DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 646 HE 001 514

AUTHOR Cleveland, Harlan
TITLE Prospectus for the Seventies.
INSTITUTION Hawaii Univ., Honolulu.
PUB DATE Jan 70
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.95
DESCRIPTORS Administration, Community Colleges, *Educational Planning, Graduate Study, *Higher Education, *Institutional Role, *Planning, Relevance (Education), *State Programs, Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS *Hawaii

ABSTRACT

This prospectus prescribes a "general sense of direction for the University of Hawaii in the 1970s." It discusses: (1) the need to provide higher education for all who desire it; (2) the rapid growth since statehood of the state university system and prospects for continued growth; (3) the growth and purposes of the community colleges; (4) the need for "relevance" and reform of undergraduate education; (5) the need for graduate education to focus on areas in which the University has expertise, on programs related to the environment, and on the development of professional fields; (6) continuing education programs that serve the community; and (7) suggestions for administering the University of Hawaii as a statewide system. A summary of the major points concludes the prospectus. (AF)

PROSPECTUS FOR THE SEVENTIES

Presented by Harlan Cleveland • President of the University of Hawaii • January 1970

Contents

I. Introduction

"In dreams begins responsibility," wrote the Irish poet Yeats. My responsibility as your new president begins with a dream about the future of the University of Hawaii.

A dream is not a plan. An enterprise so full of rugged individuals, so pluralistically governed as a university has to be, does not make progress by following detailed blueprints and central directives. It moves by creative improvisation on a general sense of direction, by plural initiatives within a framework generally understood and agreed.

In suggesting a general sense of direction for the University of Hawaii in the 1970s, after only four months here, it would be presumptuous for me to describe it as my personal initiative; yet to describe it as a consensus of the University community would be equally presumptuous. The notions in this Prospectus are something in between—the product of a wide and free-wheeling consultation with literally hundreds of students, faculty members and administrators on all the University's eight campuses; with my immediate bosses, the University regents; and with my ultimate bosses, the governor, members of the legislature and taxpaying citizens who are asked to make each year a larger bet on higher education in the state of Hawaii.

Yet precisely because the parties at interest are so many and various, it falls to me to make these suggestions on my personal responsibility without implying that any of those consulted, even Richard Kosaki's Task Force for Planning which struggled with these issues during the fall semester of 1969, would agree with all of them.

The Prospectus is, then, a *draft* sense of direction, opened today for debate and disputation, offered as a basis for the next steps in academic planning, facilities planning and financial planning in the years just ahead of us. It is not a rigid "master plan"; it will be subject to continuous mutation, just as the proposals I am about to make are themselves mutants from the University's previous plans.

II. A Chance for All

The goals of a public university are set in practice by the expectations of the society that nourishes it and of the students and faculty which are its *raison d'etre.*

The expectations of the state of Hawaii about its University are reasonably clear. The University will be expected during the 1970s

- to contribute to the education of nearly every citizen of the state who gets through high school, plus a good many who get past the age of 18 without getting past high school;
- to participate in national growth by educating selected citizens of other states (how many, and how selected, is for debate); and
- to assist the development of a wider Pacific and Asian community which Hawaii is qualified by geography and heritage and ambition to serve as an educational hub.

This University happens to be charting its future just when the nation is entering the era of universal post-secondary education. The reason is that in a highly developed society, nearly every working person needs some education in innovation and complexity. Five years ago the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, in a report called "Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond the High School," proposed "that the nation now raise its sights to make available at least two years of further education, aimed primarily at intellectual growth, for all high school graduates." The nation is moving toward adopting this doctrine as a goal; the state of Hawaii has already in practice adopted it as the operational guideline for the University of Hawaii.

Hawaii's commitment to the development of the potentialities of each of her citizens was clearly stated by the state legislature. In recommending the 1969 operating budget, the Conference Committee reported:

> . . . your Committee feels that there is at present a climate for change—change which will have to take place if we are to continue to develop our state into one where each citizen is given the opportunity to achieve his full potential; for as in the words of John Gardner, former Secretary of HEW:
>
> > "The fact that large numbers of American boys and girls fail to attain their full development must weigh heavily on our national conscience. And it is not simply a loss to the individual. At a time when the nation must make the most of its human resources, it is unthinkable that we should resign ourselves to this waste of potentialities. Recent events have taught us

with sledge hammer effectiveness the lesson we should have learned from our own tradition—that our strength, creativity and further growth as a society depend upon our capacity to develop the talents and potentialities of our people."

Your Committee believes that "excellence, as well as equality" should be attained. The attainment of such a goal will require an openness on the part of all of Hawaii's citizens, openness to newcomers and visitors, from one social and economic class to another, from one culture to another, from each and every citizen to his fellow citizens.

Your Committee therefore in addition to recommending the appropriation of resources necessary to carry out the programs designed to bring about such changes, challenges the other segments of our society to participate in designing and developing a Hawaii in which the *needs of all* citizens are considered.

Not so long ago, such a policy would have seemed terribly radical, even Utopian. Time was when the children of the rich and highly born filled the better colleges; the others could content themselves with physical labor or, if they were unusually talented, with the specialized skills of artisanry. Later on, as more complicated societies required more educated people, the doctrine developed that all should get an equal start, but if some fell behind because of early disadvantages or racial discrimination or inability to speak the language of the governing classes, that was not regarded as serious because the need for common labor and easy-to-learn skills was still very great.

But now, machines are taking over most of the physical drudgery, and computers are taking over most of the clerical and analytical tasks. Those rows of desks with people copying or calculating or stamping or drilling are becoming rows of machines doing those things, only more quickly and more accurately. The people are freed for more interesting work, for tasks that require thinking and figuring-out, telling the stupid machines what to do and when and how, and checking up on them when they fail—and, above all, for tasks that require working cooperatively with other people. Each person has to understand something about how the whole system works, so that he can do his part in a relevant way. And at any level in the organization, a person with imagination and an aptitude for leadership becomes a potential agent of change.

That is why everybody, or very nearly everybody, will be going to college. That is why each American parent, whatever his own circumstances, wants all his children to go to college, not just some or one or none.

The requirement for universal education in complexity and change does *not* mean that every young American graduating from a high school, or getting past the age of 18, must go right on to the college of his choice. Many will benefit from a period of work, or even from a period of travel and experience and thinking about themselves; some of those

who drop out or get a job or decide to get their military service over with or even bum around the world may have a more accurate judgment about their own readiness for higher education than their parents or high-school counselors can possibly have.

But sooner or later, nearly every man and woman who is going to contribute to society in a way that satisfies his or her own self-esteem is going to insist on getting some more education beyond the secondary level. And those who get their higher education early will find they have to get some more later on.

To say that in the 1970s everybody will want to go to college is not, of course, to say that everybody needs to get a college degree, or even work for academic credit at all. We are going to need to be very flexible about the way we certify that a person has tried, by systematic exposure to formal education, to improve his understanding of his techniques, his environment, or himself. Some may benefit from academic exposure even if they never attain a predetermined standard of excellence. Others can go on, some in much less than the traditional four years, to tackle the more specialized or complicated or theoretical kinds of work which we normally associate with "higher" academic and professional degrees.

"This means that everyone who can profit from a college education should have the chance to acquire it," says a regional education commission, "but it does not suggest that everyone should have the same education. On the contrary, diversified, well-planned education, research and training programs suited to the differing capacities of individuals, and designed to meet the needs of society, constitute the ideal system of higher education in a democracy."

In Hawaii, where the state government has wisely provided for the most integrated system of public higher education to be found in any state, we have a good chance to provide quite consciously the diversity of options a system of universal higher education will require. During the '70s we will have one central University campus, one large four-year campus and one or more smaller ones, and at least seven community colleges—not to mention dozens of research and training facilities scattered around the state and around the Pacific. Each campus in the system will be encouraged to experiment freely, especially in methods of teaching and learning; but its fields of specialization and its bets on excellence will have to be carefully planned. Even with a flexible statewide system and willing support from the legislature, we cannot aspire to be excellent in everything everywhere. What we probably can do is make sure that the individual student seeking higher education finds somewhere the right kinds of options tailored to *his* educational needs.

III. Growth With Dispersion

One out of every 24 people in the Hawaiian Islands was a student at the University of Hawaii this past semester. Of the 35,000 students, 27,500 were enrolled for full-time academic credit; the others were enrolled in various non-credit and apprenticeship programs.

Since statehood the University's full-time enrollment has grown by more than 200 per cent; it was 7,680 in 1958. That is much greater, for example, than the rate of growth of telephones in use, or electricity sold, or bank deposits, or the value of building permits, or most of the other indices of Hawaii's progress in the first decade of its life as the 50th State. The University's growth is surprisingly—and fortunately—more than double the rate of increase in motor vehicles on Hawaii's roads. It is *ten times* the rate of expansion in Hawaii's population, and nearly ten times the rate of increase of students in public schools from kindergarten through high school. As an index of pulsating growth, the dynamism of the University of Hawaii is exceeded only by factors which were deeply affected by dramatic changes in technology: the tonnage of transpacific cargo, the number of airline passengers arriving in Honolulu—and, of course, the number of tourists staying here overnight.

We have tried to project our enrollment for the 1970s; it is a tricky statistical game but an illuminating one. If we were just to let nature take its course, we think the Manoa campus would continue to attract one-fifth of Hawaii's high school graduates, with that proportion inching up perhaps half a per cent per year. Transfers to Manoa from other parts of the system, and from the mainland, would go up quite rapidly. On that basis the Manoa campus would by 1973 or 1974 break across the "magic figure" of 25,000, suggested as a ceiling by *Academic Development Plan II*. The graduate population at Manoa would be about 27 per cent by then, up from 23 per cent today.

Present assumptions, which treat the Hilo campus very largely as a college for Big Island students, would carry Hilo to its "magic figure" of 1,500 by 1975. The existing community colleges would probably exceed the present steep growth rate by another two per cent per year—mostly students who would not get to college if there were not a community college system. That system has 8,197 students enrolled for credit today, and in the natural course of events would nearly double that figure by the middle of the decade of the '70s; to that figure should be added the population of Hawaii Technical School (516 in 1969)

which is becoming a community college, and the proposed Windward Community College now on the drawing boards.

On these "normal growth" assumptions, then, the picture by the middle of the decade of the 1970s would look like this:

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII SYSTEM
FALL SEMESTER CREDIT ENROLLMENT*
ACTUAL 1966-69, PROJECTED 1973-76
(Normal Growth Assumptions)

	Manoa Campus (Daytime Credit)	Hilo Campus	Five Community Colleges†	Total System
Actual				
1966	14,772	571	2,505	17,848
1969	18,474	864	8,197	27,535
Projected				
1973	24,605	1,418	12,567	38,590
1976	29,670	1,638	15,875	47,183

* Note that these totals exclude both non-credit enrollment (896 in 1969). For the Manoa campus, they also exclude credit enrollment in evening courses (3,114 in 1969) and enrollment in the University of Hawaii Summer Session (20,410 in 1969).

† Figures do not include Hawaii Technical School, which is becoming the sixth community college, and projections do not take account of a seventh community college on the windward side of Oahu.

Even though these numbers exclude non-credit and evening enrollment, and do not take account of the University's enormous summer school, they suggest the direction in which we should try to modify the "natural course of events." Already planned is a new campus, in the leeward area of Oahu; the group laying academic plans for this campus has proposed that it commence with four separate colleges and build to perhaps 5,000 students in a first phase; the committee's recommendations (summarized later on in this report) provide for growth to 10,000 students by the end of the decade.

The chief problem is to reduce the population pressure on and around the Manoa campus, where there is already an acute shortage of housing, parking space, and (not quite as acute) of classroom, laboratory and library facilities. Ideally, the Manoa campus should never get to the "magic figure" of 25,000; a strong case can be made for a somewhat lower figure.

Manoa will remain the University's main graduate and research campus, so the question is how many prospective undergraduates can

and should be diverted to other campuses. There are sound educational reasons for accommodating many more of them at smaller four-year campuses, where higher residential ratios, easier achievement of close faculty-student relations, and more new purpose-oriented and interdisciplinary programs may moderate the high costs, student *anomie* and complaints about "relevance" which are so characteristic of large university campuses throughout the United States.

As the community colleges' college transfer programs come into their own, moreover, more freshmen can start their college experience in a community college and finish it on one of the four-year campuses; for some students, the cultural change in midstream may itself have educational value.

To illustrate what a policy of diversion of more undergraduates from the Manoa campus would mean, let us start with a reasonably generous assumption about the total number of students who will wish and have good reason to attend the University of Hawaii—50,000 by 1976, rather than the 47,000 that results from the rather conservative assumptions in the earlier table. A revised pattern of enrollment might then look like this:

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII SYSTEM
FALL SEMESTER CREDIT ENROLLMENT
ACTUAL 1969, PROJECTED 1973 and 1976
(Revised Assumptions)

Year	Manoa Campus	New Campus	Hilo Campus	Seven Community Colleges	Total System
1969	18,474	.....	864	8,584	27,922
1973	24,000	1,000	1,500	14,000	40,500
1976	23,000	3,500	2,500	21,000	50,000

To limit Manoa in this way will require a number of coordinated moves: a more rapid buildup at Hilo, a faster development of the new campus on Oahu than the present plans contemplate, maintenance of a steep slope for the community colleges' expansion curve, and a well-managed system-wide program of admissions to and transfers within the state-wide University system as a whole. The geographical dispersion of our undergraduate offerings is already planned and under way; no change of direction is suggested, but rather a speedup in accomplishment. The purpose should be to serve more students better in more communities, and also to protect and enhance the environment of learning at Manoa, which will remain the center of advanced education and graduate research for the state of Hawaii.

Besides sheer numbers, the most significant thing about the University's future student body may be its "mix." More college students will be older, more of them will be studying part time—not only because of employment demands or a desire to use leisure time constructively, but because learning will increasingly be recognized as a life-long process.

Our student body will be increasingly cosmopolitan, too. We should deliberately attract some of the best students from the mainland, rather than continuing the existing policy of *laissez faire* in mainland admissions. The non-resident tuition fee will not in practice be a deterrent. Students will come to the colleges of Hawaii because they find specialized programs not found elsewhere, or because of quality teaching and research, or because we have an attractive environment for learning—an asset which ought to be jealously protected in Manoa Valley and consciously developed on the newer campuses.

Beyond service to the youth of Hawaii and the mainland, this University will also be expected to do more in a systematic way to assist in the development of young people in the Pacific and Asian area. Fifty-five per cent of the world's population is under the age of thirty, and 75 per cent of the under-30s live in the developing countries. The exchange programs of the East-West Center have been a start, but have concentrated on graduate students. The University of Hawaii as a whole will be expected to build in the 1970s a more systematic program of assistance, especially for the peoples of the Pacific, and in other than graduate fields of study. We should, moreover, plan to send more American students to live and study in the Pacific and Asian countries. And meanwhile we will be trying to make the educational experience more international and cross-cultural even for the stay-at-homes.

IV. The Community Colleges: Education for Vocational Variety

The decision by the state legislature in 1964 to place community colleges under the University Board of Regents added a truly new dimension to public higher education in the State of Hawaii. It made a state-wide system possible, indeed inevitable. It made possible, if not inevitable, maximum coverage at minimum costs, and opened the way to the era of universal higher education in this state.

The decision was popular—not just in the sense that it was politically approved at the time, but in the sense that a large demand materialized for the services it provided. When the community college system was established, four of its five units had been in existence for decades; yet their new lease on life as part of a University system brought a 300 per cent enrollment increase between 1964 and 1969. When a new college, Leeward, was established, it rocketed from zero to 1,670 students its first year, and doubled to 3,200 its second year. The colleges had 6,164 students in the fall of 1968, jumped to 8,584 in the fall of 1969, and are projected to exceed 10,000 in 1970 and 20,000 in 1975. In many occupational programs there are long waiting lists; for every occupational student enrolled at Honolulu since the fall of 1968, one who is equally qualified has been placed on standby. Would-be day students are having to take classes in the evening at Kapiolani and Leeward, and those who do study by day are getting used to the continuous noise of construction as physical facilities are rushed to keep up with human demands.

Our community colleges are in five different kinds of educational business at once. They are junior colleges, offering lower-division and preprofessional courses designed for students who will continue at a four-year college or university campus. They prepare students for employment in technical, vocational and semi-professional skills. They conduct short courses to upgrade skills and enrich the lives of adults in their communities. They stress guidance and counseling, to match people and skills with organizations and jobs. They add cultural and educational events to what the community offers its citizens at large.

Most of the students are in occupational programs, and most of the problems are there, too. Only one college has fewer than half its students in vocational training specialties, and for four of them the percentage is 87 per cent or more. The average for the system is about 70 per cent.

The demand for occupational programs at our community colleges suggests concentration on their improvement, rather than on their position in the academic pecking order. There are real problems in the programs as they stand. The attrition rate is high; the average completion rate last year was 26 per cent. The calendar is rigid and often inhibits students from enrolling when they are ready to enroll. More short-term courses, with less emphasis on achieving a sort of academic degree at the end of a two-year period, might help adapt the programs to the students' real needs. Two years may be more than is really needed to learn the elements of some of the trades which are taught; it is almost certainly longer than impoverished students or shorthanded firms are willing to wait. Moreover, slicing the material into more manageable chunks might enable a student to come into the program at any time during the year, starting from the beginning and moving at his own speed.

The dropout rate might also be reduced by establishing a learning center where mechanical and programmed learning aids could be stored and used by students on their own time. In a traditional program, a lecture or demonstration is given only once. The student who misses it by absence or inattention may not get a second chance, because new materials are introduced in the following class sessions. And there are always students who need to listen several times before they fully comprehend. If these are potential dropouts or failures, a chance to "make up" or "review" on their own might have a real effect on the attrition rate. A learning center would be expensive, and it would be well to experiment first with one such center serving the Oahu colleges.

In a vocational program there is a natural tension between the college which concentrates on trying to help people grow and the employers who want to fill jobs. As in other university dilemmas, the answer probably lies in maximizing options for the students. A student who wants to concentrate full time on shop training need not be dragooned into a course on Shakespeare.

But a student who wants to prepare for something besides his first job would do well to spend some time and effort in the arts and sciences; his potential for leadership will bear a direct correlation to his understanding of the wider society, and more inclusive technology of which his first job is likely to be a very small piece. By the same token, we need to review the general education offerings of the community colleges to see whether they contribute to the student's ability to help solve problems. An introductory course in psychology offered in a two-year college to men starting life as skilled industrial workers is—or should be—very different from the introductory course offered as prerequisite to a psychology major in a four-year college.

The community colleges on the neighbor islands face somewhat different problems from the crowded colleges in urban Oahu. Small populations and limited job opportunities make for small enrollments in some of the occupational programs. Flexibility and a careful division of labor are the key. We should encourage a student from, say, Kauai to enroll in a community college on another island—and vice versa. For we will need to ration carefully what we try to do in each community college, to avoid expensive duplication and ensure that enrollments in any one program are big enough to be cost-effective. In each community there are service needs to be met, but each community college should not establish its own program in electronics, or nursing, or diesel mechanics, or hotel management. These specialized programs which often require costly equipment should be offered wherever the best talent is; it is easier to move students to the equipment than the other way around.

I will not now, on such brief acquaintance, specify which community colleges should concentrate on what. The provosts and faculties of the colleges should have the maximum autonomy to do that—but such decisions will have to be made jointly with other provosts and faculties, within a system of state-wide coordination loose enough to be liberating but not so loose as to permit the wasteful use of resources that are always bound to be scarce. The provosts and faculties of the colleges should have the maximum autonomy in how to do their "thing"; but there will have to be some careful joint planning to make sure that the "things" done are different enough to maximize the variety in the state system. The aim, in any case is clear—to maximize the variety in the state system of higher education—and thus, once again, maximize the options available to each prospective student.

The community colleges have a special opportunity to help the educationally disadvantaged, which national estimates place as high as twenty per cent of the population. A dent is already being made through the Model Cities program and the Manpower Development programs housed in some of our community colleges, but the "regular" programs still make it difficult or impossible for a young man or woman in the last thirty percentiles of his or her high school class to find further training or educational stimulation in any part of the University of Hawaii system. Some attention to opportunities for the educationally disadvantaged should surely be part of the University's horoscope.

One of the reasons for moving the community colleges from the Department of Education to the University was to marry the occupational programs to general education programs in the arts and sciences. The marriage is still rather unstable, and requires special attention. The wide differences in requirements for teaching appointments is one divisive factor; in colleges where more than half of the faculty do not

themselves have a B.A., faculty consideration of academic transfer courses naturally presents special problems. Where real progress can perhaps be made is in marrying occupational and general education courses in the life and work of individual students. Some occupational courses might be considered for college transfer credit. And more of the general education offerings might be oriented around problem-solving for reasons analogous to those suggested for the four-year colleges in the next section of this report.

V. Undergraduate Education: "Relevance" and Reform

Undergraduate education is due for a major overhaul in the United States, and the University of Hawaii has a chance to be among the leaders in fashioning its future. We have to grow and disperse our growth on a dozen campuses. We draw a high proportion of highly motivated students. The legislature has wisely integrated all forms of higher education in a single state-wide system of manageable size. We therefore have a chance to experiment more widely, and to do what needs to be done in the '70s more boldly, sooner and potentially better than elsewhere in America.

There is of course no standard definition as to the direction in which the universally predicted "reforms" should take us. What is the itch that we should start scratching with such vigor? Many students call it "relevance." Some words about this much-used word may be in order.

Typically the incoming freshman, man or girl, has not decided what to study or why. There are exceptions; but the person who knows exactly what he wants to do with his life at the age of 17 is in some danger of closing off avenues of stimulation and adventure that he cannot yet imagine, or do not yet exist. For the rest, "going to college" stirs drives that are deeply felt but often extremely vague. As a recent study concludes, they are able "to think about their thoughts, to construct ideals, and to reason realistically about the future. . . ." The late adolescents, says this study, need a sense of personal identity, of achievement, and of self-esteem . . . (and) to discover "a visible relationship between knowledge and action, between the questions asked in the classroom and the lives they lead outside it."

So what do the students mean by "relevant"? I have discussed this question at length with dozens of freshmen, and a good many other students whose memories of what it was like to be an incoming freshman are sharp. They seem to mean they want to be shown what the search for knowledge is *for,* how the learning of disciplined and therefore tedious method makes possible the doing of things worth doing.

The catch is that the things worth doing—managing a city, or learning what goes on inside a cell, or practicing medicine or composing a quartet or building a hotel or abolishing poverty or preventing war—all require the application of *several* disciplines. In the real world all problem-solving is interdisciplinary. To grapple with the real world—as distinguished from merely complaining about it—each of us needs

several intellectual tools, or ways of thinking (or analytical techniques or methodologies, to be academic about it) that enable us to understand and thus do something "relevant" about the problems each student sees ahead.

In these circumstances the University confronts the incoming student with two faces, equally impersonal and equally baffling. One is the harried adviser on registration day who tells him that if he doesn't know what he is there for he might as well get his core requirements out of the way—some English, some math, a foreign language, some other courses which are elementary and therefore tend to be focused on methods and techniques rather than purposes and values. The other face is that of the permissive adviser, who thinks he is doing the student a favor by telling him students should build their own curricula, but has neither the time nor the University-wide knowledge to help the student match the faculty's offerings to his own prior preparation and personal needs.

So the students go into the core courses and start complaining. The foreign language requirement is a favorite target.

One way in which colleges are catering to this student dissatisfaction is to create courses with titles (and sometimes even content) as vague as the students' feelings—"The Meaning of Life," "The City in Human History," "Humanistic Approach to Knowledge" and the like—where the stress is on clearing the air and the questioning of inherited assumptions, as a preface to learning how to solve real-world problems. Another response to complaints about the curriculum is to divert students into frankly vocational programs where relevance can be achieved by relating classwork to success on the student's first job after college.

There are other complaints—prerequisites, class size, inequities in grading, and just plain bad teaching are those most frequently expressed. And there are complaints on the outside as well—that college students are not learning to spell or write or use computers or practice responsible citizenship. Most of these are impossible to settle to everybody's satisfaction. For each student who prefers the participative environment of small classes, for example, there is another who prefers the anonymity of a lecture course. "What students want," says the ASUH Academic Affairs Committee, "is the opportunity to choose, to have both large classes and small classes offered in the same subject to allow the student to learn in the environment most suitable to his own temperament"—assuming, of course, that he knows himself well enough to be sure which that is.

The same can be said of grading—some prefer A's and B's, some want Pass-Fail, some would like to withdraw rather than fail—to preserve a cleaner record for their later re-entry into higher education. We are experimenting with all these grading systems here or there in the University of Hawaii system; I doubt that we will find the universally

acceptable answer, but we may be able to maximize the options, which in a university system is close to the definition of freedom.

Description is always easier than prescription. In general, the reforms in prospect at the University of Hawaii will:

- Pull students more into curriculum-building in every department and program. University education will increasingly be regarded not as preparation for life but as a slice of life itself.

- Allow the students to take more responsibility for their own education but also help them do so; this implies more tailor-made programs and independent study (following the precedent of the existing honors program and the "non-major major" for upperclassmen.

- Develop more interdisciplinary courses built around the solving of problems, especially environmental problems—and offer more of them to freshmen and sophomores in the four-year colleges and even in the community colleges.

- Build into the curriculum more work experience, internships, and actual scholarly research, earlier in the student's career than is now common.

- Make it possible for some students to achieve a B.A. degree in considerably less than the traditional four years, by qualifying for academic credit through examinations and special projects as well as through course work.

Some of these new approaches may require special funds to get new programs under way. It might be wise to set aside one per cent of the University's instructional budget for the funding of innovations and experimental programs.

The formal language requirement should certainly be modified to make room for a more flexible system that encourages the student to expose himself to immersion in a culture other than his own, including but not limited to language learning. This can best be done by a "semester abroad"—often earlier in the college career, and for a shorter period, than the traditional "junior year abroad." Moreover, for a student at the University of Hawaii, cultural immersion does not necessarily mean going "abroad"; an experience of living and working on the mainland, or even on another Hawaiian island in a different kind of social and economic community, can well be the educational equivalent of a sojourn in France or India. In this broader sense, a semester of cross-cultural experience should in time be an option available to every student in the University of Hawaii system.

Even for those who remain on the same campus for four years, a "culture-learning" requirement can become an alternative to the present

language requirement; planning for such a shift is already well advanced, for example, in the Asian and Pacific languages department on the Manoa campus. In Hilo, a unique opportunity exists to build an international program at the undergraduate level with a strong cross-cultural component, taking advantage of both the program and the personnel of the new center for cross-cultural training and research.

A policy of maximizing the student's options suggests a practice of deliberate diversity among the campuses of the University. With student participation, the faculty and administration on each four-year campus—Manoa, Hilo, and the prospective new campus in the leeward area of Oahu—will need to develop what they consider the best approaches to undergraduate education, subject to broad standard-setting by the University community as a whole but designed for diversity, not uniformity. This will create problems about transferring credits from one campus to another, but they are soluble if the standards in all parts of the system are high.

Diversity will be important not only in curriculum but also in the size and character of the campuses themselves. Undergraduate education at Manoa is deeply influenced by the presence of strong graduate and research programs, and of professors who teach at both graduate and undergraduate levels. At Hilo, we should avoid building beyond a two or three thousand campus population, and press for a high proportion (up to 50 per cent) of students in college residences. In this way a small-college atmosphere can be maintained that would serve the individual needs of many students from other islands (even some from Honolulu) better than the larger and more complex Manoa campus. A deliberate effort should be made to attract to Hilo a cosmopolitan "mix" of students.

On the new campus, we have an opportunity to start from scratch in tackling issues that are inherently difficult to solve in an existing institution: the need for more "tailored" academic advising, a more intimate faculty-student relationship, a greater effort to demonstrate the connections between learning methods and solving problems.

A representative committee of faculty, students, and administrators has been planning for our new campus since last summer, and has just presented its preliminary report. They have proposed that the University acquire a single tract of land large enough to accommodate 25,000 students, but that we plan during the '70s to build two phases, first for a student population of 5,000 or 6,000, and then another program that would bring the student body not beyond 10,000. The first phase would feature four "theme colleges," stressing interdisciplinary problem-focused studies in humanistic learning, social science, education and instructional technology, and environmental sciences.

I will not rehearse here the well-reasoned arguments for the com-

mittee's proposals, which I find generally sensible as a basis for our further planning. We propose to begin building the new colleges for the new campus in the womb of the Manoa campus, starting in the fall semester of 1970 with a new College of Humanistic Studies. A few features of the present plan might be improved by a skeptical second look: it is too early to decide where a law school should be located, and the proposal to build graduate programs on top of the new campus undergraduate colleges might best be considered after the undergraduate programs are well under way.

We should now move ahead with dispatch to select a site, plan the first stage of the new campus, and move to establish at Manoa the experimental basis for the new colleges. And we will not forget that our new campus will generate a wider community around it—at an estimated rate of four persons for every student—which will require the University to take a close and professional interest in all aspects of the environment of that part of the island of Oahu.

The reform of undergraduate education along the lines here indicated will require substantial changes in attitudes and organization, not just the delineation of a general policy. The implications for organization are suggested later in this report. Fortunately for the future of the University of Hawaii, the inevitability of growth and the necessity for change are already widely accepted in the University community. The receptivity to experimentation is indeed one of the factors that most influences first-rate new faculty members to join us these days.

VI. Graduate Education and Research: The Doctrine of Uniqueness

The University of Hawaii system will develop in planned diversity. The state will want to see a balanced undergraduate menu on a statewide counter. But our educational cafeteria will also feature certain selected graduate and research specialties—poi, sashimi and curry, but not necessarily tacos or all the elements of a standard smorgasbord. What specialties will we offer in the 1970s?

The graduate-study-and-research policy in the '60s, laid down in *Academic Development Plan I* (1963) and repeated in *Plan II* (1969), is clear but general: scholarship would be "fostered with special diligence in areas in which the University has some inherent advantage," and/or "which promise to contribute significantly to the development of the state of Hawaii." In practice there are two additional policies: a faculty member who is good enough to assemble the necessary resources and attract bright graduate students can and should pursue his own scholarly interest. And the University will invest in faculty research—research leaves, travel, reduced teaching loads, aid in publishing—where that will help develop and upgrade members of the instructional staff.

Pursuant to these policies, the recent growth of graduate education and research at the University of Hawaii can only be described as phenomenal. The academic departments now offer master's degrees in 65 fields and doctoral degrees in 31 of those. Our present projections suggest that the University of Hawaii in 1976 will have between six and eight thousand graduate students studying for advanced degrees on its Manoa campus, compared with roughly 2,600 in 1968-69. In 1968-69 the University granted 982 master's and 58 doctoral degrees; the projection for 1976 is 2,250 master's degrees and 300 doctorates.

A rough count of specialized programs, centers and institutes which have acquired the dignity of a campus telephone number is fifty.

At any university, a doctrine of "uniqueness" is traditionally cited in support of a new program or in justification of an old one. But Hawaii may have a stronger claim to one-of-a-kind status than any other American university. Located near the center of the world's greatest ocean, at the intersection of trade and travel routes, tropical yet comfortable in climate, volcanic in origin, with high mountains and deep waters close at hand, these not-so-isolated islands are the home of one of the world's few truly multi-racial, cross-cultural societies.

The local problems are specialized twists on national and world problems, and the University is naturally expected to provide both the information and the skilled professionals to tackle them. The Islands' unique conditions make them a year-round laboratory for many forms of physical and biological and social research. And Hawaii's history and placement in the scheme of things have created a deeply-felt obligation to take a lead in the modernization of the other Pacific islands and of the developing countries of East and Southeast Asia.

Education for the students of this state, and the others who join them from the mainland and abroad, cannot of course be limited to the subjects that happen to be "naturals" for a university in this location at this moment in world history. A liberal education does not consist in exposure to research programs in oceanography, volcanology, travel industry management, Oriental languages, pineapple technology, or urban planning in Honolulu. A student at the University of Hawaii has to be able to learn medieval history and organic chemistry and English literature as well. We must have pretensions to universality, else we are not a university. And such is the interrelationship of knowledge that reaching for excellence in one field requires strong supporting programs in others: a strong instructional program in marine biology or ocean engineering in an institution with a weak chemistry department is a contradiction in terms.

Nor is it wise or practical to divorce undergraduate teaching from graduate and research programs. As part of their learning, many graduate students also teach; as part of their teaching responsibilities, members of the faculty also have to keep learning in their own changing fields of knowledge.

Nor should research be seen as an activity separate from specialized education. The acquisition of new knowledge is not an unalloyed goal or aim of the university, as used to be so widely claimed; it is both byproduct of and prerequisite for specialized education. A report to the University Task Force for Planning cites with approval the opinion of a scholar in a geophysical journal this fall: ". . . the prime role for research in a university is as the principal tool for graduate education. It is the education of men and women, who through research learn to think creatively and imaginatively, that justifies a significant university involvement in basic research." That probably goes too far: the state and national communities look to a major university not only for trained researchers but for the products of the faculty's best thinking. Still, the point is clear that graduate education and specialized research are of one piece, and can be unglued from each other only with damage to both.

There is in consequence no field of university education in which it is obviously ridiculous to sponsor faculty research or offer graduate degrees. Yet we cannot do everything superbly; even at our moments of

maximum ambition, we know we have to concentrate on certain categories of excellence, and settle for doing everything else merely well. The problem is to choose—and the availability of resources to back our choices will depend quite simply on whether they seem sensible to the people of this state and especially to their elected political leaders. And the natural question for them to ask is, "Is it a 'natural'? Of all America's universities, why should we be doing this in Hawaii?" It is the right question. Let us see if it helps us choose.

In graduate study and university research, what is a "natural"? The **first** answer has nothing to do with our geography. A "natural" is anything we can do best. It was natural for the first nuclear fission to occur at the University of Chicago, because some of the world's best nuclear physicists happened to have their laboratory there. It is "natural" for the University of Hawaii to have a pioneering Laboratory of Sensory Sciences, because a world leader in that field is a member of the Hawaii faculty.

Second, it is "natural" for the University of Hawaii to help the development of Hawaii. This may entail responding to a felt need or direct request—the Land Study Bureau and the Economic Research Center are examples. But it is equally appropriate for a university to assert a need until it is felt. We are helping just now to promote interest in Hawaii's environment, and suggesting what a multi-disciplinary ecology can do to help.

Third, the University of Hawaii is an oceanic university. It is not normal for a geophysics program to spend most of its time and raise most of its money for research and training in and under the ocean science fields; but it was quite natural that this should be the case with the Hawaii Institute of Geophysics. The governor's task force report, "Hawaii and the Sea," points up the University's central role in marine science. There is already a substantial body of first-rate talent already engaged in marine biology, biomedical research, ocean engineering, and the study of water resources, tsunami, ocean currents, underwater sound propagation, the interaction between the atmosphere and the ocean, and other "relevant" subjects. Hawaii is, naturally, one of the Sea Grant institutions under a new federal program.

The problem here is that our efforts in the marine sciences are insufficiently related to each other. A faculty-student committee has just recommended the naming of a University executive director of all marine programs, and a search is on for the right person to preside over growth with excellence in this natural group of specialities.

Fourth, the location and climate and atmosphere make some kinds of science "naturals" for Hawaii: the obvious examples are tropical botany, tropical agriculture, research in tropical diseases and tropical meteorology. The presence of some of the nation's clearest, uncluttered atmosphere above Mauna Kea and Haleakala, plus the comparative absence of background light at night from below, make Hawaii one of the world's best places to locate telescopes for observing the planets and probing into deep space. These conditions, plus a good deal of state and federal money, have already made Hawaii an excellent location for astrophysical research; developments now in prospect may make Hawaii one of the largest national centers in this important field.

Fifth, it is natural for a university in Hawaii to interest itself in the history, cultures and languages of Hawaii's racial groups, both those that were here earlier and those which have come later. If any university can develop excitingly "relevant" ethnic studies programs, we should be able to do it. We are beginning this year to do so.

Sixth, the University of Hawaii is naturally wrapped up in the future of the Pacific Basin and the eastern part of the Asian continent. The key questions are: where is the East-West Center going, how we focus our broad interests in Asia, how we concentrate our talents to aid the developing countries, what relationships we work out with Asian and Pacific island universities, and what we should do about our special obligations in the other Pacific islands?

For a decade now, the Center for Cultural Interchange between East and West has featured a federally-financed exchange of persons, bringing to Hawaii to study and work in a cross-cultural university setting some 6,600 Asians and Americans during the decade of the '60s. Starting this year, the East-West Center will become a more explicitly educational institution by identifying certain overriding problems of joint Asian and American concern, and then devoting the resources of the Center to seeking solutions. One problem-oriented institute has already been established, for the study of population, with $3.7 million of AID funds and plans for joint faculty appointments in the social sciences, the School of Public Health, and other parts of the University of Hawaii. In full consultation and cooperation with other elements of the University, Chancellor Kleinjans is working toward the establishment of other problem-oriented institutes in the fields of food, communication, culture learning, and ecology.

The East-West Center has run for several years on a constant provision of federal funds, just over $5 million a year. The East-West Center library has not been built because federal appropriations are lacking. The state of Hawaii has a large stake in a larger budget for this national

Center; more funds will certainly be needed from somewhere to make the most of its potential.

Hawaii's regional interest in East and Southeast Asia is natural enough, but still there are choices to be made. The next big problem in American foreign policy is our relations with Asia in the aftermath of the war in Vietnam. Our interest in Asia has to include China because the greatest uncertainties and the greatest influence are there. Japan has again become one of the world's most important nations; continuing security and development problems create special obligations both in Korea and in Southeast Asia.

The University of Hawaii is big enough and broadly enough interested in Asia not to have to limit itself to one focus of exclusive interest in that part of the world. We teach a very large proportion of the Japanese, Chinese, and other Oriental-language credit-hours that are taught in the United States as a whole, we have a Pacific and Asian linguistics specialty, we have programs of Asian studies. We also happen to have by far the nation's greatest concentration of American scholars interested in Korea. We could establish in Hawaii a national center for Korean studies while continuing to encourage scholarships and learning in the area as a whole.

We are now considering plans for a Pacific school of development, as one important contribution the University of Hawaii can make to research and instruction in the several disciplines involved in the modernization of the developing nations. Development is a world-wide subject, and we should avoid a parochial "area viewpoint" in a field where Asians, Africans and Latin Americans have so much to learn from each other's trials and errors. But Hawaii's "natural" laboratory is in Asia. A school of development would specialize in interdisciplinary study and training for both Asians and Americans; it might well serve as the integrating academic core for the East-West Center's subject-matter institutes, which will share a strong interest in problems of modernization and development.

A Pacific school of development could also work out fruitful relationships with the major universities in the Pacific and Asian region, to which the University of Hawaii has remarkably few strong ties. And it would provide a focus for stimulation and coordination of the University's broad but still somewhat scattered interest in assistance to other island groups in the Pacific Ocean, especially American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific.

Seventh, the University of Hawaii has a unique opportunity to build on its unparalleled expertise in training Americans for cross-cultural assignments. Under contracts with the Peace Corps and AID, the University has trained more than 5,000 Peace Corps volunteers and for-

ign-aid technicians during the '60s. After thinking hard about what we have learned from this rich experience, it seems clear that we have the basis for a permanent center for cross-cultural training and research, established in its own right with a healthy component of evaluation and research—the neglected part of the past experience—and proposing to serve not only the Peace Corps and AID but also other U.S. institutions that send people to live and work in Asia. We propose to locate this new center in Hilo, taking advantage in the first instance of the existing personnel and facilities established by the University to carry out its training contracts with the Peace Corps. The Hilo location also provides a useful tie-in with the proposed new undergraduate international division on the Hilo campus.

Eighth, in the specialized professional fields difficult and important policy issues are just ahead of us. In the detailed review of University projects and programs we would hope to conduct during the coming months, it will be important to take a new look at both cost and effectiveness of existing programs.

Meanwhile two new programs are up for debate and decision. The proposal to expand the present two-year medical school to a full four-year basis has logic on its side; more and better doctors are certainly needed in Hawaii as elsewhere. But there are two important considerations. The most obvious is the future expense involved. The other is that the current proposal needs to be integrated with our thinking about the future of the University's broad health sciences program (including public health, nursing, research in tropical medicine, and some aspects of social welfare) in terms of the entire Pacific Basin. This larger framework needs first to be explored.

I believe we could usefully proceed forthwith to develop plans for a law school at the University of Hawaii. The complications inherent in expansion of the medical school are not present in the law school case, and the prospective cost is not large by comparison with programs requiring special equipment, especially since a substantial state law library already exists as a base for a teaching program.

But even if the primary justification for a law school is to enable young people to get their basic legal education in the state, the "uniqueness" question is not out of place. We should build here the kind of law school that could only be built at the University of Hawaii. This means, I think, that it might be associated with a strong graduate and research program in comparative law, and perhaps in the law of the sea as well. The department of political science in the College of Arts and Sciences is already giving some thought to this option in laying its own plans for future faculty recruitment.

VII. Education for the Community

The University of Hawaii has organized to provide six kinds of "continuing education" (the words are from *Academic Development Plan II*):

> "(1) opportunities for adults out of school and part-time college students to pursue degree programs; (2) professional and career development programs to enable persons in the community to keep abreast of their professional fields and to advance in their particular career objectives; (3) consultative services which help bring the resources of the University to bear on the solution of community, state, and national problems; (4) education for citizenship responsibilities; (5) educational programs for personal growth and development; (6) programs which contribute to the cultural enrichment of the people of the State."

During the summer session (one of the largest in the nation), a wide variety of "continuing education" courses is offered, with emphasis on career development (especially for teachers) and cultural enrichment.

The tradition in continuing education, at Hawaii as elsewhere, is that it should pay for itself. Some financial losers are in fact offered, both in the Division of Continuing Education and Community Service and especially in the Summer Session; but they are paid for not by the state (as in the case of the regular day program) but by profits from other courses that more than pay their way. Moreover, a person taking course work at the University of Hawaii pays $9.00 per credit-hour if he is enrolled in the regular day program. Beginning in June 1970, he will pay $20.00 per credit-hour in the continuing education and summer programs.

There is remarkably little complaint from the University's clientele about this state of affairs. The political reason for the discrepancy is clear enough: the adults who mostly take the evening and summer courses are presumed to be more affluent than the students enrolled during the academic year. This is doubtless broadly true, and perhaps the absence of complaints will delightfully persist, even if the University does not follow very strictly the principle of equality of educational opportunity.

But complaints or no, the University can hardly be expected to be experimental and innovative in the evening and during the summer if

we have to be sure to break even; we can break even, but only by staying with tried and true formulae most of the time. In the circumstances, it is remarkable that the Division of Continuing Education and the Summer Session do as much experimenting and innovating as they do; but they could do more if the state did not use all its educational money on the programs that are *not* designed for community outreach.

If we mean it about universal availability of post-secondary education, then we are going to have to widen the opportunities for education that do not lead to an academic degree. Both continuing education and the community colleges are already experimenting with more community-oriented programs that do not have to lead to examinations passed and credit-hours gained. A major increase in this kind of experimentation is in order—but it would have to be financed from the state's general funds, as is presently done in the community colleges, not from the precarious profits of other community education projects.

As post-secondary education becomes the rule in the '70s, the issues about equal access to college-level instruction will become more visible and therefore more politically touchy. The state-wide system of public higher education should provide an equitable and rational delivery system for continuing education to all regions and all campuses. That means there will have to be some central management of what is offered locally, so that the areas that would be short-changed in a system left wholly to local initiative by the four-year and community colleges are helped toward access to minimum University standard of educational offerings.

Another aim will require some standard-setting by the University system: the aim of getting active community participation in defining local educational needs, establishing programs, and evaluating the programs (including the instructors). There already exist good examples of real community involvement, and the results are clearly productive. The University's Center for Governmental Development, for instance, has actively sought the advice of the "practitioners." An advisory council with leaders from business, labor and government, and an executive committee made up of all the civil service personnel directors from the state and county governments, have helped develop a "relevant" program, and then ensured the participation in it of the relevant civil servants.

Another way to ensure equitable and rational delivery of continuing education is a vigorous program of public television. The University has a going concern in its ETV station (KHET, channel 11), but has lacked the resources and leadership to become a major factor in community education. Resources to improve the equipment are certainly

needed—the station needs to program and transmit in color, and will certainly need some mobile equipment. But much can be done to provide the local public affairs programming which the commercial stations don't do and won't do. As the Department of Education goes over to a tape operation to increase the flexibility of the use of educational television by individual teachers and individual schools, there will be more air time for use as "public television," as these stations are now being called. Their potential for continuing education and community service is simply enormous. Public television has its limits, of course, but we are not yet near enough to them to worry about them.

Beyond formal course work and other university programs, some members of most university communities reach out to serve the wider community by influencing public policy, organizing courses or meetings or demonstrations on such subjects as pollution and conservation, population growth and food supply, war and peace. There are those who object to undue involvement by the university in the formulation of public policy.

No university is antiseptically unrelated to the world around it—which is also the world inside it. The University of Hawaii, for example, is surely against crime, against ugliness, against disease, against racial discrimination, against poor spelling and other forms of ignorance. But the University does not have the answer to every question on the governor's desk, the legislative calendar, and the court's docket. What it does have are specialists with a great deal of reasonably objective information, and presumably some skill in analyzing this information and conveying its essence to others. Nobody has to avail himself of the informed opinions of University people; but they nevertheless have some obligation to make their views available on topics they know something about.

VIII. Organizing for the Task

The "sense of direction" here proposed puts the stress on innovations, on maximizing student options, on selected excellence, and on a state-wide approach to higher education in Hawaii. The governance of a large and growing University system in a time of extensive growth and rapid change presents some intriguing problems in public management. Here is how I think we should organize the University administration for the task.

Although my suggestions relate to administration as such, and not to the broader issues of governance, let me say at the outset that I think we should arrange the maximum participation by the faculty and the students (graduate students as well as undergraduates) in making University policy.

You will remember that what made the airplane governable was the joystick—a steering gear that could operate in three dimensions. We need to "invent the joystick" for the governance of universities—that is, to work out ways of joining student, faculty, and administrators' judgments on major issues that affect each group and the university as a whole. How to do this is the subject of a separate discussion this week and I will not poach on that debate, except to express a general skepticism about formal bureaucratic arrangements in as fluid a consultation system as a university ought to be. The more formal structure there is the less opportunity there is for real participation by those really touched by particular decisions from day to day. Too often the grinding of formal machinery becomes a substitute for an honest effort to bring into decision-making the people whose futures are at stake and whose oxen are gored.

For today, let me concentrate on the present dilemmas and future directions as I see them, in the administration of the University.

We have a state-wide system; we should organize to manage it as such. To this end, I would propose that we move along the following lines:

- Each **Community College** should regard itself as primarily responsible for its own destiny. Its provost, its faculty, and its students, working together, should develop their academic offerings, their budget, and their long-range plans. There are, of course, many issues that require coordination among the colleges—including the decisions as to

which college will offer what specialized programs. These should to the maximum possible extent be worked out cooperatively among the provosts, faculty senates, and student leaders, as appropriate. I have established a council of provosts; the faculty senates also have an inter-college committee of their chairmen; the student leaders also meet together from time to time.

The **Office of Community College Services,** should be regarded as a staff section in the office of the president. At the provosts' suggestion, the director of community college services serves as presiding officer for the council of provosts.

■ It is still too early to devolve the administration of the new campus on a separate administrative unit. In time, I would visualize the appointment of a **Chancellor of the New Campus,** which presumably would take its name from the neighborhood in which it is sited. Meanwhile, we propose to form in the President's office a **Council for the New Campus,** to guide the academic development of this important undergraduate enterprise. New colleges destined for establishment on the new campus will be formed "in the womb of Manoa" and placed under the administrative supervision of the dean of the proposed new division (see below).

■ In Hilo there are three major units of the University:

The Hilo campus, now a three-year liberal arts college becoming a four-year college.

Hawaii Technical School, transferred only last year from the Department of Education to the University, is destined to become a community college comparable to the other occupationally-oriented members of that system.

The center for cross-cultural training and research is being established during this academic year, using the existing Peace Corps Training Center as an initial base.

These three units should work out close relations with each other, and interact closely with the Big Island community. The time has come to place them under the supervision of a senior officer of the University, who would relate the University as a whole to the development of the Big Island better than can be readily done from Honolulu. To perform these functions we are proposing to establish a new position of **Chancellor of the University of Hawaii at Hilo.**

■ How do we relate the administration of the state-wide system to the management of the Manoa campus?

In effect, the president of the University of Hawaii has two jobs.

He presides over a state-wide system, and he is also directly responsible for administration on the Manoa campus, where his office is located. There have been suggestions that a chancellor be named for the Manoa campus, on the Berkeley model. But as in so many other things, it does not help to think of Hawaii as a baby California; our structure and prospects are very different. Manoa is still so large a part of the whole administrative stew that the president and his vice-presidents will be deeply involved in every aspect of its management. A Manoa chancellor should be appointed only when he can realistically be given some real autonomy in academic planning, physical planning, and financial planning. That time may well arrive, I hope it will arrive, in the decade of the '70s; but that time is not yet.

For the time being, therefore, the president and his administrative family will have to do double duty, distinguishing Manoa management from state-wide functions as best they can in day-to-day decision-making and in the public mind. It may look a little ragged from the outside, but I believe it is a much more practical arrangement than establishing at this early stage in the development of our state-wide system two duplicate bureaucracies to argue with each other about overlapping jurisdiction.

The state-wide setup, then, which would also handle Manoa management, would consist of a president, five vice-presidents, and a secretary of the University with the rank of vice-president. The division of functions among these officers would be somewhat different from earlier arrangements:

- The **University Vice-President** would serve as general deputy and *alter ego* to the president, in both his state-wide and Manoa campus functions. This would make permanent the interim arrangement established at the time of my arrival in September.

- The **Vice-President for Academic Affairs,** with the dean for academic development as his deputy, would be concerned with setting state-wide academic standards—for the community college programs, the Hilo campus, and the new campus as well as the Manoa campus. But on the Manoa campus, he would be more directly the "dean of faculties." The deans of the colleges would, as previously, be responsible to him. Directly under the office of the academic vice-president I would propose the following units:

  The dean of the graduate school.

  The director of research, who would also serve as the main liaison with the Research Corporation of the University of Hawaii.

  (These two positions are currently held by the same person, which seems a very practical arrangement under present conditions.)

The dean of the "new division," the office proposed in *Academic Development Plan II* as the umbrella for innovative and experimental programs. This division would not only supervise the honors programs, the non-major major, and some interdisciplinary undergraduate programs, but also serve as the administrative home for the new campus colleges during their gestation period in the womb of Manoa.

A new dean of marine programs, including Sea Grant programs, who would serve as chairman of a University-wide council on marine programs.

The dean of a college of continuing education and community service. Like the academic vice-president, he would do double duty—not only administering the program of continuing education on the Manoa campus, but also monitoring, stimulating, and supporting the comparable programs offered by other units of the University of Hawaii in other parts of the state.

The dean of the summer session.

Within the Manoa campus, the major academic reorganization now in prospect is that in the College of Arts and Sciences. The final recommendations have not been formulated by the faculty and administration of that college. I would hope that the college would find it practicable to concentrate its departments into half a dozen manageable divisions which could more readily sponsor interdisciplinary efforts and bring some of the research institutes into closer relationship with the academic departments working in the same or adjacent fields of study. Moreover, I think we need on the Manoa campus a dean who would concentrate exclusively on undergraduate education.

■ The **Vice-President for Planning and Facilities** would be responsible for the whole process of physical planning, construction and maintenance of the University plant in all parts of the state. He would originate proposals for the capital improvement budget, and be responsible for master planning, the procurement of architecture and engineering services, the expediting of construction, and the protection and improvement of the environment on all the University's campuses.

■ The **Vice-President for Business Affairs** would be responsible for the overall University budgeting, for financial management, for the business functions, and for campus management and security on the Manoa campus.

■ The **Vice-President for Student Affairs** would administer a state-wide admissions and student information program, develop statewide standards and inter-campus cooperation, but work for the maximum self-starting autonomy in the student activities of the several cam-

puses. A dean of students on the Manoa campus would serve as his deputy, and directly supervise the counseling, health and other student services, student activities, and the campus center.

■ The **Secretary of the University** would serve as secretary to the board of regents and serve as legal and policy adviser to the president.

These indications do not constitute a comprehensive description of the internal administrative organization of the University. They touch only on the major division of line functions. Moreover—to repeat—they rearrange only one of the three elements of a three-dimensional consultation system in which there needs to be the fullest opportunity for participation by faculty and students as well as administrators.

IX. Enduring and Adaptable

There is a good deal of apocalyptic talk these days about the future of the American university. But the idea of the university is a durable one. Medieval institution it once was, but we were reminded in the *Saturday Review* this fall that the university "has outlived feudalism, monarchy, and other medieval institutions, and it is several hundred years older than the nation-state, Protestantism and industrialism." It has endured because it has adapted, and it has adapted because it is loosely governed, with plenty of air for reformers to breathe.

In this nation especially, the public university has managed to keep its distance from party politics and governmental change, and governments of every persuasion have nourished it. Among the 50 states few governors have given such warm support, and few legislatures have been so sure they wanted a good university, so consistent in supporting it, and so tolerant of its eccentricities and its eccentrics, as the governors and legislatures of the state of Hawaii have shown themselves to be.

We in the University of Hawaii have an obligation to return the compliment by trying to be as clear as we can about where we are going. The Prospectus I am presenting today is designed to serve this purpose.

In the Annex is a final section that summarizes—in oversimplified fashion, of course—the main suggestions and recommendations on which we should now creatively improvise.

If I had to summarize the summary, I don't think I could improve on that nugget of old Chinese wisdom:

If you are planning for a year ahead . . . sow rice;
If you are planning for ten years . . . plant trees;
If you are planning for a hundred years . . . educate people.

ANNEX
Checklist for the 1970s

1. The 1970s will be *the era of universal post-secondary education.* This means that every citizen of this state who has completed high school or reached the age of 18, if he or she desires a chance for higher education, should find that chance somehow somewhere in the state-wide system of public higher education called The University of Hawaii.

2. In general, we should: maximize in every way the *educational option for the individual student or prospective student.*

3. Specifically, we should: *disperse* within the state-wide system the expected large increases in enrollments. We should *limit enrollments on the Manoa campus to less than the 25,000 earlier planned* by enlarging Hilo and speeding up with the new campus.

4. We should encourage diversity among the campuses, in curriculum and teaching methods, and diversity also in the "mix" of students on each campus. We should recruit more positively for good mainland students, and encourage undergraduates as well as graduate students from foreign countries.

5. Each community college should *be outstanding in a few occupational specialties.* A student should go to the community college that serves his interest, not necessarily to the one nearest his home. It is easier to move the student to the equipment than the other way around.

6. In the community colleges, *the high attrition rate* might be reduced by a more flexible curriculum and calendar, and by a center for programmed learning.

7. The community colleges can be effective in helping the educationally disadvantaged; more needs to be done in this direction.

8. In their arts and sciences component, community colleges should stress problem-oriented courses.

9. In all undergraduate programs, we should pull more students into curriculum-building; encourage them to build their own academic programs; emphasize interdisciplinary problem-solving courses;

build more work experience and real research into undergraduate programs; and (for students going on to higher degrees) shorten the time it takes to get through college. One per cent of the University's instructional budget might well be set aside to fund innovations and experimental programs.

10. We should fashion culture-learning substitutes for the foreign language requirement, and open up an option of a semester abroad (or alternatively a cross-cultural experience on the mainland or even on another Hawaiian island) for undergraduates throughout the University of Hawaii system.

11. On the basis of the new campus committee's proposals the University can now proceed to the selection of a site for the new campus. Pending its physical development we should organize the proposed new colleges in embryo on the Manoa campus.

12. A university has to try to be universal in its general education. But in graduate study and research we cannot do everything superbly, so a certain priority has to be given to what Hawaii can do especially well. This means special concentration on assisting the development of Hawaii; taking advantage of Hawaii's geography, climate and mixture of cultures; focusing on problem-solving in the Pacific and Asian area; and, in general, doing whatever we can do best.

13. The University should encourage and facilitate "program-oriented" institutes in the East-West Center.

14. Our interest in East and Southeast Asia is broad enough and deep enough to enable us to serve as a national center for Korean studies without slighting other areas and languages.

15. A Pacific school of development might help sponsor interdisciplinary research and training for both Asians and Americans, and help organize the University's contribution to aiding other Pacific islands groups and Asian developing countries.

16. We propose to build on the University's Peace Corps and AID training experience by establishing on the Big Island a center for cross-cultural training and research.

17. We should review, for effectiveness, for service to the state, for uniqueness, and for contemporary relevance, the existing specialized professional programs.

18. The proposal for a four-year medical school should be considered as part of a wider review of how we proceed with a health sciences program in Hawaii and the Pacific Basin area.

19. We should proceed to develop plans for a law school. To build a law school that could only be built in Hawaii, we should associate with it a graduate program in comparative law and perhaps the law of the sea as well.

20. We should take a new look at the policy which requires continuing education and the summer session to support their courses by higher tuition fees. The present system, while economical for the state, creates educational inequities and discourages innovation.

21. We should develop to its full potential a vigorous public television station, with emphasis on local programming.

22. We need to "invent the joystick" for three-dimensional governance —ensuring that faculty and students participate with the University administration in judgments on major issues and policy recommendations.

23. In administering the University of Hawaii as a state-wide system:

    - Each community college should be primarily responsible for its own destiny, with coordination through intercouncils.
    - It is not yet time to appoint a chancellor for the projected new four-year college in leeward Oahu. But we need a University council to supervise its development, and we can develop "in the womb of Manoa" the new colleges destined for establishment there.
    - Beginning next academic year, we would propose to establish a new position of chancellor of the University of Hawaii at Hilo, comprising a four-year college, a community college, and a new center for cross-cultural training and research.

24. The president and vice-presidents of the University will need to do double duty for the time being, in supervising the state-wide system and managing the Manoa campus. The University vice-president (the alter ego to the president) and vice-presidents for academic affairs, planning and facilities, business affairs, and student affairs, would share this double role.

    - In academic affairs we would propose to establish a new division for innovative and experimental programs; a dean of marine programs who would chair a University-wide council on marine programs; and in the College of Arts and Sciences, a dean responsible exclusively for undergraduate education.