career studies should be done in a liberally educative manner is not unique to William James. I think the college succeeded brilliantly with the overwhelming majority of its students n bringing them from stages of confusion and inarticulateness, from being ill-prepared academically, through emphasis on individual planning and initiative, combined with intense faculty attention, to a relatively high level of sophistication in terms of articulateness, self-direction, practical experience and worldliness--through synoptic experiences on the intellectual community level, through internships and field work including study abroad. I think the college succeeded brilliantly with most of the faculty, who found opportunity for personal and professional enrichment, satisfaction in the progress (palpable progress) made by students, and in projects of their own , within and outside their fields, which they were given the freedom and resources to develop. I believe that some of the ways in which the college was less successful had less to do with internal considerations than with external circumstances and pressures. Even with the best use of resources and political sense, William James College could probably not have successfully competed for primacy among the units in the Grand Valley federation, and a secondary voice meant a subordinate position. If William James had not had to compete with other units and had been given enough "seed resources" at th outset, it might continue with greater momentum today. Most significant, however, I believe is the state of the economy in Michigan. We all know the devastating effect of the Michigan economy (particularly the decline of the Detroit automobile industry) has had on education in the state. Grand Valley is hit particularly hard because of the location and setting of its campus, which relies so much on a commuter clientele which works at least part time. The costs of student commuting and of energy on the isolated campus itself are overwhelming. Cluster colleges indeed duplicate services, and in order to consolidate, Grand Valley did have to put

pressure on the individual clusters to avoid duplication, and to meet the needs of a more cautious, conservative student clientele. As usual, however, the administration was in many ways inclined to lead in the process of greater traditionalism, rather than deal with economic problems more imaginatively. Whereas in the early seventies, Grand Valley proclaimed proudly: "Grand Valley Gives You a Choice" by the late seventies it concluded lamely and blandly, "Where Good Things Are Happening," surely a sign of weakness and defensiveness. The view seems to be that Grand Valley as a whole should be a traditional liberal arts college and serve the pre-professional and semi-professional needs of the local communities, and this view forgets that there are other educational institutions in the area which can provide the same services, and the distinctiveness and dynamism of the campus depended upon the colorful variety of its colleges, and the enrgy, imagination and community service which exuded from the students and faculty of those colleges.

I think that Stockton, too, finds itself at a crossroads, but I tend to think that its future looks brighter. Let me look first, however, at some sources of weakness and erosion. At Stockton, too, there has been a sense of increasing conservatism and traditionalism among some students, faculty, and administrators. I think Stockton gave up some of its most useful and innovative experiments much too easily and much too early--a more intensive advising system, clusters of faculty, students, and courses working on common themes, team teaching, varieties of pedagogy, experiential learning, colorful lifestyles among students and faculty (not including the beer culture of the "party school" image). It gave up too soon and too early on changing the nature of major program requirements to parallel its General Studies Program--I do not think programs should have as many requirements and introductory courses as they now do, because General Studies courses should provide breadth of learning skills. I think that programs should be more permeable and interdisciplinary and less discipline=based than th y have become. I think the college should not have fallen so easily into a more traditional grading system, Faculty should make a greater effort, not only to teach in courses, but to inculcate a particular ethos and individual

student initiative in course and program design, but in instilling a sense of community identity. This is particularly difficult, because of the way that faculty were hired in the early days of the college, which provided not only for diversity but for deep schism within the faculty. Stockton did not have a traditional College of Arts and Sciences to contend with, as did William James, but there are significant clusters of very traditionalist faculty who do not share any sympathy for innovative education within both the Division of Arts and Humanities and, somewhat less militantly, within the Division of Professional Studies. Stockton is blessed, however, with faculty within each of the divisions and renewed cohorts of faculty who are open to the idea of innovative education, and it is unfortunate that many arts and sciences professors do not appreciate the potential of their colleagues in career-related fields.
In addition to a faculty with conflicting views, and students who might not understand the ethos of the college and need socialization, Stockton has to cope with the heritage of an extremely authoritarian administrative structure and painful faculty review policies, and a tradition of rapid and arbitrary firings and large turnover of faculty and staff. This makes a sense of community of trust, of sharing of interdisciplinary experiences difficult to achieve. Much energy is dissipated on vigorous political -- infighting among faculty and administrators, and this has led to an atmosphere of paranoia, defensiveness and isolation. The association of Stockton w th a more centralized state college bureaucratic structure has both advantages and disadvantages. The amount of petty paperwork--all requisions and vouchers must go through Trenton--is overwhelming, and yet the centralization makes it possible to assume the balanced continued coexistence of the various state colleges, and I believe that Stockton is the most dynamic of them. I believe that many of the problems of Stockton can be solved in a creative and productive manner, however, and would assert that its strengths and potential far outweigh its weaknesses.

These strengths include:

1) A dynamic core of faculty who can be mobilized politically in favor of transdisciplin ary, innovative education which emphasizes the use of skills development and exciting themes in courses, as against some more traditional faculty and administrators. This core can make use of similar "populist" sentiments among a Board of Trustees which has frequently, however, acted in an arbitrary and interventionist manner.

2) A program of skills development and writing courses which makes use o: a core of specialists and faculty rotating from throughout the college to teach basic skills and writing courses. The pedagogy is both very rigorous and applies intensive personal care to students.

3) A faculty who are highly qualified, energetic, committed and dedicated. The quality of instruction and the rigor of standards is higher than at most state colleges. Further, faculty are beginning to move from the individualistic spirit of early days to a collective sharing of interdisciplinary course materials, and a collective setting of standards. The level of faculty intellectual life, of energy committed to students and quality, rigorous teaching remains very high.

4) A program of General Studies which provides both an intelligent structure which all can relate to, and opportunity for great diversity in subject matter and teaching style.

5) Great attention to teaching through faculty workshops, and an increasing concern with articulating more effectively to students, to the local community, and to the outside world, the kinds of efforts Stockton is pursuing.

6) A faculty which seems to be going in the direction of greater initiative to maintain an imaginative curriculum, access to a diversity of students, and high-quality education. The faculty is also coordinating better to put pressure on the administration to maintain innovative programs.

7) A continuing tradition of studnt and faculty initiative in developing appropriate projects and enterprises,The combination of the traditional and the innovative will be a source of strength and continuity for the college. Students are able to present traditional majors to employers, yet the structures of the college permit great curricular choice in general education, in combining clusters of interdisciplinary courses, and in allowing self-motivated students to design their own plans of study.

8) An institution which is well-organized, particularly in terms of admissions policies, relations with the state college bureaucracy, a basic studies program, and community projects. The institution has the potential to become a high-quality residential state college (thus overcoming the danger of commuter colleges in an age of energy crises) and a college which continues to reach out to a diverse student body. Despite economic and resource pressures from state government, a good quality plant and basic resources continues to exist.

If both William James and Stockton continue to flourish, however, they will do so primarily because of the energy and commitment of their respective faculties, which must be the guardians of the productive innovations which were made in the sixties and seventies. Faculty development and faculty interaction at each innovative institution, and in networks of innovative colleges throughout the country, should therefore be prime objectives for those of us who wish to make use of this heritage.

I believe that at William James and at Stockton significant practices of the sixties and seventies remain embeded and will continue to be useful to imilar institutions, and they all center on the idea of faculty reaching out beyond their disciplines reaching out to students, and reaching out to communities. I think certain important practices have achieved legitimacy, such as:

1) Organizing general education into interdisciplinary learning experiences;
2) Emphasizing active and experiential learning, providing opportunity for the individualized planning of student study plans by students in consultation with faculty, providing independent studies and internships;
3) Looking at students and at the four-year college experience as a developmental process, with attention both to cognitive and affective learning;
4) The integration of skills with content area courses and the responsibility of faculty from throughout disciplines and areas for skills and other common educational experiences
5) Figuring out ways to teach career-related skills in a critical liberal arts manner, and demonstrating the practicality of the liberal arts, and the mutual relationship of career studies and liberal learning;
6) Cooperative study and research projects among faculty and among faculty and undergraduate students;
7) Student participation in course and faculty evaluation, and participation in campus committees;

In sum, I would say that integration takes place on the level of the individual faculty and the individual student, and care must be taken to develop their interests and commitments, and interaction with each other. Rigid requirements must not be reinstated, for there is no one way to do higher education, and we must continue to experiment with a variety of approaches. Theory and practice must be rleated, and learning should not only be interdisciplinary, but active, and studentz and faculty should be given opportunity and encouragement t reflect on the process of education itself, and on their relationship to their communities and society. Innovative state colleges must perforce operate in a highly visible social and political context, and should not only take that context into acount, but should glory in their mission to take a diverese body of students and through intense effort and imaginative teaching bring them rapidly up to a high lefel of skills, intellectual and social awareness, and worldly sophistication.

It pays society to democratize education, to create an intelligentsia of working people who have an understanding of the world, who will be self-assertive, who will be able to make informed choices and decisions about the difficult questions we confront in the areas of energy, resource allocations, world population and distribution of wealth, the power of corporations and international corporate and resource cartels, and the arms race.

It pays society to democratize education.

#