THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA CRUZ: INSTITUTIONALIZING EDEN IN A CHANGING WORLD

Evergreen Conference on Innovative Education
September 8-10

George Von der Muhll
Merrill College
University of California, Santa Cruz

Academic innovations appear doomed to a predictable trajectory. With much fanfare, a bold new venture in higher education is launched. Lovingly drafted prospectuses contrast the promise inherent in its pathbreaking instructional program with the deficiencies of "traditional" collegiate curricula. Intellectually adventurous faculty and students are invited to apply; foundations are approached for funds to sustain the undertaking in its early years. If well conceived, and fueled by further inputs of publicity and financial support, the experiment attracts many of the university world's best and brightest into its orbit. For perhaps a decade its precepts evoke wide discussion. Then, with an inevitability suggesting the operation of a gravitational law, the enterprise begins to sink slowly below the horizon of public consciousness, its innovatory impetus spent. Enrollments drop; the more academically mobile administrators and faculty move on. Those who remain are left to allocate the blame for the wreckage.

In its sixteen years of operation, the University of California campus at Santa Cruz has traversed this readily recognizable arc. Its recent decline into a marginally differentiated member of that system may therefore bear many aspects of a twice-told tale. It is a tale that bears retelling. For the Santa Cruz campus was not subject, through much of its history, to many of the forces most commonly associated with the demise of utopian experiments. It was in no simple sense the product of a single founder's inspiration. Its first chancellor displayed from his inauguration a political scientist's sophisticated attentiveness to the organizational incentives required to institutionalize his innovations. Backed by the treasury of a State-supported university system, its academic program did not depend on the transient enthusiasm of private donors for its survival. And perhaps no experimental pattern of instruction in recent decades addressed itself more directly and more self-consciously to a more widely perceived malaise in American university life. Those who retain an expansive faith in the margin for innovation in higher education have reason to look closely at this poignant case.

I. FLOWERING OF A VISION

Seldom have circumstances more favored the founding of an experimental campus than in the early 1960s. California in those affluent years was rapidly becoming the wealthiest, most populous State in the Union. In that fabulous kingdom by the sea, the most dazzling anticipations soon merged with reality in upwardly spiraling trends. Unguardedly optimistic forecasts proved underestimates in retrospect. And as economic productivity soared, so did the demand for higher education.

Already in 1957 a study by the State Department of Finance had projected the swelling of two of the University of California's six campuses to some 40,000 students apiece in little more than a decade unless new campuses were built. But public support for higher education had likewise reached previously unimagined heights. To most California voters, education seemed intimately connected with economic growth. In the heady atmosphere of the times, the case for expansion stated itself.

In October of that year, the Regents of the University of California announced their election of Clark Kerr as president of the system. They promptly authorized him to add three new campuses to the original six. In short order, the necessary bonds secured approval. Yet merely providing new space for old patterns of instruction was hardly what the newly selected president had in mind. No one understood more clearly the emerging limits of mammoth "multiversities" than the man who coined the phrase.[1] Casual readers have sometimes assumed that Kerr endorsed the development he later described. Kerr did believe, to be sure, that large taxpayer-supported universities must serve many clienteles; but he had also taken note of the costs of surrendering uncritically to those pressures. Long before the Berkeley "free speech" movement burst like a thunderclap across the land, its former chancellor had had ample opportunity to observe at first hand the alienating impact on students of rigidly departmentalized campuses largely dominated by their organized research units and their graduate and professional schools.

Under Kerr's leadership, each of the three new University of California campuses would mark an important departure from traditional patterns of university organization. Yet with noteworthy but ultimately marginal variations, the first two were expected to pursue instruction and research along familiar lines. These lines had already established the University of California as one of the

nation's leading universities. They had also increasingly raised questions about the criteria used in that judgment. For the ninth campus, Kerr therefore reserved a more radical charter. On former Cowell Foundation ranchland above the aging seaside resort of Santa Cruz he hoped to bring into being nothing less than a pilot plant to test the University's capacity for self-renewal.

Kerr's operational program for institutional renewal had matured over many years. As a graduate student at Stanford, he had had numerous occasions (so legend holds) to compare his undergraduate years at Swarthmore with those of his roommate from UCLA. They had concluded at that time that the ideal campus would combine the research facilities and egalitarian accessibility of a large public university with the student-centered intimacy of a Swarthmore. For nearly four decades that envisaged union of seeming incompatibilities had remained untested. But now, as president of the largest university in the United States, Kerr was in a position to offer his former roommate the chance to prove the practicability of their ideal. In July of 1961, he appointed Dean McHenry founding chancellor of the proposed University of California at Santa Cruz.

McHenry came well-prepared for the assignment. Somewhat of a utopian socialist in his earlier years, he had developed, while on the political science faculty of UCLA, a shrewd, clearsighted understanding of California politics.[2] Restoring unity to the "multiversity" was for him a congenial charge. He set about it with a combination of exploratory openness and practical assurance that quickly drew others in his train.[3]

Santa Cruz, he promised, would deliberately take on the challenge of countering the isolating, dehumanizing pressures of contemporary university life. Living and learning would be combined at modest cost in an enriching formula hitherto restricted to the most exclusive of private institutions. Undergraduates and graduates alike would be offered centering, self-exploratory, increasingly self-directed education of uncompromising quality in a sylvan setting unparalleled in the nation. Faculty members would be expected to work closely with students at all levels without distinction.

Others had made such claims before. But Santa Cruz would differ from other experimental ventures in one crucial respect. As a public institution, it could not limit its admissions to a carefully selected elite. On the contrary, McHenry reiterated, the campus would fully accept its obligation to serve the taxpayers of one of the largest, most occupationally diverse, most ethnically heterogeneous of the States. It would therefore have to resolve the eternal tension between quality and quantity in education; and it would do so through its design. Santa Cruz would develop as a series of small residential "Colleges"

surrounding laboratories and a library appropriate to a full-scale university. Centering instruction in the Colleges would enable the campus to retain its intimate quality while accommodating first the thousands, and then the tens of thousands, of socially diverse but academically qualified high school graduates that a State university was charged with enrolling. Although systemwide plans called for Santa Cruz to accept in time as many students as the giant campuses at Berkeley and Los Angeles, it would continue (in the words of President Kerr) to "seem small as it grows larger". That feat was one other universities serving similar clienteles might well wish to study.

Such were the most immediately striking elements of the prospectus that Kerr and McHenry offered the California public. But around these elements clustered a penumbra of larger, less readily articulated concerns. The Santa Cruz campus was being founded at a time of confluence between rampant opportunity and growing unease in the academic world. Headlong expansion, proliferating specialties, successful performance in the market for foundation and governmental grants, limited institutional loyalty and an increasing search for recognition from prestigious external peer groups--these had become the hallmarks of dynamism in the American universities of the period. Mirrored in these preoccupations, still faint but ever more distinct, one could discern the values of corporate capitalism. In the pursuit of such excellence universities risked losing their integrity. Inevitably, the Santa Cruz experiment became invested with the anxieties and aspirations of an era. Here was a campus that sought alternatives to the impersonal, fiercely competitive pressures on which leading American universities had come to rely for extruding achievements from their students and faculty. Its proposed design raised hopes that, without retreating from the frontiers of scholarly research, a campus could find the means to offset the centrifugal forces of grant-oriented professionalism that elsewhere were fractioning university campuses into isolated institutes. From this perspective, anchoring both faculty and students to the College system seemed not merely a means of facilitating contact between the two; even more, that anchoring might prove a structural precondition for maintaining the centrality of a liberal education. Santa Cruz came conspicuously into being as a product of its times. Somehow, in the flowery glades of the Coastal Range, it would also insulate itself against the predominant values of those times. By restoring old values to their proper primacy in the educational process, Santa Cruz would clear the way for the blossoming of the new.

Not surprisingly, this vision of a radical return to a Garden of Eden intrigued the educational world. It assured the Santa Cruz experiment a scrutiny reaching well beyond the borders of California. It forcefully posed questions as to a university's capacity to change an encompassing society without being changed in the process. And it fastened on the campus itself a restrictive legacy. Form could never, in this mission, be incidental to the ends served by the form. At Santa Cruz, form quickly became the end.

II. INSTITUTIONALIZING UTOPIA

On one point the founders of the Santa Cruz campus largely remained in agreement. Insofar as the inevitable limits of human imagination and resources permitted, the campus in its entirety was to express an integrated utopian vision. Little that later struck its visitors was accidental. From its forest-encircled parking lots to its program of interdisciplinary study, from the refusal to build a faculty club to the deliberate deemphasizing of competitive sports, its distinguishing features reflected a fundamental rethinking of the organizing principles of university life. Whether viewed as an ecological design, a set of administrative arrangements, a curriculum, or an expected form of faculty-student interaction, the distinctive patterns of Santa Cruz could be read as an ambitious, often novel, and highly self-conscious thesis concerning the proper goals of higher education. The soberest planning documents from its early years crackle with barely suppressed excitement at that mission. Repeatedly one encounters there a repudiation of the notion that Santa Cruz was to be merely the ninth campus (so many additional square feet of classroom space, so many beds, so many full-time equivalent faculty positions) within the settled system of the University of California.

The founders of Santa Cruz were not, of course, allowed completely free rein in designing their academic utopia. Their campus was to be a unit of a state university; and over the previous century that university had evolved an imposing corpus of standards and procedures within a frame defined by the Constitution of California, the California Master Plan for Higher Education, the standing orders of the University of California's governing body of Regents, and the regulations of its Academic Senate. "We were handed the chalk and invited to write on the blackboard," its founding chancellor was later to remark, "but the slate was not unmarked."[4] Even before the campus had opened, Chancellor McHenry had found it expedient to allay Regental fears concerning the projected "country club" appearance of the campus through a pledge that the plans for Santa Cruz would be realized at no greater cost in public funds per student than on any other campus of the University. More intangibly, a taxpayer-supported university campus had to take into account prevailing public expectations regarding a public institution of higher learning. These were generally fluid in California in the tolerant early 'sixties, and mediated in any case through the University's Board of Regents; but they could not be presumed to be indefinitely elastic.

Nevertheless, these constraints were on the whole quite loose. In an era of rapid growth and growing dissatisfaction with established patterns of education, a small campus could expect an ample initial margin for experiment. This margin was widened in the case of Santa Cruz by the shared vision and close working relationship of its chancellor and President Kerr. And the Santa Cruz campus possessed, in addition, the great advantage of virgin birth. It did not have to expand laterally or downward, absorbing and adjusting to the faculty and facilities of an existing institution, as was the case with all but one other of the more recently established University of California campuses; nor did its founders have to implement their reforms from within, as did Robert Hutchins at the University of Chicago or James Conant at Harvard. Santa Cruz was not one experimental college on a larger campus, but an entity unto itself. For most purposes, the existing University of California system acted not as a source of restriction but as a context of opportunity. Certainly it was in this spirit that the founders proceeded to draft their plans.

Despite careful examination of several possible prototypes, the planners found little to guide them in their search for a collegiate system appropriate to their mission.[5] Many felt an instinctive initial attraction to the College-centered education offered undergraduates at Oxford and Cambridge: Kerr himself had declared that a university could aim no higher than "to be as British as possible for the sake of the undergraduates."[6] On closer consideration, however, they could see that the radical separation of teaching and examining functions and the leisurely, empirical evolution of a curriculum out of faculty-intensive one-to-one tutorials for a selected clientele of students sharply limited the relevance of these models for a newly-founded State campus in California. Ivy League university colleges did not confront the problems of scale anticipated at Santa Cruz. In many cases, they had become overshadowed by their graduate schools. Nowhere, in fact, had planners faced so complex yet so ambitiously open-ended a mandate to provide an innovative form of education so quickly for so many students.

Lacking precedents, the task force created its own. Like many utopian planners, McHenry and the small group of faculty and career administrators he gathered around him appear to have felt the impulse to prescribe with unusual care in unusual detail the features that were to give their planned community its innovative characteristics. These impulses were held in tension, on the other hand, with McHenry's recognition, as a professional student of collective behavior, that the most lasting innovations often unfold organically from the

disaggregated daily choices of those who have been recruited to carry forward a common enterprise.[7] In any case, the very novelty of the undertaking, together with regental pressure to open quickly, precluded decisions in advance in many important areas. The task force therefore came up with a mixture of highly specific prescription and deliberately open-ended delegation of future choice. McHenry and his planners gave particular attention to the structure of authority--who would participate in deciding what issues, with what supply of incentives to help make their preferences prevail. They also addressed themselves in depth to certain questions regarding the physical and social organization of the campus which, through prior definition, would symbolically communicate the value premises appropriate to future decisions. What the substantive content of many non-constitutional issues should be--even in so sensitive an area as that of which disciplines should be represented in what proportions on campus--they left to the future.

Amid the multitude of proposals and commitments appearing in early exchanges among the campus planners and between them and various outside agencies, a few indicate with particular clarity the innovatory pattern of education to be pursued at Santa Cruz:

1. With many parallel objectives in view the campus was given an isolated pastoral setting recalling the ambience of a Cistercian monastery. Spectacularly located on a mountain slope well above the Pacific, and encircled in the remaining three directions by many miles of dense forest, it visibly disengaged its members from the outer world, enclosing them in the prescriptive social network of the university community itself. The new campus was unique--perhaps in the world; certainly in the United States--in the degree to which nature was left to dominate artifice. Cows from the former Cowell Ranch continued to graze in the acres of rolling meadows separating the main entrance gate from the initially invisible college buildings. Deer--and sometimes a coyote--still emerged near the dormitories at dusk. Paths from the classrooms to the library were laid out to wind through dells providing a natural backdrop for performances of Shakespeare's A Midsummer-Night's Dream; even the central administrative building was lost in the largely undisturbed redwood forest. To provide seating for campuswide assemblies and ceremonies, a Grecian amphitheater was hewed out of the depths of a limestone quarry, its dimensions adding further mythological intimations to an arcadian landscape Poussin might have painted. On every bridge, at every bend in the pathways, students were implicitly invited to dream new dreams, far from the busy haunts of man.[8]

2. Residential Colleges were adopted as the basic planning unit for the campus. Approximately fifty faculty and six hundred students were to be assigned to each College, and the majority of the students were to be housed and fed there as well. Classrooms and faculty offices were included in the cluster of College buildings in the hope of promoting a web of acquaintanceship among faculty and students. Each College was provided with a small administrative staff to manage the dormitories, maintain students' academic records, help organize their social life, and offer them advising and counseling assistance; and the Colleges as a whole were to be headed by faculty Provosts, whose broad but formally undefined responsibilities placed them one step below the chancellorial office in the administrative hierarchy.

3. Though in varying proportions, each College was to include faculty from every discipline represented on campus among its Fellows. All faculty, moreover, were to hold College appointments.[9] The rule of relative uniformity of disciplinary distribution was formally justified by the assumed need of each College to maintain a full complement of advisers for its entering undergraduates. An important practical effect of this presupposition once several Colleges had opened, however, was to preclude the concentration of more than a small fraction of the faculty members of any one discipline in any single College.

4. The Provost and founding Fellows of each College were expected to develop a leading "theme" for the College that would give it a distinctive axis of orientation. Necessarily, this theme would be interdisciplinary in character. The chosen theme of the College was to be reflected in its version of the introductory core course the campus would require all entering first-year students to take. It was also to affect the choice of such other courses as the Fellows might teach under College auspices. As undergraduates were expected to do most of their lower-division and some of their upper-division work in their Colleges,[10] the College theme would provide a basis for selecting students and faculty most suited to the interests of the College.

5. Within the interdisciplinary environment sustained by the Colleges, the faculty were to evolve "a restricted curriculum, designed mainly to serve students' needs rather than reflect faculty interests."[11] This worthy goal was to be accomplished in several ways. It implied, to begin with, that faculty would pool their resources in large-scale collaborative efforts to provide students with a firm grounding in the core elements of a liberal education. Only later, when students had acquired a more informed base for making disciplinary and pre-professional commitments, would they be invited to choose among a carefully selected group of Upper Division courses. "Non-proliferation" served as a watchword of early faculty committees on courses: there was a presumption against filling the campus catalog with advanced-level disciplinary courses that might signify a diversion of energy from meeting the core needs of the curriculum.[12] No faculty were to be exempt from teaching undergraduate courses. As a further check on fragmentation of faculty and student energy, the first Academic Plan included the provision that all courses were to be taught as "full courses" for five units of credit so that a student would normally carry no more than three courses in any one Academic Quarter.

6. All students, not merely the more demonstrably proficient, would be entitled--indeed, encouraged--to arrange courses of independent study, and even an independently designed major, with appropriate faculty, preferably within their College. Required comprehensive examinations or senior theses as the terminus of a major similarly pointed toward expectations of independent work on the part of each student. Considerations of cost ruled out reliance on one-to-one (or even group) tutorials as the primary mode of instruction. As at other universities, scheduled courses with final examinations or papers would form the basic building blocks of the curriculum. But early documents and statements anticipated that faculty-student interaction in the Colleges would lead to collaborative exploration of an individuated synthesis of knowledge.[13] "The pursuit of truth in the company of friends," the motto of Santa Cruz's first College, might readily have served for the campus as well.

Much simplified, with much omitted, these were the contours of the educational environment that Chancellor McHenry and his associates laid out in their blueprints

for the campus. The leading strokes were bold enough; only time could show whether the finer lines of daily practice would eventually efface the original imprint. But no political scientist with McHenry's administrative experience would leave this development to chance. Patterns of human behavior, he had much reason to know, do not maintain themselves. His task force therefore planned the distribution of the political resources of the campus with care. It used them to motivate key actors to continue acting in accordance with the prescriptions of the founders' plan.

Some of the resources were merely facilitative. By creating the Colleges as the central units of the Academic Plan, the founders created agencies that could offer powerful inducements to obtain the loyalty of their faculties and students. Colleges were given broad authority to sponsor courses. They provided their faculties with office space and parking space, and harbored steno pools at which faculty received messages and mail and had their typing done. College Common Rooms were used for sherry hours, and College dining halls for weekly evenings of entertainment to which faculty and their spouses were regularly invited. Provosts were allotted various funds they could use to support collegiate academic programs and to hire short-term faculty to enrich the College offerings. They could parlay the name and organizational resources of the College to secure outside grants--in some cases exceeding a million dollars--with which to construct College libraries and recreation centers, and fountains and art galleries, sponsor resident chamber orchestras, and extend the range of academic programs. Since even classrooms were located in the Colleges, many students and faculty would find little occasion to move outside the College precincts for weeks at a time.

But the Colleges were also granted more direct methods of sustaining faculty loyalty to their programs.[14] They were to share with disciplinary groups the responsibility for initiating the recruitment of a candidate for the faculty. No faculty member could be hired without the express approval of the College of which the candidate was to become a Fellow.[15] Before granting that approval, the Provost and the College faculty personnel committee were expected to inquire closely into the alignment of the candidate's academic interests with those of the College program. Thereafter, the Colleges would pay fifty percent of the faculty member's salary; in exchange, they would expect each faculty member to teach at least one and generally two courses of interest to the College,[16] to undertake a share of student advising, to be available to qualified students wishing to pursue independent studies under College auspices, and to participate

fully in the institutional life of the College (which, during the founding years of each College, was foreseen to be extensive). On the occasion of each personnel action, a faculty personnel committee of the College was required to submit a letter commenting on the Fellow's record of teaching and administrative services for the College, relations with students, academic colleagueship, and (within the bounds of the committee's professional competence to judge) research accomplishments; to this an independent letter from the College Provost would be appended. The extraordinary complexity of the University of California's personnel procedures precluded any firm statement as to the weight to be given these letters. That it was to be considerable was clear.

The founders of the campus saw plainly, however, that inducements to faculty to participate in developing experimental College-centered curricula would prove ineffectual if overbalanced by pressures emanating from sources that on other campuses had been blamed for having exacted conformity to conventional patterns of education. They therefore deliberately set out to check, weaken, or at least retard the growth of such pressures.

Most cited among these agencies was the academic department; Santa Cruz would therefore have no departments. The Academic Plan acknowledged the inevitability--and even, to some limited extent, the desirability--of grouping faculty according to their specialties:

> ...in many fields, distinction is unlikely to be achieved without a critical minimum of colleagues who associate frequently and who have access to appropriate facilities....Contacts by discipline with colleagues in other institutions, and in learned societies... are desirable to place students, to find outlets for creative work, and to secure informed reactions to one's ideas and experiments.[17]

But this acknowledgment of professional concerns was to be institutionalized through creating three comprehensive "Divisions"--the Divisions of Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences. Under the administration of three Vice Chancellors (later Deans), the three Divisions received all non-collegiate instructional funds. They were to participate in recruiting regular ("ladder") faculty, to pay 50% of their salaries, and to provide the requisite complementary assessments of professional accomplishment in all personnel actions.[18] But by no oversight whatever, no reference was made in the 1965 Academic Plan to the formation of any sub-divisional administrative structures. The only injunction was a negative one to the Colleges: "To encourage interdisciplinary cooperation and to minimize particularism, there will be no formal departmental organization within the colleges."[19]

Graduate and professional schools were the other perceived threat to the student-centered, interdisciplinary form of education the Colleges proposed to offer. Experience on other campuses suggested that these schools, whether by magnetic example or by active intervention, tended to exercise a pervasive influence on the undergraduate curriculum, converting it into a preparatory conduit for specialized advanced-level education while enticing professors into the hidden recesses of the laboratory, the library, the graduate seminar room, and the contractual grants office.[20] Those who most enjoyed such precincts, and who had made their professional reputation through sticking close to them, could be expected to have little sympathy for the experimental objectives of the collegiate curriculum envisaged for Santa Cruz. Graduate programs were therefore to be developed slowly and gingerly, leaving time for the Colleges to take firm root and to institutionalize the commitments required to prevent their faculties from reverting to patterns of behavior acquired on conventional campuses. Full-scale doctoral programs would take time to develop in any case, and professional schools would have to be deferred until systemwide planning had determined their proper location and character. From the point of view of the campus planners, these limitations were not to be regretted.

Such, in sum, were the organizational dimensions to the efforts to institutionalize innovation on the campus. Through clustering students and faculty in relatively small interdisciplinary Colleges, through decentralizing many salient administrative functions to these agencies, and through providing them with the resources to promote their interests and resist absorption into larger units, the founders had done what they could to provide the administrative correlates to their vision of a hybrid university retaining interdisciplinary intimacy in a context of scheduled expansion. The question remained of whether these necessary conditions would develop into sufficient conditions for such growth. It was a question only subsequent faculty, staff, and students could answer. When all the physical structures had been built and occupied, when all the lines of authority were in place, when all the goals had been specified and the faculty and staff recruited to implement them, the success of the enterprise would inescapably still hinge on whether the formally controlling ideals of the founders became internalized by the campus community and subsequently became manifest in a continuous flow of daily transactions. And whether this development would occur would itself depend heavily (since the role of "student" or "faculty member" is only one of many roles that any human being brings to a university campus) on the quality of the personal interchanges that would grow up around the formally prescribed purposes of the institution.

Two points stand out in this overview of the qualities the early planners hoped to institutionalize on their campus. The first is that their vision emerges most clearly in matters of procedure. With its careful allocation of administrative resources, its deliberate structuring of incentives, its checks and balances, its efforts to dissipate unwelcome pressures it could not altogether suppress, the plan strikingly resembles the cunning contrivance of eighteenth century constitutional inventors. Montesquieu and Madison would have found much to applaud in its ingenious alignment of forces. To be sure, there was much emphasis as well in the plan on communitarian values, on the humanizing virtues of intimacy and natural beauty, quite foreign to those thinkers. But that emphasis, however sincerely maintained, could not but acquire very quickly a patina of familiarity. In their abstractness, such aspirations sound common to any educational enterprise. The founders of Santa Cruz offered no new prescription for the integration of learning with labor, no new thoughts concerning the life of the mind and the life of the world. Their venture held the mind, then and now, not through its objectives but through its strategy for reaching them. It promised to stand apart from other anti-traditional undertakings through the institutional protection it would offer to innovative impulses.

This predominantly procedural profile is closely connected to a second general aspect of the plan. With all its lofty idealism, despite its unmistakably generous and hopeful overtones, the founders' vision was an essentially negative vision. On one point only were they clear beyond controversy: Santa Cruz was not to become another Berkeley. Berkeley, despite the international reputation of its faculty and the prestige of its graduate schools, conspicuously concentrated on its campus all the forces that Santa Cruz wished to hold at bay. Its undergraduates disappeared from sight in long lines before central administrative buildings. They sat in lecture audiences of several hundreds in Berkeley's giant auditoriums. Powerfully entrenched departments and graduate faculties had captured its curriculum. Its younger instructors were held severely accountable to professional standards devised by research-oriented senior professors rarely visible on campus; its increasingly anomic community could only be drawn together by inflamatory rallies in Sproul Plaza. It was, in a few words, too big, too impersonal, too stratified, too rigid, too fragmented.

Such an image might be a caricature, and one laced with significant exceptions. Nevertheless, it was the image that gave the founders of Santa Cruz their mission. Such consistency as can be found among their goals derives from this negative identity. A small-college atmosphere was desirable because

Berkeley's units were too large in scale. The curriculum at Santa Cruz would be interdisciplinary because Berkeley's was unequivocally disciplinary. It would give undergraduate studies central attention because Berkeley was too graduate-oriented; its return to a traditional "Liberal Arts" emphasis would be "innovatory" because Berkeley served too many external constituencies too uncritically. It would emphasize friendship and community in learning because Berkeley had pulverized its community through fiercely competitive pressures. In the early days, Santa Cruz saw little need for explicit scrutiny and defense of these values. The evils of Berkeley appeared evident to all. In the longer run, as the equilibrium of societal values shifted back again toward Berkeley, this overmasteringly dialectical relationship between the two campuses was to provide a rigidity of its own that threatened the very survival of the more vulnerable institution.

III. SYSTEM UNDER STRESS

In the fall of 1965, the faculty and students of Cowell College assembled in trailers in an open meadow to inaugurate the first classes of the new university campus. Even before the paint and plaster had dried on Cowell's freshly constructed pergolas and belvederes, Santa Cruz was beginning to acquire an identity. On campus, as in the academic world at large, it was perceived and welcomed as an open-ended experiment. Faculty, students, and administrators throughout the country were soon applying for openings in the radiantly stated belief that the academic charter of Santa Cruz provided not so much a program as an invitation. This view likewise surfaced repeatedly in discussions of the faculty's Academic Senate, where all traditional practices appeared open to scrutiny and the most novel suggestions for improvement obtained at least a respectful hearing.[21] On other University of California campuses, stereotypical views of Santa Cruz developed quickly: life was agreeably undemanding there; personal values reigned supreme; teaching took precedence over research; the curriculum was anti-disciplinary, perhaps irresponsibly so; an academic counter-culture was rapidly becoming entrenched. Santa Cruz, for better or worse, was different.

For a while, the difference seemed for the better. Santa Cruz had little need to publicize its virtues; that work was done for it by others. National journals--and not only those devoted to education--found the combination of natural beauty and the novel collegiate system an irresistible attraction. One editor of a distinguished monthly even spent a term in residence and wrote a glowing account of his experience. With little difficulty, the administration obtained a Ford Foundation Venture Grant to deepen and extend the collegiate program. Internationally celebrated faculty from the leading universities in the country responded readily to the invitation to teach--or to found a new College--at Santa Cruz. Soon they--and an ambitious junior faculty--added further to the luster of the campus with an imposing harvest of Guggenheim and Fulbright awards.

In their wake came a tide of students. Until well into the 'seventies, Santa Cruz was obliged to redirect the applications of four out of five qualified applicants to other campuses of the University.[22] Those it retained were from California's most academically promising students. For several years, among California educational institutions listed in the reports of the American

Council of Education only the California Institute of Technology significantly outranked Santa Cruz in terms of the combined mathematical and verbal Scholastic Aptitude Test scores of its enrolled first-year students. Nationally, Santa Cruz was outscored in this respect by at most two dozen top-ranked private institutions. At the other end of the process, the better Santa Cruz students obtained admission in large numbers, often with handsome fellowships, to graduate schools at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Stanford, and the University of Chicago. The rate of acceptance of pre-med students at medical schools ranked steadily among the highest in the country.

Internal developments gave substance to this favorable external image. With largely inclusive enthusiasm, the freshly assembled Cowell faculty assumed responsibility for sections of a comprehensive three-quarter core course on Western Civilization. As new Colleges opened each fall with themes of their own, their faculties followed Cowell's example. Stevenson's predominantly Social Science faculty found common ground with its Humanities contingent in a core course on "Self and Society"; Crown (the first predominantly Natural Sciences College) provided a bridge to the other Divisions with the theme of "Technology and Society"; Merrill complemented the previously eurocentric orientation of the curriculum with its Third World program; College V provided a center for aesthetic philosophy and the Performing Arts. Soon Cowell added a second tier of interdisciplinary courses on Oriental and American civilizations. Other Colleges--most notably Crown--preferred to elaborate a sequence of integrative Senior Seminars.

Meanwhile, the College framework released an explosion of creative courses designed by individual faculty members. Sometimes it permitted the flowering of a long-suppressed desire to teach outside one's professional field. A physicist turned his analytic powers to the study of Meso-American civilization, in which he had developed a deep avocational interest. An astronomer bore witness to a lifelong engagement with music through a successful course on Beethoven; an anthropologist's and an economist's discovery of a shared interest in architecture led to an analytic course on the structural properties of bodies and buildings. Sometimes, as in an historian's course on the social background of the 19th century Russian novel or in a psychologist's analysis of the paintings of Cézanne, instructors would apply the insights and explanations of their own disciplines to subjects conventionally treated under another heading. Alternatively, they might draw on texts from outside their disciplines to enrich the resources of their own, as in a political scientist's use of literature to

illuminate the enduring dilemmas of public choice in the political arena. Collaborative ventures became common among College faculty who preferred to remain comfortably within their own discipline. A biologist, a psychologist, and a philosopher brought their distinctive disciplinary perspectives to bear on the phenomenon of death; an anthropologist, a linguist, and an instructor in American literature set out jointly to capture the elusive traits that define American civilization. More commonly, faculty met their obligations to their College through devising a general education course--a course for non-scientists in the history and philosophy of science, perhaps, or on the methodology and ethics of social research--of the kind that active, frontier-oriented scholars at other institutions have often proved personally reluctant to take the time to offer, even while acknowledging their place in a well-rounded liberal curriculum. Underlying these disparate endeavors was a common approach: a disengagement from the constricting pressures of the monographic tradition, a joyous affirmation of the capacity of the amateur to bring new life--and sometimes new insight--to old subjects.

Students responded to these examples with an efflorescence of independent studies and individually designed majors. Interdisciplinary and even trans-divisional joint and double majors rose steadily from roughly 6% in the 1969-70 academic year to nearly 11% in 1973-74; together with individual majors, they totaled precisely one sixth of all degrees awarded in the latter year.[23] When Merrill College inaugurated a program of Field Studies, students quickly fanned out off campus to undertake research projects of up to a year in such scattered locations as the nearby Salinas Valley, Bay area prisons and mental hospitals, the Bolivian altiplano, and the jungles of Sumatra.

Other initiatives in the early years reinforced the emerging sub-culture of the campus. Imaginative efforts were made at every level to promote congruence between its formal and informal aspects. Thus in rejecting high-pressure inter-campus competitive spectator sports, with their artificially induced hysteria and commercial overtones, and emphasizing instead the acquisition of individual proficiency in such "lifetime" sports as scuba-diving and rock-climbing, the physical education office sought self-consciously to parallel the stress on individual tutorials in the Colleges. With administrative encouragement, academically overwhelmed students regained contact with more elemental challenges and rhythms through cultivating an organic garden in the very midst of the campus--and later a farm--in which flowers and vegetables of exceptional quality were offered free of charge to all visitors. But by far the most significant development

of this nature occurred almost casually on a single September afternoon when the newly-arrived Cowell College faculty responded favorably to a proposal from their founding Provost that they replace the traditional letter grading system, with its misleading implication that all dimensions of a student's academic performance in a course could be logically collapsed into a single comparative scale, by short narrative evaluations in which these dimensions would be separately assessed. To many subsequent faculty, and certainly to a massive majority of Santa Cruz students, the narrative evaluation system soon came to seem the feature that contributed above all else to the sense that the campus cherished the individuality of each student.[24]

Santa Cruz was becoming an early monument to its own success. Intimations that construction of a City of God on earth was under way were not absent from the decision (stirred by reading the chronicles of old New England) to entitle the campus newspaper "The City on a Hill Press". Within half a decade, student nostalgia for the opening days reached flood tide in the form of reverent senior theses, memoirs, and public addresses. "Late" arrivals among the faculty--late by as little as one or two years--not infrequently found themselves patronized by the founding faculty of their College as unsubtly as were visiting faculty from such ossified institutions as Berkeley and UCLA. Administrators could not conceal their satisfaction during the "May Days" of 1970 when Santa Cruz students, highly politicized but rejecting the notion that their institution could be judged complicitous in the events in Indo-China, came down off the hill and employed energies elsewhere directed against the home campus to organize a people-to-people anti-war mission among the local citizens. Meanwhile, Santa Cruz was being studied--and then restudied--by educators professionally concerned with academic innovation. So wide was the spectrum of possibilities being opened by the expanding campus that in one of the more prominent of these efforts two separate chapters were thought necessary to cover the emerging polar patterns of Cowell and Kresge Colleges.[25]

Then, at some unperceived hour in the early 'seventies, these heady developments crested. Almost imperceptibly at first, but soon noticeably, and then--toward the end of the decade--with a dismaying suddenness that attracted statewide journalistic attention, Santa Cruz lost its innovative momentum. This loss was both qualitative and quantitative. It could be measured in the diminution of new proposals, and in weakening faculty and budgetary support for the more experimental of the existing programs. It appeared in altered promotional criteria, and in the redefinition of mission to conform more closely to standards

prevailing on other campuses within the system. In time, however, these trends began also to register as figures--figures that might merely signify, in the first instance, that the campus had stopped growing, but that, in their implications for claims to externally-provided resources and even for the very survival of the campus, inexorably chilled the expectations of the most ardent reformer. And this loss of momentum soon showed up in every aspect of life on campus: it affected not only the curriculum but also the pattern of physical construction, not only the number and kinds of students who came to campus but the character and calibre of the faculty who remained to teach them.

First to go were the College core courses. Spurred by the general rebelliousness of the Viet Nam years, students began to object in principle to required courses. An overcommitted, harassed faculty, now that the sheer novelty of collaborative amateurism had palled, were increasingly disposed to yield the point. Cowell abandoned its sophomore tier of core courses after three years, and its historic first-year course after six. Stevenson College progressively contracted its three-quarter course to a single required quarter; Crown abandoned all efforts of this nature following the departure of a crucial instructor for another campus. A small number of Merrill faculty members continued to offer an optional one-quarter version of the former three-quarter requirement amid mounting controversy over the appropriate geographical and political definition of the "Third World". College V resolved at the outset to forego a comprehensive year-long core course in favor of small single-quarter studio seminars in the performing arts; these were staffed by individual instructors without any particular effort's being made to generate a common experience through coordinated requirements, and soon disappeared as a mandatory integral element of the College program. Kresge College gave greater emphasis to what its founding Provost described as its "human environment" than to a specific academic program; College VIII, with limited residential facilities, eschewed in terms the core course approach, announcing that it intended to provide a home for the "neglected" upper division transfer and graduate students. Deviant in this as in other respects from the trend established by the later Colleges, Oakes College alone, though seventh out of eight in line of founding, raised sufficient outside funds to develop a well-staffed introductory program designed to facilitate the entry of disadvantaged students from ethnic and racial minorities into the academic mainstream.

Next the concept of a College "theme" itself came under attack. Stevenson College had been expected to inaugurate social studies on campus through its "Self and Society" program. By 1968, however, the senior Fellows in Literature had come to outnumber the social scientists. Soon the faculty was issuing formal statements to the effect that Stevenson should be considered henceforward a "general, liberal arts" College stressing "overall humanistic excellence" without any distinctive commitment to a particular mode of inquiry.

Other College faculties soon followed Stevenson's example. At Crown, structurally vulnerable from the outset through its dependence on a faculty majority largely housed and closely tied to the central laboratories, two successive Provosts stirred up such intense controversy through their efforts to restore some degree of centrality to the College academic program that the faculty resolved in 1975 not only that Crown's core course and senior seminar programs should remain moribund but, for good measure, that no other courses . . . should be taught under collegiate auspices by its "hard money" faculty. Kresge College had no substantive theme to give up; its much-publicized experiments in interpersonal dynamics had become a source of embarrassment, however, and were quietly contracted by a more conservative Provost. Oakes College and College VIII remained from their founding more oriented toward constituencies than toward "themes". Faculty loyalists at Cowell, Merrill, and College V continued the struggle to maintain some semblance of a commitment to their Colleges' respective academic emphasis on Western Civilization, the Third World, and the (Performing) Arts. Particularly in the latter two Colleges, however, the primary instructional burden in the College programs was increasingly borne by "soft money" faculty. In an ironic turnabout, these temporary appointees came to have a greater stake in preserving the thematic identity of their Colleges than did the regular "ladder" faculty. And this paradoxical development accelerated in the early 'seventies as the Colleges, searching for roles to replace the one they had yielded as the academic home base for lower-division students, shifted their resources into such precariously financed upper-division ventures as the Cowell College major in "Arts and Crafts and Their History," Stevenson's "Modern Society and Social Thought" program, and the College V Aesthetic Studies Major.

These developments reflected an underlying tension in the original design of the Colleges. Requiring each College to harbor members of every discipline on campus while charging it with developing a definable theme assured that some Fellows would feel appreciably closer than others to whatever axis of orientation was chosen. The dilemma was insoluble. Provosts could put pressure on those

more removed from this axis--chemists in a "Third World" College--to reeducate themselves in line with collegiate objectives. Occasionally, such pressures might lead to a welcome expansion of capabilities; more often they would generate faculty irritation, insincere or incompetent teaching, and a strong disposition to withdraw from general participation in the life of the College. Alternatively, as at Stevenson, Colleges could relieve the stress by permitting their Fellows to follow their own bent in devising courses to be taught under College auspices, but at the price of blurring the curricular identity of the College. With no binding disciplinary or thematic thread, even the very best of such courses failed to cumulate into a coherent program while the remainder became increasingly difficult to subject to commonly understood standards of academic merit. A miasma of academic self-indulgence radiated outward from certain conspicuously idiosyncratic College courses, persuading many sober scholars that the most egregious College courses were typical of College courses generally, and discrediting the collegiate enterprise as a whole in their eyes. Such academics were likely to take refuge in teaching "College" courses distinguishable from their disciplinary courses only by their sponsorship--a "solution" that subsequently forced sharp-eyed students to locate a course in epistemology or elementary calculus or the modern German theater under any one of eight different College labels when it was missing from the disciplinary section of the catalog. Curricular planning became excessively difficult when four marginally differentiated courses on the sociology of economic development, using virtually identical texts to cover the same themes and regions, might be offered under four College labels in addition to the courses sponsored by the economics and sociology faculties. Yet the production of such scattered and inadvertently overlapping courses became progressively more likely as the first flush of amateurism subsided, or as faculty went on leave or were replaced, or as the ratio among disciplines within a College shifted, or as favored disciplinary candidates who had been euchred into newly opening Colleges through a misleading highlighting of their marginal but thematically strategic interests eventually began to reveal their true colors. Commitment to themes--even broadly defi themes--was proving an unexpected source of rigidity in the collegiate structure: it provoked much fretful division within the Colleges, and any adaptation to changing conditions seemed inexorably to diminish the integrity, authenticity, and distinctiveness of the curricular orientations that provided the very rationale for the Colleges themselves.

The declining innovatory capacities of the Colleges might conceivably have been offset by growing momentum within the three academic Divisions that were

their intended counterpart in the original campus plan. But the Divisions had long since lost such capabilities as they possessed to serve as magnetic fields of faculty energy. With more self-confident, far-sighted leadership than they received in the crucial opening years, they could possibly have been used as a framework to foster imaginative interdisciplinary combinations within their generous partitionings of the fields of knowledge. Such leadership, in the event, was not forthcoming. It would have entailed, in concert with the Divisional faculties, a fresh definition of the goals of university education, an uninhibited assessment in relation to those ends of the terms in which such education is currently compartmentalized, and an architectonic vision of the curricular possibilities the campus offered. It would also have required unwavering insistence, even in a period of rapid growth, on exploiting complementarities among neighboring disciplines in the recruitment process. The three Divisional Vice Chancellors gave no indication during this period of any inclination to proceed along such lines. Ever mindful of the University of California tradition that authority over the curriculum rests with the faculty, they seemed content to allow faculty preference to shape defining choices.

Initiatives of this nature would probably have been doomed to failure in any case. From the outset, the Divisions suffered from a suspicion of artificiality. Divisions lacked the ecological base and social perquisites of the Colleges. They enjoyed no natural loyalties: they were administrative and budgetary categories, lines on organization charts given embodiment in small staff offices removed from the prime centers of research and teaching activity. Their faculties came to campus trained and certified in disciplinary not Divisional, fields. Divisional appointments by title ("Professor of Social Sciences") were rare; and in a curious but significant omission, campus Academic Senate regulations made no provision until 1979 for Divisional sponsorship of courses. Divisional partitionings of knowledge, moreover, were not free from the charges of arbitrariness frequently leveled against the disciplines. The Humanities Division was deeply split between the standards of the traditional "letters" faculties and the orientations and needs of studio artists. "Social" historians, and instructors who approached literature as a cultural manifestation of society, tended to interact more intensively with social scientists than with their Humanities colleagues. Commonality of subject matter did more to determine the vital associations of philosophers and linguists than did Divisional lines.[26] As each Division approached one hundred members, these slender ties attenuated further. By 1974, when incoming Chancellor Mark Christensen announced that he was changing the title of all future heads of the Divisions from "Vice Chancellor"

to "Dean", his action merely ratified a well-established expectation that such figures, whatever their title, would manage units essentially limited to processing personnel and budgetary requests.

As both the Colleges and the Divisions receded in importance, a superficially novel organizational entity emerged: the disciplinary Board of Studies. Departmentalization was, of course, precisely what the Santa Cruz campus had been designed to head off. Insofar as the Colleges could not be expected to assume full and exclusive responsibility for curricular and personnel decisions, these functions had been left in the original campus plan to the three Divisions. Even the most optimistic among the founders foresaw, however, that as the campus expanded, some unit smaller than the Division would be needed to organize information relevant to the various personnel processes of the Division. In addition, some body--perhaps, the early planners thought, a rough equivalent to the various boards of examiners in England's two model collegiate universities--would be needed to establish the formal requirements for disciplinary majors and to administer the comprehensive examinations thought necessary to certify proficiency in these fields.[27] The inclusion of 150 junior-level transfers from other campuses in the opening class, most seeking to complete their degree requirements in a conventional field by the end of the following academic year, inescapably posed pressing questions concerning the future status of disciplinary studies on campus.

The central administration fully understood the challenge these organizational imperatives posed. By vesting budgetary responsibility (and therefore the payment of one half of faculty salaries) in the Divisions, by providing all stenographic services to faculty through the Colleges and the Natural Sciences laboratories--even by self-consciously employing the title of "Convenor" for the Divisionally-appointed chairs of sub-committees called together from time to time from the various Colleges to transact disciplinary-related business, and resolutely denying the "convenors" pleas for special secretarial assistance--the Chancellor's staff sought to resist pressures to resurrect the academic department as a basic administrative unit. When obliged to act at all in these matters, the Divisional Vice Chancellors proceeded with great caution. Thus when, early in the opening year, they called meetings of the Social Sciences and Humanities faculties to propose the creation of "Boards of Studies" in the several disciplines of the Divisions, they further proposed that membership on these "Boards" be limited to three to five appointed (and presumably senior) faculty, at least one of whom would be from an outside though related discipline. Moreover, they

intimated that the functions of these Boards would largely consist in defining and maintaining formal standards for a degree.[28]

None of these precautions availed. Senior faculty were quick to point out that the proposed appointive power could be manipulated by the Chancellor to influence personnel recommendations and to breach the historic autonomy maintained by University of California faculty in curricular matters. Junior faculty were not disposed to turn over to a limited number of their senior colleagues the right to structure major requirements, initiate recruitment of additional faculty, and plan the graduate programs.[29] On December 7, 1965, the Academic Senate accepted the recommendation of its Special Committee on Boards of Studies that such Boards be established. Reflecting the objections that had previously been raised, however, it further endorsed the Committee's recommendation that the Boards automatically include as of right all Senate members in the discipline as well as a single "outside" member.[30] This move decisively increased the ratio of disciplinary to non-disciplinary members within the Boards.[31] It also converted the Boards into general-purpose action groups in the eyes of their members. Since junior faculty typically arrived on campus directly from disciplinary graduate-school programs, their inclusion in a familiar professional entity, unmediated by prior involvement in the life of the Colleges, effectively (if quite unintentionally) added momentum to the disciplinary sub-divisions of the Divisions in relation both to the Colleges and to the Divisions themselves.[32]

The consequences were soon evident. Although a Senate motion to change the title of the Boards of Studies to "Departments" was overwhelmingly defeated in 1967, and although (in contrast to the prevailing practice in departmentally-based universities) the Divisions maintained firm control over the budgets, the Boards soon acquired most of the remaining accouterments of conventional departments--among them, office space and a secretary for the "Convenor" (soon to be retitled "Chair"), full authority to sponsor courses acceptable to the Academic Senate's Committee on Courses, a virtually exclusive initiatory role in the recruitment of ladder faculty, and a major role in all subsequent personnel processes. By the early 1970s, five student enrollments in six were in courses taught under Board auspices; by 1978, the enrollment in College-sponsored courses had dropped below 10% of the campus undergraduate total. Apart from six College major programs, a small and equally exiguous set of areal studies and other interdisciplinary majors, and a scattering of individual majors devised by students under College sponsorship, the Boards administered all the routes to a major and the corresponding Comprehensive Examination or Senior Thesis it required. Several Boards had sponsored

graduate programs on their own, although an interdisciplinary "History of Consciousness" program remained the most conspicuous--and most controversial--undertaking at that level. By 1975, few would take issue with the campus planning official who declared that "the Boards are where the action is."[33]

Thus were laid the conditions for a struggle that was to consume much of the energy and much of the emotion for most of the 'seventies on the Santa Cruz campus. Running like a fault line through every proposed initiative, polarizing and classifying colleagues, threatening interests and hardening stereotypes, was the issue of how each decision would affect the delicate balance between College and Board. Bookkeeping issues displaced educational objectives in the contest for faculty time, for office space, for course sponsorship and credited majors. The question at hand might involve the arcana of dollars and cents; it might take the form of an asserted right to consultation; it might have to do with the shadings in a choice of title. The assured constant was a rapid mobilization of concern in each instance around the implications of its resolution for this equilibrium.

Bitterest of all, predictably, were the disputes generated by personnel actions. These typically began with charges by the College that the Board had given it a thin file on a chosen candidate 24 hours before bringing the bewildered recruit for a hurried encounter en route to the Chancellor's office, evoking increasingly contemptuous responses by the Board to the effect that the Colleges in any case judged candidates merely by their manifest social graces and their skill in feigning interest in the collegiate "theme". They ended five to seven years later amid allegations by the Board that College personnel committees and Provosts uncritically defended members of their social club even in tenure decisions, and with lamentations in the College at the Board's confusion of quantity with quality, of the routinely documentable with the noble ideals on which the campus had been founded.[34] In between these crucial checkpoints, assistant (and even tenured associate) professors felt they were serving two masters, confronting demands of uncertain weight that were often incompatible and generally overwhelming in their cumulative effect.[35] Many grew progressively more nervous over their physical and even professional isolation in a College from senior members in their discipline. And these concerns were often well founded; for the demands of the College, in particular, could have injurious consequences for those assistant professors who, having failed to obtain tenure at Santa Cruz, were subsequently forced to discover how low a value a conventional and increasingly glutted outside job market placed on evidence of gifted extradisciplinary teaching and imaginative

contributions to institution-building in a dossier otherwise relatively bereft of publications.

Over time, the perceived pattern became simplified beyond reality. Colleges saw themselves as the sole remaining guardians of academic innovations on campus. The Boards of Studies, from a College point of view, had proved to be Trojan horses from Berkeley, illadvisedly constructed pumps (to change the metaphor) that everlastingly drained faculty time and energy from the Colleges into conventional channels. Board chairs replied with mounting weariness that the Colleges gave license to the faculty's most self-indulgent impulses while leaving to the Boards the ungrateful task of maintaining a curriculum enabling students to make normal progress toward a degree. Students tended to endorse (often in highly rhetorical language) the College position; their actual choice of courses supported the Board's. Framed in these terms, the contest was one the Colleges could not win. Both Colleges and Boards might lose from it, however. Since mutual distrust prevented Boards and Colleges from seriously considering recommendations that they collapse at least some of the numerous parallel committees their dual structure generated, the resulting administrative burden on faculty remained inordinate. And since virtually all "ladder" faculty were members of both Colleges and Boards, the perpetual contest between the two assured a progressively deepening schizophrenia.

The participants in this conflict could see clearly its debilitating effects. But the faculty remained too divided to undertake coordinated reform themselves. Their single most vital organizational units--the Boards of Studies--were understaffed, and beset by competing pressures. Board chairmanships rotated biennially among the more vulnerable (not infrequently junior) members. And Santa Cruz had now grown to the point at which no centrally administered remedies were readily available. Traditional faculty prerogatives in the University of California system markedly qualified administrative discretion in budgetary matters, severely limited it in personnel decisions, and extruded it altogether in the realm of the curriculum. By expanding the usual trilateral tension between departments, Academic Senate committees, and the chancellorial office to a hexagonal contest involving Divisional Deans, College Provosts, and College faculty committees, the campus had stretched the administrative process to its limits, diffusing accountability and stalemating every initiative. In a tangentially related but unfortunate coincidence, moreover, the Chancellor's office in Santa Cruz was in no position during the mid-'seventies to exercise such leadership in the crisis as might otherwise have been possible. Founding Chancellor McHenry retired on

schedule in June of 1974. His amiable successor was deposed by a remarkably united faculty barely eighteen months later for insufficient administrative direction. President Saxon then appointed a University Vice President to preside benignly over the campus until his scheduled retirement in mid-1977, at which point the present Chancellor, a distinguished biologist largely unknown to the Santa Cruz faculty, was brought in from the California Institute of Technology to try his hand. For much of this period, questions of leadership necessarily displaced other items from the agenda of consideration without leading to policy conclusions. To disenchanted observers, the problem at Santa Cruz appeared not to be that its elaborately contrived system of checks and balances was failing to work. It was rather that this intricate clockwork, with its assurance of a fair hearing for all parties, was working too well.

Meanwhile, a crisis of a different nature was gathering force. Suddenly and swiftly, Santa Cruz was running out of students. Until 1972, qualified applicants to the University of California had more difficulty obtaining admission to the Santa Cruz campus than to any other; three years later, recruiters for Santa Cruz were actively scouring the high schools, and the campus was accepting applications redirected from Berkeley and Davis. As the quantity of applications declined, so did their measurable quality. Nationwide test score averages were falling during these years, but those of the applicants Santa Cruz was obliged to accept fell faster--from mean verbal and math SAT scores (men only) of 611 and 647 in 1972 to 558 and 588 in 1975 respectively; from 67.9% reporting high school grade averages of "A-" and above in 1972 to 45.6% in 1975.[36] By 1975, too, the transfer students were beginning to outnumber first-year students among those newly admitted to the campus. Key administrators professed to welcome this development as a realization of the egalitarian ideals of the California Master Plan for Higher Education of 1960. In so doing they chose to ignore the implications for the distinctive collegiate programs of the campus, and for its general education and breadth requirements, of relying ever more heavily on constituencies with only a major in a discipline to complete.

Declining growth--or at least the prospect of such decline--was perceived as a problem throughout the University of California system by the end of the 'seventies. But for Santa Cruz, it had especially ominous implications. During the halcyon budget years, Chancellor McHenry had honored his pledge to keep the per-unit cost of his campus below that of any other in the system. He had done his work too well. Now, as Santa Cruz began to feel the pinch of overcrowded laboratories, overextended studios, Colleges of seven to eight hundred students

designed for six hundred, and swimming pools and library facilities that remained on the drawing boards, it confronted a much more constricted financial climate. In this context, its declining admissions record and publicly visible weaknesses in its collegiate and leadership structures did not enhance its case. But rising student/faculty and student/facility ratios did not reveal the full extent of the problem. Santa Cruz had come into being at precisely the moment when wide-open growth had seemed most plausible. It had organized its disciplines and recruited its facilities on the supposition that it would proceed on schedule to nearly thirty thousand students and a corresponding faculty by 1990. Suddenly choking off that expansion left the campus with numerous truncated mini-departments and lopsided specializations alongside gaping holes in its curriculum. To fill these holes and round out the disciplinary and interdisciplinary offerings in an orderly manner had now become impossible. In its concern to remain avant-garde the campus had neglected to tend its flanks.

From certain perspectives, advantages could be discerned in the enforced slow-down. It avoided a full test of the Kerr-McHenry thesis that might have been found wanting in the event. It gave the Colleges new life in their competition with potential graduate programs; it forced the Boards and Divisions to consider afresh the advantages of cooperation among ancillary fields in faculty hiring and course sponsorship; it relieved pressure on proposed facilities that might not have been funded in any case. Undoubtedly, the slow-down helped preserve the beauty of the forest ecology. These blessings did not seem salient to anguished administrators and ambitious faculty, however. Santa Cruz was still a sufficiently American campus for many to feel that quantitative growth was a basic index of institutional vitality.

And now another statistical trend that clearly was such an index began to alarm the campus. Santa Cruz, which had always cherished the belief that above all campuses it gave first place to its students, had to face graphs that showed its rate of attrition among enrolled students to be the highest of the nine campuses--and highest by a large margin. Various explanations suggested themselves for this unwelcome trend. Most popular was the somewhat self-serving reflection that the utopian promise of Santa Cruz inevitably attracted a disproportionate number of unconventional, highly idealistic students--students who looked upon education not as an instrumental preliminary to a materially rewarding job but as a potentially transfiguring experience, and whose disappointment with any earthly institution was eminently predictable. But Santa Cruz had broadcast its utopian appeal most strongly in the early days. The upward rate of attrition coincided with a rising proportion of students who had

first chosen to attend conventional campuses before transferring to Santa Cruz - and it was among this group that the rate of attrition was highest.[37]

One could also maintain the ultimately unprovable thesis that Santa Cruz had simply expanded beyond the small, fixed pool of California high school graduates for whom its program was distinctively appealing, and that both its admissions and retention problems were attributable to this single fact (although, when the campus had nearly reached its present size in 1972, it was obliged to redirect as high a proportion of qualified applicants as when the campus consisted of two Colleges). Less speculative were the reports from several Boards of Studies that they were losing their most ambitious students to Stanford and Berkeley because of an erroneous but unshakable conviction that a grade point average was needed to obtain admission to the most competitive graduate schools. Moreover, as occupational concerns acquired more urgency in a decelerating economy, Santa Cruz's reputation as an experimental, exclusively liberal arts campus was proving a liability. And there was simply too much evidence, ranging from exit forms to survey data, that students other than the most secure and self-directed seemed to suffer from poorly coordinated advising, insufficient attention to their curricular needs during the years preceding selection of a major, and an uncertain relation between collegiate and disciplinary programs. But to make these observations was to call into question the central principles on which the campus had been founded. Merely to try to do better what Santa Cruz had always tried to do well would not suffice. Outside events were posing ever more squarely the question: could a campus founded to embody the most soaring aspirations of the 'sixties adapt to a prolonged projection of soberingly lowered expectations?

IV. REFORM AND REVOLUTION

Attempted reform, whether successful or fruitless, is instructive in either case. If successful, it may offer a validation of the diagnosis and strategy pursued by the reformers.[38] If unsuccessful, it indicates the weight and interrelationship of the variables with which they were obliged to contend. Either way, attempted reform highlights the perceptions and predicates of those who take action. It also illuminates the consequence of displacing certain variables of the system, revealing their critical range. So it was at Santa Cruz.

Amid mounting indications of system failure, the Santa Cruz campus attempted systemic reforms on two occasions within the past decade. The first attempt--the so-called "Reaggregation" movement--occurred under the auspices of the Santa Cruz Academic Senate's Budget and Planning Committee in 1974 during the first year in office of Santa Cruz's second chancellor, and indirectly contributed to his shortened tenure in that office. The second--this time styled "Campus Reorganization"-- was initiated by its fourth chancellor in 1978 during his second year on campus and eventually became the responsibility of the three Divisional Deans in conjunction with several key Academic Senate committees and two ad hoc chancellorial bodies. "Reaggregation" had much effect on certain individuals, but little on the system. "Reorganization", on the contrary, threatened to affect the system so deeply in so many respects that many embittered faculty and students concluded the changes had destroyed precisely those qualities that made the campus distinctively appealing to them. As such, the two reforms offer a striking study in contrasts.

In the winter of 1974, for no reason directly attributable to a specific external event, several prominent faculty members began circulating mimeographed versions of their thoughts regarding the status of the Colleges at Santa Cruz. Other faculty responded in kind; by the end of the Quarter, a quite respectable accumulation of proposals for reform had emerged. At a special meeting of the Academic Senate, the Senate's Budget and Academic Planning Committee was directed to address itself to the issue. It did so throughout the Spring Quarter; and at the unusually well-attended final Senate meeting of the academic year, the Committee presented a motion calling for a sweeping "reaggregation" of the faculty among the Colleges. After little discussion, and with one recorded dissent, the motion carried.

In the report accompanying the motion, the Planning Committee offered an extended analysis of the malaise afflicting the College system.[39] Its gravamen

was that the membership of the Colleges had become incompatible with their mission; its prescription, that a coordinated transfer of faculty members among the Colleges be implemented to concentrate faculty in critical masses more closely aligned with their professional interests.[40] The central argument proceeded in three steps:

1. For the majority of the faculty in most Colleges, the College "theme" had become peripheral. Under the rule requiring representation from all disciplines in each College, many faculty had been placed from the outset in Colleges with curricular orientations far removed from their interests. Others had altered their professional interests over the years. Still others were in particular Colleges not because of any genuine affinity with the collegiate theme but because they were available as the favored candidate of a Board of Studies at a time when that College had an opening. Rhetorically, the pattern of collegiate membership expressed an alleged commonality of interest; in actuality, it largely reflected the history of disciplinary hiring on campus.

2. Arguments for the current pattern were not convincing even at the level of principle. The rule of full disciplinary representation had been justified by the alleged need to provide a full array of advising options for students at the College--an assumption inconsistent with the belief that the Colleges could perform their most useful role at the pre-disciplinary phase of a student's education, when Divisional representation would suffice for advising purposes. Experience had shown in any case the limits to interdisciplinary cross-pollination: an economist might well benefit academically from interaction with an institutional anthropologist and a policy-oriented political scientist, but would derive only a very occasional serendipitous insight from having an office flanked by those of a potter and an instructor in French literature. The latter condition tended to reduce collegiate interchanges to the level of mere sociability while enhancing professional isolation to a dangerous degree.

3. As presently constituted, therefore, the Colleges had become irrelevant and even harmful to the professional development of their faculty without offering students clear benefits in return. To restore vitality to the College system, the central administration should accordingly establish mechanisms permitting orderly transfer of the collegiate faculties until historical accident had been replaced by interdisciplinary working clusters of faculty. Critical minimums and maximums should be defined for each discipline so as to preclude fragmented mini-groups at the one extreme and effective departmentalization of the Colleges at the other. To preserve the traditional broad base of the Colleges, each College should be required to maintain a trimodal distribution assuring representation from every Division (though not from every discipline). Thus a typical pattern might include representation of five members apiece from relatively integrated sub-fields in tropical biology, geology and ecology (excluding chemists, physicists, and mathematicians); a cluster in economic development that included political scientists and anthropologists but excluded psychologists and sociologists; and an aggregation of humanists from art history, literature, linguistics, and history (but not from philosophy) with a shared interest in Oriental and African civilizations.

With these objectives in mind, the Planning Committee proceeded to construct and administer a questionnaire designed to elicit from faculty members a sociogram

of their academic interests and the colleagues they had found most professionally supportive of their work. Using this data, the Committee grouped faculty names into tentative clusters that appeared least incongruent with the existing curricular orientations of the Colleges, and then initiated discussions with College Provosts and executive committees concerning the patterns these exercises had revealed. Soon, however, the Committee ran up against an elementary fact of human nature: academic roles were only one of many aspects of individual faculty members--and, in the intimate ecology of the Colleges, not necessarily the most salient aspect. Geography--and history--had already become destiny. In principle, College Provosts and faculties continued to support a policy they had endorsed the preceding May. In practice, they saw in Reaggregation an opportunity to pick off distinguished scholars and friends from other colleges while barring or extruding those they found personally objectionable. Founding members of a College with deep roots in its institutions were not about to be "reaggregated" elsewhere because of mere professional incongruity with its theme; more psychically mobile faculty became frustrated at the endless formation and reformation of new coalitions. Many Colleges invented factitious mini-clusters in order to justify retaining or attracting a single favored faculty member. In vain the Budget and Academic Planning Committee insisted that the Colleges must commit themselves to pre-defined academic clusters, not merely to selected individuals within those clusters. The central administration, showing signs of the vacillation and unclarity of purpose that was eventually to lead to the deposition of Chancellor Christensen, offered little more than good will and privately expressed support to the enterprise. With no formal authority to enforce its proposed rules, the Senate committee retreated in disarray.

With the demise of Reaggregation into something resembling a fraternity rush, the Colleges let slip their major opportunity to regain the academic momentum they had lost to the Boards. By 1978, their condition approached catatonia. Except at Stevenson College, where a surprisingly successful mandatory three-quarter sequence in the intellectual history of Western civilization had suddenly sprung to life, the College core courses were at most vestigial remnants in the form of optional single-quarter courses taught by two hard-dying instructors. Nothing had emerged to take their place as a form of pre-disciplinary education for undergraduates in their first two years: the catalog merely stated that undergraduates were obliged at some point to meet the campus breadth requirement through taking virtually any three courses in each of the three Division. College courses at the upper-division level contracted steadily in numbers while more

and more resembling misleadingly labeled courses in a standard discipline. In only one area did Colleges show continuing vitality: their demands on faculty time for administrative purposes remained unstinting.

It was this situation that Robert Sinsheimer confronted in mid-1977 on assuming office as Santa Cruz's fourth Chancellor. Within a few months he had discovered how little support for its financial needs he could secure from other University of California campuses so long as his house remained in conspicuous disorder. His first response to a particularly ungenerous allocation of new faculty positions was a stiff letter of protest to President Saxon. His second was more original. In October of 1978, on the eve of his formal inauguration, he revealed to a hastily assembled gathering of Provosts, Deans, and Senate chairs a sweeping proposal for reorganizing the eight Colleges. Its central features cut the Gordian Knot: Colleges would henceforward be excluded from all personnel processes involving regular faculty, would cease to sponsor courses, and would be placed in a kind of administrative receivership under the three Divisional Deans, who would thereupon supervise a large-scale transfer of faculty among the Colleges to bring about greater coherence among interpenetrating disciplines.

Stunned by the boldness of the proposal, and reluctant to show conspicuous disunity before assembled University dignitaries at a precarious moment in the campus's history, the Academic Senate endorsed the plan a few days later in a display of virtual unanimity. It even added a phrase expressing appreciation for the Chancellor's "decisive leadership" in the hour of need. Soon various Senate and special chancellorial committees were at work on the detailed administrative implications of the plan. As these became more evident, the previous unanimity disintegrated rapidly into sharply polarized factions. Nevertheless, if often by narrow majorities, the broader elements of the proposal were approved intact. Whatever the long-run implications for the power of the Colleges, the humanly exhausting and often inequitable dual-track personnel processes by now found few defenders. To the rather general surprise of the campus, the Academic Senate's Curriculum Committee, together with a special chancellorial committee on the curriculum, was able to reassign, with little Procrustean trimming, all of several hundred College-sponsored courses with one exception to disciplinary Boards of Studies, to a small number of interdisciplinary Committees of Studies, or to the newly empowered Divisions.[41] And although the three Divisional Deans were forced into many anomalous compromises that severely compromised the architectonic quality of the results, they were able, with firm backing from the chancellorial office, and profiting from deepening anxiety about the future of

the campus and weary acceptance of the inevitability of change, to carry through a much more extensive reconcentration of faculty in Divisionally-centered Colleges than had proved possible four years earlier. By the end of the academic year, the three elements of Campus Reorganization were largely complete. And as nearly half the faculty began unpacking books in new offices amid new neighbors in the early summer months of 1979, the campus seemed suddenly unrecognizable to many--whether fortunately or not depending heavily on one's degree of attachment to the old order.

Inevitably, in the year that followed, elements of the Reorganization process were shown to have been poorly thought through. But the single most telling criticism of the Chancellor's initiative was of an altogether different order, and had been made much earlier: namely, that it did not deal directly with the most dangerous threat of all to the campus--its steadily falling enrollments.

By the fall of 1978, as Reorganization was launched, this decline had begun to reach alarming proportions. For the fifth year in a row, Santa Cruz attracted fewer students than the year before. Faced in December by Governor Brown's sudden mandate to prepare a budget hypothetically reduced by ten percent from the budget of the previous year, the University of California began to consider extreme alternatives. The larger campuses. where enrollments had held relatively steady or had even increased, were not slow to note that a good part of the cut could be achieved by closing the two smallest campuses. The retiring Chancellor of Berkeley, taking note of the difficulties Santa Cruz was facing, bluntly declared to the press that the resources expended on failing campuses should be transferred to the campuses that (like his own) faced swelling enrollments. At this sensitive moment, the leading newspapers in San Francisco and Los Angeles came out with unaccountably hostile front-page articles on the theme "Santa Cruz: The Dream Fades". University of California President David Saxon now felt obliged to halt the subsequent panic on the Santa Cruz campus with an unequivocal declaration that closing an entire campus was not among the budgetary options he was considering. However, he placed Santa Cruz on a contract to turn the enrollment trend around within five years or face the first of several significant cuts in its allocation of faculty positions.

As the President was pouring somewhat oily water on this fire, the Santa Cruz Academic Senate's Curriculum Committee already had under consideration a measure that, more than any other, seemed calculated to enhance the attractiveness of the campus to an increasingly conservative body of student applicants. In its first year of operation the Natural Sciences Division, fearful of resistance its

students might encounter from medical and certain engineering schools when submitting transcripts lacking a grade point average, had secured permission from the Academic Senate to offer students the option of obtaining letter grades in addition to narrative evaluations in courses above the introductory level. Over the years, the percentage of such student requests had held at a remarkably steady 8%, leaving 92% of the course transcripts in advanced-level courses in the Division bearing narrative evaluations alone. There was no evidence that Natural Science applicants to graduate schools had either helped or harmed themselves by their choice. But recruitment teams from the Office of Admissions found high school counselors unshakably committed to the contrary proposition, and survey research results seemed similarly to point to the narrative evaluation system as the single greatest deterrent to consideration of the Santa Cruz campus by potential student applicants. To members of the Curriculum Committee, both equity and prudence now seemed to call for extending the letter grade option to students of all three Divisions. Since 92% of the students in a recent poll had indicated their belief that students should be allowed free choice in this matter (while affirming their personal preference for the narrative evaluation system by an even more impressive 96%), the Committee saw in its proposal the possibility of implementing at low cost a vital but non-controversial change.

It proved anything but that. The measure easily passed the Academic Senate in January of 1979. Immediately afterwards, however, the notion spread swiftly among students and a smaller faculty contingent that, notwithstanding a decade of experience to the contrary in the most quantitatively oriented of the three Divisions, optional letter grades in the other Divisions would soon drive out narrative evaluations through an inexorable operation of an academic Gresham's Law. Preservation of the narrative evaluation system in its current form became the symbolic focal point of resistance to all the changes implied by Campus Reorganization. Here faculty conservatives took their stand. And as grading was the issue that most directly affected students, their voices were heard with special sympathy. When rally after rally and a massive, wholly successful petition campaign showed that the campus was becoming deeply and dangerously split over the question, the Chair of the Curriculum Committee, persuaded that the agenda needed clearing for other reforms, advised the faculty to reverse the Academic Senate's--and his own committee's--action in a mail ballot. This they did on March 12, 1979.[42]

The simmering--and occasionally boiling--issue of letter grades ironically illustrates the difficulty in effecting change on a campus committed to innovation. James Q. Wilson of Harvard has argued that organizations whose members are primarily attracted to the organization by its purported ideals will experience greater difficulty in adapting to changing circumstances than will those organizations that maintain their membership through a supply of social or instrumental (which Wilson prefers to call "material") incentives.[43] As universities go, Santa Cruz is preeminently an organization of the former type. To be sure, the faculty and staff would not long remain there without paychecks, and most of its students are not indifferent to the value of their certificate of graduation in the outer world. Nor is sociability a minor factor on a campus dedicated to "friendship in the pursuit of truth." But Santa Cruz has always pulled the majority of its staff and students to the campus by visions larger than those just named. In that fact is to be found both its special attractiveness and the source of its most perilous restrictions.

V. RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

As the University of California at Santa Cruz enters the 'eighties, it bears ever fewer marks of the hopes of the 'sixties. Gone are its days as a model for others to follow. For some years the campus has stabilized at less than a fourth of the 27,500 students it was scheduled to absorb by 1990. It shows no signs of expanding dramatically beyond that point. Its Colleges faithfully feed the majority of their students but no longer seek to reorient their minds. Its faculty now largely teach within their disciplines and expect to obtain their primary forms of institutional recognition through their achievements within these channels. The courses in its catalog do not differ greatly in subject matter and aggregate pattern from those of other universities of similar size. By default, its narrative evaluation system has come to attract a disproportionate degree of attention from students and the press as the principal sign of educational innovation at Santa Cruz. Even that institution, however, has entered a precarious passage from which it may not emerge intact.

Behind these formal similarities to other university campuses remain important differences. Santa Cruz retains its unparalleled natural setting and sensitively planned ecology which, though often spoken of in deprecatory tones as peripheral and even antithetical to a serious educational atmosphere, nevertheless continually contribute to its members' diffuse sense of being privileged to live and work in a literally unique community. If choice of College is no longer critical to a student's formal curriculum, and if Colleges have become a purely formal source of his or her instructor's paycheck, they have proven deeply rooted as a source of social identity and loyalty and an incontestable success as decentralized, humanly scaled administrative units. Faculty interaction, though increasingly intra-Divisional, remains unforcedly interdisciplinary in character, leading directly in many instances to bi-weekly seminars and the formation of Organized Research Units.[44] Santa Cruz has remained entirely free of the corrupting influences of spectator-oriented athletics, and its faculty have continued to resist the more simpleminded pressures to make the curriculum serve the vocational and avocational interests of various external constituencies in the State. As to the courses they do teach, one has only to pay comparative visits to the textbook sections of the campus bookstores in Berkeley, Stanford, and Santa Cruz to appreciate the exceptional wealth and exhilaratingly imaginative range and combination of materials employed in the undergraduate courses at the last of these institutions.

These are qualities that make the tuition-free, publicly-supported campus of Santa Cruz one of the best bargains in liberal undergraduate education in the United States. But the founders of Santa Cruz had set their sights higher than the level this claim entails. For their object was not merely to provide a sensitive education of high quality for undergraduates and a scattering of graduate students. The more messianic among these planners, at least, had sought to institutionalize a disposition toward academic innovation on a rapidly growing campus that would constitute a permanent break with prevailing patterns of higher education elsewhere. Judged by this standard, the Santa Cruz venture must be deemed a significant failure. But what central thread runs through the record of retrenchment and reorganization this essay has recorded? Did this paradigmatic product of the most generous reformist impulses of the 'sixties merely experience the ineluctable routinization of innovatory impulses? Did Santa Cruz suffer from loss of vision--and loss of nerve--by its leaders? Was that vision perhaps initially flawed and internally contradictory to begin with? Or were the prospects for utopian reconstruction on a single campus, however ingeniously designed and unstintingly supported, always limited by its external environment more severely than its founders were willing to acknowledge?

This essay has shown that any complete account of the fate of the Santa Cruz experiment must include elements from all four theses. "Burn-out"--a familiar problem of most high-stress contemporary organizations--was particularly prevalent at Santa Cruz. Founding faculty members, who found themselves repeatedly asked, expected, and tempted to put aside their scholarly work to attend an institution-building meeting or to create a new program or to stretch themselves beyond their prior disciplinary limits to take part in an interdisciplinary core course, were particularly subject to this affliction; and even those who retained their original enthusiasm and freshness of vision inevitably found themselves adjusting to the growing pressures toward standardization accompanying tested precedent, sheer numerical expansion, greater complexity of the interdependent parts, and the movement beyond a select and relatively homogenous faculty and student body to an enlarged and diversely motivated university community. Certainly, too, there were failures of insight and firmness of purpose at the level of leadership--failure to capitalize on even the limited potential of the academic Divisions was one instance, collapse of the Reaggregation initiative another. Beyond these choices, there were undoubtedly flaws in the original design as well. Among the most consequential of these was the failure of either the founders or their successors to face squarely the philosophical faultline

between an Enlightenment view of "liberal" education as a clearing away of the institutional obstacles to a self-directed pursuit of independently and externally acquired academic interests and a Rousseauist insistence that students must first be "liberated" from these accretions before they are qualified to take responsibility for their own education.[45] The swift establishment and equally swift demise of the College core courses illustrates this clash particularly well.

But of all the flaws of initial design and subsequent choice, the most damaging were indubitably those arising from failure to give sufficient weight to the problems of insulating a utopian campus from the outer world. Meadows could visually isolate the campus from a relatively harmless seaside resort; they could not guard against the seeds of worldly ambition, of mundane occupational concerns, of deeply ingrained cultural values that faculty, administrators, and even students imported, often quite unknowingly, from their society. These might lie dormant, sometimes for years; eventually, given the right conditions, they would spring to life once more. So long as faculty were trained in and hired from highly professional universities, so long as they retained respect for the dominant canons of these institutions, so long as they retained ambition for scholarly accomplishment and recognition--so long, in fine, as Santa Cruz remained accountable to the values of the University of California, and beyond it, to the society that sustained that institution--these seeds would remain. When, not whether, they would sprout was the only serious question. Students could dream a little longer. As the bright job prospects of the 'sixties became a mirage in the 'seventies, however, they too would discover in themselves a growing appreciation for the benefits of conventional disciplinary certification.

Santa Cruz was therefore faced by a fundamental choice. It could pit itself wholly against the world, accepting a leisurely rate of growth and limiting its recruitment to those who (regardless of external scholarly reputation) truly met collegiate needs. It could absorb new faculty into new collegiate colonies established by members of the mother college, and grant promotion for imaginative and dedicated College service and for various signs (including a modest amount of writing and research) of intellectual distinction.[46] The consequence of this move, of course, would be to reduce faculty to a form of feudal dependence on the unique environment and unique protections that Santa Cruz alone was prepared to offer. Alternatively, the campus would accept the inevitability of its linkage to the University of California (a research-oriented

institution within the division of labor proposed in the California Master Plan for Higher Education), the certainty that some of its faculty would choose or be obliged to exit into the external academic marketplace, and the probability that no amount of intensive on-campus socialization could ever wholly offset calculations rationally appropriate to that world. It would then have to find some imaginative means of bringing about a reasonably good alignment between these calculations and the functional needs of its internal organs.

Given the use of external faculty peer review in promotional cases and the implications of continuing accountability to the University of California system as a whole, there never really could be a choice. Those faculty who faced up to these implications, and who shaped their behavior accordingly, survived within the system; those who acted otherwise by and large did not. But Santa Cruz as an institution could fudge the choice; and for many years it did so, and with considerable success. There could be much talk, on the one hand, about the exciting prospects for a College-centered undergraduate curriculum, and on the other about maintaining without compromise the standards of research appropriate to a large-scale public university with its laboratories and libraries. On the one hand, faculty could be urged to participate in interdisciplinary College core courses and to take undergraduate advising seriously; on the other, the campus could reserve both its practical rewards and its public accolades for those who, regardless of whether they had responded to these exhortations, had published an award-winning book or synthesized a new protein or obtained admission to a particularly exclusive scholarly honor society. This pride in external recognition was entirely understandable in both human and political terms; it was merely inconsistent with a critical objective in the original vision. And it was entirely understandable, too, that administrators and senior faculty, uneasily sensing this contradiction, should seize on the case of a few exceptionally efficient and productive scholars (often without dependents, or with grown children) who had also given much to the Colleges, and should cite them to prove that no contradiction in fact existed. But in the end, in any case, the contradiction resolved itself through a circularly reinforcing process. A high proportion of the faculty proved more interested over time in getting on with research and teaching in the discipline in which they had chosen to specialize than in continuing to share the burdens of the collegiate enterprise. And as this proportion survived in statistically greater numbers than the more College-centered faculty and came to predominate among the faculty as a whole, its members began to insist that the reward system on campus be brought more closely into line with that of other universities.

With these priorities clarified, the Santa Cruz campus has begun to reconstruct itself along motivationally consistent lines. Since Reorganization, most faculty in most of the Colleges are in but not of the Colleges. Spurred on by colleagues in allied disciplines, they tend to their research and publications, knowing that it is by these that they will be primarily judged. Colleges organize a variety of social occasions for the faculty's benefit, and they provide (through their office space and steno pools) a valued ecological context for intra-Divisional interdisciplinary relationships.[47] In return they request (without great expectation of a favorable response) assistance in College advising and participation in the College core courses. Those faculty members who do respond favorably do so without expecting significant professional pay-offs for their contributions. These conventions have worked inefficiently and (from one point of view) inequitably, but at least without serious misunderstanding on the part of the participants.

Yet the Colleges themselves, even under the conditions described, have stubbornly refused to die. Until late in the Reorganization process, the historic office of College Provost was cautiously referred to in working papers as that of the "Chief Executive Officer" of the College--a retitlement with deliberately bland and bureaucratic connotations. Since then, the three Divisional Deans have turned back to the Provosts administration of the student-affairs dimensions of collegiate life into which the Deans were temporarily plunged by Reorganization; and the newly revitalized Council of Provosts, now serving collectively in place of the former Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, has acquired for the first time an authority commensurate with the College mandate in this area. Pressed to justify the continued autonomy of their units, the Provosts have searched for roles for their Colleges that conspicuously assist the campus's adaptation to a changing educational climate. The former part-time faculty College Academic Preceptors have been replaced in many Colleges by professionally-engaged staff members who have brought a long-needed measure of uniformity among the Colleges to the previously informal and often conflicting rules defining student academic standing. College advising has been similarly strengthened on a professional basis; and in collaboration with the Humanities Division, each College has now capitalized on its greater intra-Divisional coherence by instituting its own interdisciplinary core course in writing and critical thinking, and has made the course mandatory for all entering first-year students as part of a general drive to make the Colleges once again true academic communities for their increasingly poorly prepared recruits. Meanwhile, in conjunction with the Senate Curriculum Committee and three newly-created

faculty Divisional Curriculum Committees, the Deans have now for the first time assumed leadership in defining in analytic terms and nurturing into being a small set of systematically selected courses deemed suitable for meeting the mandatory campus breadth requirements in the three Divisions. These seemingly disparate developments in fact reflect an emerging understanding of a new and viable division of labor that leaves the Colleges performing the functions they are best equipped to perform--organizing the transition of high school students into the academic life of the university, and tending to their non-instructional needs thereafter--while elevating the interdisciplinary curricular role of the Divisions as a newly powerful counterweight to the consolidated strength of the disciplinary Boards of Studies. By elaborating this emergent division of labor in terms that draw collaboratively rather than competitively on faculty energy, the Santa Cruz campus is groping its way toward a new game with old players but new rules in which no one need be the loser.

The brightest blooms in the garden of the University of California's newest, most daringly conceived campus have now faded; so much is generally conceded. The campus that once drew its negative identity from Berkeley while planning to equal Berkeley in size is now gratefully accepting an overflow of applicants from the Berkeley campus in order to maintain its enrollment at one-fifth that level.[48] For many, the experience has proved a humbling and bitter one. Santa Cruz is an institution of excellence in many respects, but it is not the institution of which its founders dreamed. It has maintained a level of instruction that is often outstanding and has produced much research of high quality in a setting of beauty and intimacy, but it has not shown the way back to a Garden of Eden of academic innocence and primeval tranquility. Repeatedly, it has had to abandon or to alter the institutions that defined its exceptionalism in order to accommodate motivations oriented toward an encompassing society it had sought to challenge. The educational experiment at Santa Cruz has demonstrated once again that any large-scale institution in this world must be at least partly of it as well. In recognizing these restraints, and in converting them from obstacles to opportunities, lie such prospects for continuing innovation as an increasingly restrictive environment will permit.

Notes to Section One

1. See Kerr's Godkin Lectures, The Uses of the University (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963).

2. McHenry's utopian propensities seemed in the fore in his active participation in novelist Upton Sinclair's unsuccessful 1934 election campaign for the governorship of California. Yet generally he showed an unblinking appreciation of the need for political support to execute his idealistic objectives. It was typical of him to have made a case for locating the proposed ninth campus of the University in the Almaden Valley near San Jose so as to have five potential advocates in the California Assembly instead of one. (Personal communication).

3. McHenry's own version of his role in the founding of the campus may be found in his article, "Academic Organizational Matrix at the University of California, Santa Cruz," in Dean McHenry (ed.), Academic Departments (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977).

Notes to Section Two

4. McHenry, "Academic Matrix," p. 87.

5. During this preliminary planning phase, McHenry looked closely at Woodrow Wilson's proposed reforms for Princeton, the "house" system at Harvard and Yale, the cluster colleges of Claremont and the University of the Pacific, and the relationship of colleges to the university at Oxford and Cambridge. None seemed to match the initial vision underlying the venture at Santa Cruz--the "house" system because it lacked a strong academic mission, the cluster colleges because they were more a confederacy than a federation except for their administrative overhead, the Oxbridge arrangement because it relied for instruction on in-house tutorials and comprehensive university-level examinations to an extent inapplicable to American conditions. See McHenry, "Academic Matrix," pp. 88-101.

6. Kerr, Uses of the University, p. 18.

7. McHenry, "Academic Matrix," p. 107. The following characterization of McHenry's thinking draws heavily on his own account, particularly pp. 91-98 and 107-110.

8. Remarkably enough, the campus acquired its striking forest setting almost as an after-thought. The original ground plans were drafted on the assumption that, as on other California campuses, the buildings and parking lots would be located in open grasslands near the city limits to minimize initial clearing costs. Only as the architects began to appreciate the ecological potential of the forest zone abutting on the meadows did they come to consider the advantages of locating the campus in the redwood forest itself. The revised plan secured the assent of the initially skeptical Regents through being presented as a cost-effective means of reducing the landscape maintenance that would otherwise be required in California's dry climate.

9. As the astronomy faculty did not offer an undergraduate major, and as the primary base of operation for many of its members was some 50 miles away in Lick Observatory, a partial exception to the rule of College membership was made in their case. After the opening year, moreover, a substantial majority of natural scientists moved into offices next to their laboratories in the central laboratory buildings. However, they remained Fellows of specific Colleges and were expected to participate fully in the advising and in the instructional, administrative, and social life of their Colleges.

10. "Santa Cruz Campus Academic Plan, 1965-75," mimeo, p. 8.

11. "Academic Plan, 1965-75," p. 2.

12. This restriction was, of course, in the first year an almost inevitable consequence of opening a College with at most three or four faculty members in any one discipline. Its significance lies in the effort to maintain the principle even after the opening of several Colleges had brought in sufficient faculty in many fields to make feasible a relatively specialized division of labor.

13. McHenry, "Academic Matrix," pp. 89-90, summarizes these aspirations, which are also to be found scattered through the early campus brochures and catalogs.

Notes to Section Two (cont.)

14. Since students were in the majority of cases to be housed, fed, advised, instructed, and entertained in the College precincts, and (if Santa Cruz students from their first year onward, as typically envisaged in the academic plans) would enter the academic life of the campus through their College core courses and remain subject to College academic and social disciplinary procedures until they graduated in College-sponsored ceremonies, their identification with their College was correctly foreseen to be less problematic than that of the faculty. The chief exceptions to this generalization were transfer students who came to that campus with substantial advanced standing to complete a disciplinary major; for them, the Colleges from the outset were sometimes little more than a mailbox.

15. Regarding the issue of finding and recommending candidates for positions, the Academic Plan of 1965 stated that "who takes the initiative and which recommendation to follow in case of disagreement will be determined by the Chancellor, advised by the appropriate committee of the Academic Senate" (pp. 15-16).

16. That faculty members would teach one course in five for the College (generally as part of a core course, with perhaps a second course at a more advanced level) evolved as a rule of thumb, with some variation among the Colleges; no ratio was written down as a universally binding rule. It seems clear, however, that the founders had expected a higher fraction of course time would be given to the College than was demanded in the event.

17. "Academic Plan, 1965-75," p. 15. Cited in Academic Quality at Santa Cruz: Report of the Chancellor's Self-Study/Accreditation Commission (Santa Cruz offset, 1975), p. 21. This report, an appraisal undertaken after a decade of operation, is by far the most comprehensive and systematic assessment of the campus to date. Karl Lamb, the political scientist who chaired the Commission, joined McHenry in 1963, two years before the opening of the first College, as one of the earliest faculty to participate in the preliminary planning.

18. McHenry credits the idea of "dual employment" of teaching staff with split salaries to a visit he paid to Cambridge University in the early 'sixties at a time of heightened interest there in integrating its excluded "university" teachers with the college system. ("Academic Matrix," p. 97). It was an idea that could be expected to recommend itself to a close professional student of the checks and balances of American constitutional government.

19. "Academic Plan, 1965-75," p. 6. If anything, one can trace a progressive hardening of resistance to departmentalization in the founding documents. The 1962 provisional academic plan had held open the possibility of such formations in the remote future, even while providing a rationale for resisting such a development in the early years:

> The school or faculty might ultimately be further subdivided into campus-wide departments for convenience of administration. In the initial years, however, formation of departments will be deferred for policy and pedagogical reasons. Until the colleges are firmly rooted and the character of the undergraduate instructional function is established, it appears ill-advised to set up conventional departments. The early years should be a period of ferment and cross-pollinating among the disciplines. (UCSC, 1962, p. 9).

Notes to Section Two (cont.)

19.(cont.) But by 1964, Clark Kerr and McHenry were inclined to hold departmentalization at bay "indefinitely, perhaps permanently". Cf. McHenry, "Academic Matrix," p. 100.

20. Joseph Tussman has argued, in Experiment at Berkeley (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), that the conflict between the "college" and the "university" is endemic in American higher education, with undergraduates in their early years as the persistent victims. Tussman himself accepts as inevitable and appropriate that "university" interests should dominate undergraduate curricular planning and teaching style after--but only after --the first two years. See passim, but esp. pp. 104-106.

Notes to Section Three

21. It is possible to overstate this early consensus. The founding Provost of the campus's second College moved on to another campus after the College's first year of operation; the initial appointee to that position at the fourth College left even before the College had opened its doors to students. Several key administrative participants in defining the identity of the campus likewise moved on during the opening years. Santa Cruz, like many other innovative enterprises, continuously risked attracting both those whose bright hopes for radical change proved less widely shared than they had expected and those who discovered that the very real professional adaptations demanded of them at Santa Cruz were less congenial--and the rewards of more traditional institutions more important--than they had thought. On the whole, the latter reactions were the more prevalent.

22. The regulations governing qualifications for the University of California are complex, but essentially restrict admission to the top 12.5% of California high school graduates.

23. Academic Quality at UCSC, pp. 68-71 and Tables II-6, II-7, and II-8. These tables show that by 1973-74, 102 of the 938 degrees awarded were interdisciplinary, including 38 trans-divisional majors, and an additional 54 were individually designed. "Double" majors at Santa Cruz are obtained by completing the full requirements for a major in each of two fields, "joint" majors by completing all but a few formal requirements of each major. Examples of "trans-divisional" degrees in the 1974 graduation list included "Mathematics and Economics," "Politics and Art," and "Psychology and Aesthetic Studies."

24. For statistical evidence of the preeminent importance attached by present and former students of Santa Cruz to the narrative evaluation system, and for supplemental anecdotal indications of the values they saw therein, see the results of the surveys conducted by the sociologist Mark Messer and recorded in "Academic Quality at Santa Cruz," pp. 9 and 57-60. Even more conclusive is the awesome degree of student mobilization against efforts, in 1979 and again in 1981, to extend a letter-grade option currently enjoyed by students in the Natural Sciences Division to the students of all three Divisions.

25. Gerald Grant and David Riesman, Perpetual Dream: Reform and Experiment in the American College (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978). Despite obeisance in its arts and crafts program to William Morris's precepts regarding hand and mind, Cowell College was "innovative" chiefly in its reaffirmation of the centrality of the West European humanistic tradition to any course of study. Kresge College, on the other hand, carried California's human potential movement to its logical conclusion in a university setting by seeking to integrate faculty, students, and staff into an intensely person-centered community through a series of retreats, encounter groups, prolonged open-door office hours, and Core Courses in humanistic psychology. For systematic data on the impressively strong and much differentiated impact of collegiate membership on most students at Santa Cruz during its first decade, see the self study/accreditation report, Academic Quality at UCSC, pp. 44-56.

Notes to Section Three (cont.)

26. The logical outcome of these boundary problems occurred in 1978 when the Board of Environmental Studies--a conglomerate composed of field scientists and social planners--was given an ill-defined status as a kind of independent fourth Division without title.

27. McHenry, "Academic Matrix," p. 101.

28. McHenry, "Academic Matrix," p. 102; Academic Quality at UCSC, pp. 28-30.

29. Academic Quality at UCSC, pp. 29-30.

30. In the University of California system, all "ladder" faculty--i.e., those eligible for or enjoying tenure--are members of their campus Academic Senate unless placed on "acting" status pending completion of their Ph.D. Thus assistant professors are members of the Academic Senate even though tenure comes only with promotion to the associate level.

31. In fact, it so greatly undermined the power and legitimacy of the "outside" member of the Board that such appointments became otiose, and quietly faded away.

32. Academic Quality at UCSC, p. 33. Only Oakes College followed the original plan of recruiting a faculty cadre for each new College from the existing Colleges--a practice that might greatly have strengthened the socializing impact of newly forming Colleges.

33. Quoted in Academic Quality at UCSC, p. 33.

34. Inevitably, there were important exceptions to this pattern. College personnel committees, hesitant to judge scholarship outside the committee members' disciplines, might wholly defer to the Board in certain cases, thereby lowering the prospects for confrontation but also lightening the weight of the College personnel letters. Lacking assured criteria for judgment; College committees might be more impressed by--and more insistently inclined to look for--the sheer number of articles a faculty member published, regardless of their redundancy or intrinsic merit; conversely, though more rarely, a College committee, stung by charges of club favoritism, might demand more in the way of recognized originality and distinguished achievement than a record of solid but routine scholarship that had satisfied a complacent Board. And there were many cases, both positive and negative, in which Board and College were able to reach substantial agreement. All modal generalizations of this nature have limits: were there none, the civil war on the Santa Cruz campus would soon have grown uncontainable.

35. It must be said that such sentiments not infrequently reflected a compound of ingenuously wishful thinking and suddenly activated self-interest. By the mid-'seventies, the promotional record at Santa Cruz was becoming clear to those who were willing to see: faculty who compiled a respectable scholarly record and strongly supportive outside letters in relation to it were essentially invulnerable to charges of merely adequate teaching and modest contributions to institution-building and curricular design, whereas those who put their energy into the latter activities chose a high-risk route that few survived. Hopefully cited instances to the contrary were usually drawn from the founding years of the campus.

Notes to Section Three (cont.)

36. Academic Quality at UCSC, Table III-7, p. 88; McHenry, "Academic Matrix," pp. 113-114. One factor in the lower averages by 1975 was a more sustained and successful effort by the campus to recruit qualified applicants from among disadvantaged racial and ethnic minorities.

37. UCSC Office of Planning and Analysis, "Some Factors in the Rate of Attrition at UCSC," memo, 1980.

Notes to Section Four

38. Since actions in complex social settings often have unanticipated consequences, we cannot accept at face value the claims of successful reformers in this respect. The "successful" outcome may have occurred contrary to the initial intentions of at least some of the participants, or may reflect a disjunction at some point between their prescriptive analysis and their choices in concrete circumstances.

39. The report was prepared in May of 1974 by the present writer, at that time chair-designate of the Committee for the following academic year.

40. Formally speaking, individual faculty members had always been entitled to request a transfer to another College. To exercise this option, however, they were obliged to state in writing to the Chancellor that they were experiencing "personal hardship" in their College, and to offer substantiating detail. Chancellor McHenry's opposition to transference among Colleges, well known at the time, was subsequently reiterated in his "Academic Matrix," pp. 109-110. The point of Reaggregation in any case was not simply to enlarge a safety valve but rather to promote an orderly regrouping of whole clusters of faculty in light of a general curricular plan for the campus.

41. The one exception, the flourishing Stevenson Core Course, was itself initially assigned to the Division of Humanities. But after hearing vigorous protests from the Stevenson Provost, the present writer, as chair of the Senate's curriculum committee, decided to keep a window open to an unknown future by devising a formula permitting Colleges to sponsor up to five courses, "introductory and interdisciplinary in character and required of all entering students, with a format designed to create an academic community within the College." It is this formula that the Colleges were subsequently to use in reviving in modified form their various core courses. See page 41.

42. In the mail ballot, the measure was defeated by almost the same margin by which it had earlier passed. Two years later, under less heated circumstances, the faculty again approved by mail ballot an essentially similar measure by a vote of 111-108. As the margin of victory was only three votes, however, opponents successfully petitioned to have yet another vote on the issue in the fall of 1981. As of the moment, therefore, the status of letter grades on campus remains unresolved.

43. James Q. Wilson, Political Organizations (New York: Basic Books, 1973).

Notes to Section Five

44. For example, the so-called Comparative History Seminar--an informal assembly of social historians, sociologists, economists, and political scientists who met together (generally at least twice a month) to read and criticize a member's most recent paper--has now been given the status and funding of an Organized Research Unit and is currently planning a large-scale national conference on some contemporary theories of social change.

45. Without employing these specific historical references, Joseph Tussman is particularly clear on the conflict between these views. See his Experiment, pp. 27-42.

46. This point seems to have been grasped most fully by the founding Provost of Cowell College, who proposed half seriously, in consequence, in a memo circulated among the faculty a year before his retirement, that junior faculty be guaranteed tenure for good behavior and asked to involve themselves more wholeheartedly in College teaching and service than they currently felt free to do. Page Smith, memo to faculty, March 1972.

47. In six of the eight Colleges, at least three-quarters of the Fellows are now in the same Division as the Dean to whom the Provost of the College at least nominally reports. Crown is now clearly a Natural Science College, though most of the scientists continue to have their offices in the laboratory buildings, leaving a small number of College offices to anomalous remnants of the Economics Board and the faculties of German and Slavic literature. Cowell, College V, and Kresge are now the Humanities Colleges; Cowell retains a few founding Fellows in the Social Sciences and Kresge has added a few historians of political thought, but College V is almost purely a center of the Performing Arts faculties and may become a new Division in itself. The faculty of College VIII coincides with the extra-Divisional Board of Environmental Studies. Merrill College was intended to be the center of the Social Sciences, but houses the Latin American literature faculty and several social historians with a continuing interest in the Third World. Stevenson College falls nominally under the jurisdiction of the Dean of Social Sciences but retains so many founding Fellows in literature, philosophy, history, and linguistics that, along with still independent Oakes College (which alone is authorized to participate in personnel decisions and to offer College-sponsored courses above the introductory core course level), it must be counted as one of two remaining truly inter-Divisional Colleges on campus. As the above review indicates, the administrative structure of the Colleges is currently far from uniform but in most instances reflects a predominantly Divisional--though never departmental--orientation.

48. With the assistance of a newly vigorous Office of Admissions, Santa Cruz was able this year to close its date of acceptance for applications several months before opening day of classes for the first time since 1973. It also registered a greater gain in applications from first-year students than any other of the University of California's nine campuses. But Santa Cruz's troubles are far from over in this respect. This year marks the end of the great bulge the post-war baby boom placed in the demand curve for higher education; hereafter, Santa Cruz will have to compete with other campuses for a smaller, poorer, less well educated contingent of students composed increasingly of disadvantaged ethnic minorities who have characteristically preferred metropolitan campuses within easy commuting distance that offer more remedial and more vocationally-oriented programs. The implications of

Notes to Section Five (cont.)

48. (cont.) this prospect for its liberal arts curriculum and narrative evaluation system are not encouraging.