DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 563 HE 003 693

TITLE	The Tufts Seminar to Initiate New Experiments in Undergraduate Instruction.
INSTITUTION	Tufts Univ., Medford, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 65
NOTE	82p.; Report of a seminar held at Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts, August 30-September 11, 1965
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Improvement; Educational Innovation; *Experimental Programs; *Higher Education; Relevance (Education); *Self Actualization; Self Directed Groups; *Seminars

ABSTRACT

Approximately 50 workers from a variety of academic and professional fields came together at the Tufts Seminar to Initiate New Experiments in Undergraduate Instruction to discover, discuss, and explore some of the problems of undergraduate education and to suggest new or alternate ways that might be tried to meet these problems. The seminar saw education today as overly preoccupied with the task of transmitting knowledge, with covering fields of knowledge, and with surveys. What the seminar proposed instead as the pressing task was to involve the student in intellectuality, in evaluating experience, and in connecting theory and practice. The seminar sought to foster experiments in literature and writing, history, and the social and behavioral sciences. The experiments proposed are experiments in the new ways of teaching these subjects, but they are also experiments in the driving power of education: how to get students interested in motivating themselves. (HS)

THE TUFTS SEMINAR

TO INITIATE

NEW EXPERIMENTS

IN

UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

AUGUST 30 - SEPTEMBER 11, 1965

TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Medford, Massachusetts

THE TUFTS SEMINAR

TO INITIATE

NEW EXPERIMENTS

IN

UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Medford, Massachusetts

PREFACE

The Tufts Seminar to Initiate New Experiments in Undergraduate Instruction convened at Tufts University in Medford, Massachusetts for two weeks, from August 30 to September 11, 1965. Approximately fifty workers from a variety of academic and professional fields came together to discover, discuss, and explore some of the problems of undergraduate education and to suggest new or alternate ways, that might be tried, to meet these problems.

The interaction among the participants was intense. They lived together for two weeks -- meeting, eating, and drinking -- and always talking, listening and thinking -- and finally writing. Their strong committment and involvement and their deep concern for the welfare and development of students permeated the discussions. All these qualities contributed to the productivity of the Seminar, attested to by the reports that follow. Many activities have developed out of that initial Seminar. They will be described in a second report, soon to follow this one.

The suggestion to hold the Seminar came from the government Panel on Educational Research and Development. This Panel, chaired by Jerrold R. Zacharias, is under the auspices of the President's Science Advisory Committee and reports to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology. Much of the work of bringing together the Seminar participants was done by Joseph Turner of the Office of Science and Technology. Wyman Holmes of the Tufts University Lincoln Filene Center gave valuable assistance in the arrangements for the Seminar.

The Seminar was supported by the U.S. Office of Education and the National Science Foundation under Grant GY-303 from the National Science Foundation to Tufts University.

Jack R. Tessman
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. SUMMARY REPORT

by Joseph Turner

INTRODUCTION

The Tufts Seminar was successful in its purpose of extending innovation in education from the areas of initial achievement to areas that hitherto have largely eluded such efforts. It moved from science and mathematics to literature and writing, history, and the social and behavioral sciences -- the fields of the largest captive audiences in the early years of undergraduate instruction. It moved from efforts largely directed towards the education of preprofessional students to general education -- although, of course, the two problems overlap. And it involved scholars and workers from these new areas in these new efforts.

Groups formed in the course of the seminar are working on plans to carry further the work begun at the seminar -- through holding additional exploratory seminars, through recruiting additional people, and through conducting educational experiments. Programs are planned for this winter, spring, summer, and for next academic year.

As described in this summary, the experiments will be experiments in teaching particular disciplines, but they will also be experiments in involving students in intellectuality, in acts of discrimination, with the disciplines studied serving as the medium. And they will be experiments in new relationships between elementary and secondary education and higher education, and experiments in new relationships between privileged and less privileged institutions. The experiments will be in some degree replicable -- through development of instructional materials; through diaries or records of the work done; and through exchanges, seminars, and demonstrations.

The seminar operated by breaking down into working groups. At one point these groups were formed by discipline. The literature and writing group included novelists and playwrights as well as literary scholars; the history group consisted largely of American historians; the social and behavioral sciences group included psychiatrists, economists, sociologists, psychologists, students of government, journalists, and persons in public affairs. Scientists and mathematicians also participated in the seminar. These were persons with extensive experience in educational reform and instead of forming a separate group, they worked with these three groups.

At another time, the groups were formed in terms of administrative questions: experimental colleges, educational "laboratories," pooling resources, student concerns, and so on. Persons primarily college administrators, from all manner of institutions, were also present at the seminar.

Evenings were filled with talk, writing of papers, viewing of educational films, and so on. One evening was devoted to the more direct pursuit of one of the subjects under discussion at the seminar, literary art. A new one-act play by John Hawkes and a scene from one of Jack Gelber's plays were staged by the authors, with the assistance of participants in the seminar.

This summary picks up certain highlights of the seminar. An appropriate way to begin is with an account of certain ideas that ran through all the working groups, concerning what is going on and what might go on in undergraduate instruction.

I. SUMMARY REPORT

LEADING IDEAS

Experiments in Involvement

The seminar saw education today as overly preoccupied with the task of transmitting knowledge, with covering fields of knowledge, with surveys. The growth of knowledge itself tends to increase this emphasis. The feeling arises that with so much to cover there is no time to "waste." Emphasis on coverage is related to the general notion of the teacher as doer. The teacher clears a path through the underbrush for the student, who then supposedly rushes along, urged on by credits, grades, and sequences of courses.

What the seminar proposed instead as the pressing task was to involve the student in intellectuality, in evaluating experience, in connecting theory and practice. Emphasis on involvement reflects an emphasis on the student as doer, as being plunged into the underbrush and making his own way out. Of course, in another sense a student even under the present system may be making his own way. He plays the game called "going to college"; he learns how to get past professors.

The seminar sought to foster experiments in literature and writing, history, and the social and behavioral sciences. This is not to imply that professors in these fields are setting conditions to compete for students, nor that students will simultaneously be caught up in three new experimental programs. The idea is simply that to be involved intellectually is necessarily to be involved intellectually in something. The experiments proposed are experiments in the new ways of teaching these subjects, but they are also experiments in the driving power of education: how to get students to supply the gasoline.

Who Disagrees?

Nobody disagrees with the objective that both in later life and in later learning in school the student should be able to make his own way, to view things with an attitude of responsible skepticism -- skepticism in that he does not swallow everything whole, responsible in that he does not throw out things whole either. He should be concerned with evidence, with context, with origins, with consequences. An attitude of responsible skepticism is needed for future workers in various technical fields, especially when the boundaries of fields are shifting. It is also needed for the future laymen who must cope with the future experts -- and we are all laymen in most aspects of our lives.

Further, nobody disagrees with the method that finds that if a student is to learn to think, then he must have the opportunity to do some thinking; and if he is to develop taste, then he must have the opportunity to make some choices. In the first approach to a topic, if the purpose is to excite thought and not teach words, then the student must wrestle with the problem firsthand. This is true for a child beginning to play with blocks, for a scientist beginning to experiment with unfamiliar things, and for points of development in between.

The disagreement is not over objectives and methods, but whether American education actually does these things. The seminar claimed it does not. For, if the student is to wrestle with problems firsthand, then he needs materials and he needs time. But where is the stuff? Where is the time? This is not to say that henceforth the student does everything for himself. He will surely build on the work of others. Surveys, for example, serve to set in context things to be studied and to put together in a larger framework things already learned. But the balance between involvement and presentation, between confronting "it" and being told "about it," is itself a matter for experimentation.

The Early Years

To the extent that a key problem is how to enable students to get started, how to introduce them to subjects new to them, then the first and second years of undergraduate study is the period in which to concentrate the effort. This concern with giving students a chance to find their own way applies to all kinds of students, not just the "best" students and not just preprofessional students.

Dissatisfaction with present introductory courses was reflected in a reluctance even to use customary names ("Freshman English") to describe the proposed new efforts. In the past, seminar-type instruction has been largely associated with the upper-class years and with honors students. To begin educational reform with the first and second years also makes sense from a long-range perspective, for what you can ultimately accomplish in reform in the upper-class years will be determined by what you have been able to do earlier.

A Model from Physics

Enthusiasm for coverage was also low among the scientists present. They argued for the value of students experiencing directly how some of the information was gained in the first place. The physicists present were prepared, for example, to allow, even in technological institutes, students of physics not majoring in the subject to concentrate their study in such a way as to depart from college without knowing Maxwell's equations. A presentation by John King of his projects laboratory at M. I. T. became a model for much of the discussion of how to involve students directly with "it" instead of simply talking "about it."

In this laboratory, students come to formulate their own experiments and construct some of their own equipment. The work schedule at the laboratory is flexible and some of the work can be done at home. Students meet with faculty on a more tutorial basis and are graded as simply doing satisfactory work or failing. Some of the experiments are conducted with relatively sophisticated apparatus like vacuum tubes, other experiments start out with much simpler apparatus like light bulbs -- one problem being to investigate bulb lifetime. The purpose is to enable students to investigate and explain a set of phenomena. The problems are not expected to be on the frontiers of knowledge. The trick is to start with a problem that initially is not too big, yet which opens out in a variety of directions.

The Shadow of Graduate School

Much of the style of undergraduate education and, ultimately, elementary and secondary education, is set in graduate school. The seminar found that in various ways the traditional Ph. D. operates against some of the things being advocated. Not the least of the difficulties is the attitude that education does not begin until one enters graduate school.

One line of criticism concerned the very domain of study. Taking English as an example, the point was made that the present Ph. D. in English, although appropriate for the development of, say, historians of literature, is less appropriate for the development of other types of scholars -- or teachers. One criticism made of the English teacher as he now works is that he does not encourage, does not even permit, the student to find the bearing on his own life of what he is reading. This is not to say that the teacher does not know that books "connect," only that he is unwilling -- or unable -- to act on this knowledge.

Among the suggestions proposed for changing the domain was the inclusion of other arts and other disciplines. Instead of the ever narrowing pursuit of minor writers of a given period, the student might be engaged in the pursuit of an understanding of other aspects of the culture of the period, including the contemporary period. Also proposed was the inclusion of creative writing, even in connection with the dissertation.

I. SUMMARY REPORT

Teach Now!

A second line of criticism was the continual postponement of teaching -- or its inclusion simply as a service to the institution or as a way for the student to earn his keep. The student works in the problem section or quiz section of someone else's course. But, teaching under circumstances that elicit creativity, is not something that one must keep putting off until one has mastered the "methods," as is often claimed by the schools of education, or until one has mastered the "field," as is often claimed by academic graduate schools. This new kind of teacher might develop a new kind of relationship to the student. The teacher, while he knows more than the student, need not know so very much more and is himself clearly also a learner.

The seminar proposed as an intrinsic part of graduate school, the inclusion of teaching conducted on a more experimental basis, experimental not only in instructional materials and practices but also in who is taught. This would include experiences not only in the undergraduate level, but also in elementary and secondary school; it would include work not only with students at privileged schools and colleges, but also with students from deprived and segregated backgrounds. Students, and the professors who work with them, will not only be applying their expertise to the solution of contemporary social problems but will be led to examine the assumptions about the place of their field in education and its sources of appeal to men.

New Administrative Units

Despite its concern for experimenting with new ideas, the seminar found that higher education is not supportive of certain kinds of innovation. The entrenched positions, fragmentation of subject matter, specialization of educational function, the whole apparatus of courses, grades and credits, means that change is difficult. Of course, many scholars are satisfied with their research and with their teaching. The difficulty is that the satisfied stand in the way of the less satisfied.

Consequently, the seminar saw a need for new administrative units in which new activities could take place. These activities would include the conducting of experiments which are in some degree replicable, in part through the development of new instructional materials, so that others can use the new work and build on it. If the teacher is to be artful, it is helpful if he has something on hand that encourages artfulness.

The administrative units would themselves be constituted so as to encourage the formation of similar enterprises elsewhere. The new colleges now being established are one answer to the need for new units, provided they do not feel it incumbent upon themselves to imitate the old. Administrative units with the requisite independence for maneuver could also be established within existing institutions, either as experimental colleges, new institutes for graduate study, or centers specializing in teaching particular subjects. Summer institutes are also a possibility.

The Conscience of the Seminar

In another line of thinking about higher education -- what came to be called the conscience of the seminar -- some matters in the conduct of colleges and universities were called into question. A few main points may be distinguished. One criticism was that the colleges and universities, through restricting the admission of students to a certain academic range, were practicing a kind of discrimination -- this in contrast to the involvement of many students in tutoring programs and civil rights activities. Another criticism was directed at what was taken to be an overreadiness on the part of institutions of higher education to place themselves at the service of any private or governmental interest prepared to pay for research. A third criticism was that institutions of higher education were preoccupied too much with monitoring and disciplinary policies, a factor which did not control but rather inspired irresponsible conduct by students.

It is appropriate to turn now to a few of the specific proposals developed in the working groups devoted to the disciplines.

DISCIPLINES

Literature and Writing

The main push was away from teaching writing through rhetorical techniques, and away from teaching discrimination or taste in literature through literary history or literary forms, toward finding ways to enable students to grapple with literature and with their experience directly.

On the writing side, the basic notions were that the way to learn writing was to write; that topics for composition should include those generated by other subjects the student is studying; and that the teachers of writing should include not only English teachers, but also novelists, poets, playwrights as well as persons in other academic disciplines -- in fact, anybody interested in writing as something to teach.

One specific proposal, called "The Voice Project," sought to find ways to enable students to produce a personal or identifiable prose, rather than a mechanical or "voiceless" prose, irrespective of whether that prose was, say, a novel or a law brief. Among the ways a teacher might encourage a concern with voice would be to initiate a discussion of some topic with students, tape the discussion, confront the student with his own speaking voice, have the tape transcribed, then have the student attempt to say the same thing in writing and compare his speaking voice and writing voice. A teacher involved in such a project would keep a log and preserve samples of student work including student and teacher comments, for study by other teachers.

A second proposal would have students explore the theater in something analogous to chamber music called "chamber theater," They would write dialog, direct each other as actors, perform before each other as audiences -- all in the regular classroom. If successful, students might then seek larger audiences, in theaters or elsewhere.

On the discrimination side, one idea that was developed might be titled "Take out the Art part." The course, or instructional materials, would include "bad" stuff as well as "good" stuff; it would include films and noneducational TV as well as books. The student would then be permitted to determine for himself what "lies" and what "tells the truth." to relate what he is reading or viewing to his own life.

A proposal was made for a new program for a Ph.D., even a new degree, perhaps to be called a Doctor of Literary Studies. As an alternative to the present emphasis on literary history and history of language, the new program might include experimental teaching and creative writing along with studies, say, in English, American, and continental literature. The level of factual knowledge sometimes demanded on graduate level examinations today way criticized as best achieved by reading literary histories rather than original works.

History

The push in initiatory courses was away from surveys, away from the overview of what is thought to be a field, away from conclusions about conclusions -- namely, the textbook writer's estimate of what is important among the views of various historians. Emphasis lay rather in finding ways to enable students to work directly with primary sources and to pose their own questions for historical investigation, and so to come to write their own analyses and narratives.

This is not to say that everything now going on is to be thrown out. Rather this new emphasis is offered as the direction in which new work should move, to be conducted against the

background of the present courses. The relative roles of the two kinds of instruction would be subsequently explored. As a result of engaging in the new program, students when attending survey courses would perhaps possess keener ears, which in turn would require changes in the present style of surveys.

A number of possible topics for such new work were discussed and developed. One topic proposed as suitable for student investigation was the society of the Southern plantation. This particular topic possesses a certain set of advantages -- of course, many other topics also possess these advantages. The subject of the Southern plantation can be studied in relative isolation to other matters, and a good proportion of the primary materials -- the letters, the diaries, bills of sale, contemporary magazines and novels -- upon which the working historian bases his work can be made available in manageable form to the student.

A second topic proposed was for a student to attempt biographies or biographical sketches of his own ancestors. Biography is an important part of history. Such efforts would also give rise to more general questions. If the student's ancestor was a German who settled in Milwaukee, the more general question is why did many Germans settle in this city.

A third proposal was to put together a package to meet the widest possible variety of student questions to be posed by Tocqueville's Democracy or his journal of his American visit or both documents. The package would consist of perhaps 25 rolls of microfilm, comprising newspaper items, periodicals, and diaries of those nine months, plus selected paperbacks, plus a guide for teachers and college administrators consisting f the experience of other teachers and administrators with this material.

One matter demanding special attention is the library problem. How is one to bring good libraries to colleges at reasonable costs and how is one to enable students -- and members of faculties as well -- to have access to primary materials on a large scale.

Social and Behavioral Sciences

An alternative title for this section might be "Humans, all forms." Despite representation from a variety of disciplines, economics, sociology, psychology, political science, and so on, there was no splitting along disciplinary lines. The push was away from courses in the "principles" or "techniques" of particular disciplines. It was towards bringing the disciplines together, and this not through developing overarching theories, but through the introduction of specific topics, the investigation of which would then draw upon the special disciplines.

Two dangers were distinguished in instruction in the social and behavioral sciences: overintellectualism, in which the development of analytical techniques moved the course away from the discussion of social problems; and anti-intellectualism, in which a concern for social action found unnecessary, or even impossible, a search for objective ways of looking at social phenomena. The middle ground would be to attempt to help the student with the questions he is asking: namely, "What is happening to people in society today? How can I make a difference?"

Possible topics for introductory courses were developed, including the following: "What are the causes of poverty in a highly developed industrial economy, of which the United States is the paradigm case?" "What can be done in the realm of social policy to allow the effects of 'automation' to be beneficial rather than harmful?" "What are the implications of the acceptance, as a goal of national policy, of the full achievement of civil rights in America?" "What developments in modern society tend to promote or to curtail individual freedom, or to do both?" "An examination of varieties of 'private' and 'public' information."

As a medium for instruction, the film -- both viewing films and having students make films -- was thought to possess great, as yet unexploited, possibilities. One hard question that remained was what else in this area could be introduced that approached first-hand social re-

search or social invention. What would be manageable in terms of time, funds, and the student's knowledge and skills? Some participants thought that the inquiries accessible to students might be expanded by the use of raw data such as that available in the Yale University area files. Other participants looked to field experiences, to investigation by students that would be genuine intimations of, say Margaret Mead's trip to Samoa.

Other Proposals

It is appropriate now to touch on a few of the proposals developed in some of the other working groups:

Hold one or more seminars in which students are the principal participants. Such a seminar might begin by examining the materials developed by the present seminar, or the new seminar might approach matters from scratch, introducing the present materials later on if desired.

Expand the present programs of summer institutes for college teachers. At such institutes emphasis is not on obtaining advanced degrees or on postgraduate research, but on work that bears directly on what the teachers will be teaching when they arrive back at their institutions. The expansion of this effort will include not only more of the same kind of institute, but also institutes for college administrators as well as new kinds of institutes, such as week-end meetings conducted on a regional basis.

Establish a grant program to enable small colleges to recruit science faculty on a team basis, rather than one person at a time. The problem of science in small colleges, or less prestigous colleges, is not how to build up a fine faculty that just happens to be too small, but how to start from scratch. A scientist is more likely to come if he knows that he will have colleagues with whom he can work. The grants would be one-shot affairs. They would go to administrations, rather than departments, with the criteria for awarding grants to include such items as the administration's ability to interest scientists from other institutions in advising on this program.

Establish college credit for student experience in off-campus enterprises like VISTA, Peace Corps, civil rights work, and so on.

Establish "returnable scholarships" or "forgivable loans" for students from economically disadvantaged families, to be used at colleges of their choice.

Experiment with alternate college admission policies. Students with a desire to learn but lacking formal requirements could be admitted under programs which while "special" do not once again separate the better prepared from the more poorly prepared students.

II. REPORT OF THE WORKING COMMITTEE ON ENGLISH, LITERATURE, AND ARTS

Prepared by Walter J. Ong, S.J.

Participants

William Alfred, reporter
Benjamin DeMott
Joseph Farrell
Jack Gelber
Sister Jacqueline Grennan
Albert Guerard
John Hawkes
Eugene Lichtenstein
Jacquelyn Mattfeld
Charles Muscatine
Benjamin Nichols
Walter Ong, S.J., chairman
Esther Raushenbush
Seymour Simches

INTRODUCTION

In its often heated exchanges, the Working Committee on English, Literature, and Arts covered most of the common complaints about the teaching of these subjects and some uncommon ones. Since the entire Seminar appears to be directed ultimately toward some sort of action, the present report will attempt to focus chiefly on what might be done to improve undergraduate teaching of English, literature, and the arts in view of the present educational crisis. This focus of course entails some treatment of what is wrong with the present situation. Moreover, since undergraduate teaching and learning is intimately tied in with elementary, secondary, and graduate instruction, these too will come in for some attention. This Working Committee dealt mostly with instruction in English, for the obvious reason that English commands more teacher and student effort and time than the other subjects represented in this Committee. There seemed to be, however, pretty total agreement that foreign languages and literatures and the other arts -- painting and other graphic arts, sculpture, music, dance, and so on -- need to be related in various ways to the study of English.

FUNCTIONS OF ENGLISH TEACHING

Under the impression that some Seminar members representing the sciences felt that the purpose of teaching English was ultimately to engage the student himself in the production of writing, the Working Committee went on record as convinced that English teaching actually served several functions, namely the production of: (1) readers who respond fully to what they read in a way bearing on their real life world, (2) literary critics, (3) professional teachers trained through a graduate program, (4) skilled writers, nonprofessional and (in much smaller numbers) professional.

Response (Function 1)

A great deal of discussion centered around the first of these functions. It was felt that, although science teaching as expounded by members of this Seminar is more like literature teaching than most have thought (that is, it is not something remote from human interests, desicating, brutally abstract, and so on, but actually a human creation of the human mind interacting with the world where man finds himself), nevertheless what should be taught in literary study, the "stuff" of literature, is radically different from what is taught in science because literature involves the human life world itself directly and reflectively.

This and other important issues regarding response to literature were crystallized with great passion through the efforts of Benjamin DeMott and his opponents and defenders (the two were not always distinguishable). Here, fortunately, a major crisis of this Committee developed

and eventually resolved itself when DeMott presented the Seminar with a written statement, "Last Try," a copy of which is appended (Appendix A). The DeMott position was essentially that the English class is "a first rate training ground for all kinds of acts of discrimination" engaging students' real lives and involving values real to them, and that, whatever his public protestations, the professional English teacher generally speaking "does not honor that concern and purpose in his day-to-day teaching." Instead, he concentrates on matters such as "introducing students to arcane literary hierarchies (the mystique of 'good books,' etc.)," or "the structure and design of the poem or book, ... its effects ... modes of persuasion, ... images ... ," or "the history of literature, the history of language, and lives of the great writers," etc. Members of the Working Committee agreed with the aims of DeMott's "Last Try." They disagreed (how much remained unclear) as to (a) how totally desperate the present situation was (all owned it was desperate to a degree) and (b) as to when, if ever, such matters as literary history, literary forms, linguistics, or rhetorical techniques were to be studied. All agreed that unless these were studied out of and in connection with the use of real discrimination of the sort DeMott described, they were better not studied.

In addition to the critique of the present situation, the DeMott "Last Try" included concrete proposals, developed out of recent work by DeMott with a group of English teachers in Birmingham, England. These involved starting with movie scenes (rather than with books) to give the students opportunity to assess directly what "lies" and what "tells the truth;" from here one could move to Playboy, Sports Illustrated, some short stories, Mad magazine, a play of Shakespeare, and so on. For purposes of identification it was noted that the work at Birmingham was more or less connected with the writings and ...ing of Raymond Williams (Jesus College, Cambridge, England) and ultimately with the work of F. R. Leavis, Denys Thompson, and others at Cambridge University in the 1930's.

Considerable attention has been given to the DeMott statement here because it did crystallize the feelings of many on the Committee (despite the stir of opposition) and because it has far-reaching implications for the teaching of English from elementary school through the graduate school, as well as for training in writing as such.

Discussion of teaching which elicits full response from readers and demands true resonance in writers led to another matter taken to be of crucial importance: the matter of "voice." This will be treated fully in a separate report by John Hawkes (Appendix B) supplemented by a report from Jack Gelber (Appendix C). Hawkes first raised the issue of "voice" by citing a study by Walter Ong, "Voice as Summons for Belief," from the latter's book The Barbarian Within (Macmillan, 1962). Ramifications of this theme were seemingly endless -- it connected particularly with concerns of Albert Guerard and William Alfred in the teaching of writing. In brief, it might be said that the establishment of a sense of "voice" on the part of a reader or writer refers to his entering into a real (as against an insensitively masked or "phony"), relationship with himself and his audience and his material. It was widely agreed that one of the problems of students (and others) in writing was finding their real selves, and that finding oneself was the obverse of finding others to whom one was really talking. This problem exists not only for creative writing but also, at the other pole, for objectively expository or descriptive prose. The relationship of the speaking voice to the "authorial" voice of the writer was discussed at some length: the two are most often quite different and yet intimately related. Questions of "authenticity" (a frequent and even commonplace concern of modern man) are involved here. Hawkes, Gelber, Guerard, Alfred, Father Ong, Mrs. Esther Raushenbush, Charles Muscatine, and others were interested in applications of this approach to initiatory courses in writing (Freshman English, creative writing, etc.). Hawkes reported on experiments in the use of drama for the discovery of "voice" and on further plans of his to work with dramatic production, bodily action, dance, and the kinesthetic sense to enable students to discover their various "voices." Miss Carolyn Fitchett of Educational Services Incorporated, visiting the Seminar and Working Committee by request, reported on work of this sort for underprivileged children.

Criticism, Graduate Studies, Writing (Functions 2, 3, 4)

The Committee gave little attention to the state of literary criticism. Discussion of the present state of affairs in graduate training and the teaching of writing centered on the seemingly widespread failure to establish continuing contact with the realities of human existence, so that discussion of these subjects was inextricably entwined with what has been said above about response and "voice." Other reflections on these functions will appear below here in the treatment of areas of possible actions.

AREAS OF SPECIAL CONCERN AND POSSIBLE ACTION

Some ten areas of special concern and possible action were isolated by Committee members. Not all were subsequently given equal attention. They were as follows:

1. Initiation to literature and writing (chiefly Freshman English, a term in some disfavor).
2. Undergraduate literature teaching.
3. Graduate (teacher) training.
4. Elementary and secondary school teaching.
5. Relationship of literature and other arts.
6. Visiting teams to stimulate and support local department or faculties in curriculum innovation.
7. Mobile writing teams.
8. "Voice" as focus of multiform innovation.
9. Manifesto or combined interim report and manifesto addressed to the national academic community.
10. Foreign languages and literatures.

1. Initiation to Writing and Literature (Freshman English)

Freshman English has been the subject of constant attack, analysis, revaluation, and restructuring, most of it singularly uneventful. The term "Freshman English" itself is often disliked, and the surrogate for it in the subhead here above is not satisfactory either. Proposals for reform of this course or courses are legion across the nation. One which appeared particularly relevant to ideas in this Seminar was the use of teachers drawn from fields other than English (economics, history, sociology, etc.) and even of teachers without ordinary degree qualifications but otherwise highly promising drawn from the edges of the academic world (faculty wives, etc.) or from sectors of the civic community. There was great concern about involving other departments in the teaching of writing (especially since the unconcern of many faculty members causes students' writing to deteriorate after it has been brought to some kind of competence by the end of the freshman year), but there was also a general feeling that no practical way could be found to involve other departments.

A concrete proposal for handling courses in writing is contained in a separate report here by Muscatine of the University of California at Berkeley, where the proposal is about to be made (Appendix D).

2. Undergraduate Literature Teaching

Innovations in undergraduate literature teaching were urged by members of this Working Committee chiefly in connection with the DeMott presentation discussed above or in connection with "Regional" Humanities Centers or Laboratories such as the Institute for Literary Studies described below. It appears certain that there are no mere gimmicks to improve this teaching

which are not already well worn. Large-scale improvements demand thoughtful and extensive experimentation.

3. Graduate (Teacher) Training

There was a strong feeling among Committee members that one key to fruitful innovation at the undergraduate and all other levels of English teaching lay in graduate work and that graduate work should, by and large, include some apprenticeship in teaching.

The most novel and, to many, promising proposals here were that both members of graduate faculties and graduate students, perhaps at experimental centers or "laboratories," should be involved in doing teaching at levels below college as part of their education. As Muscatine put it, they -- or some of them, at least -- should become acquainted with high school teaching in order to know what they will be getting from the high schools, and with elementary school teaching in order to rediscover their subject matter itself in a fresh light by trying to convey some of it to young children.

This proposal parallels some of the current activity in physics and mathematics. The proposal was, however, generated in this Working Committee not out of a desire to imitate the ongoing activity in these or other fields but rather out of the feeling that the DeMott proposal and the Hawkes ("voice") proposal discussed above might best be introduced into education at the very earliest possible points.

Many thought that interest and experimental participation in even elementary school teaching on the part of select scholars and leading members of graduate school faculties as well as on the part of graduate students would help make the graduate schools more alive, would better undergraduate instruction, build morale for secondary and elementary school teachers, and keep the more deadly methods courses from dominating the teaching of literature at the lower levels.

4. Elementary and Secondary School Teaching

This has been covered in the remarks on Graduate (Teacher) Training above.

5. Relationship of Literature and Other Arts

Most of the suggestions in this area were concerned with ways of bringing English alive by the use of graphic and dramatic arts to establish contact with areas of reality in the students' experience.

For the teaching of foreign languages, the use of arts other than literature was particularly recommended, but significant innovations were not proposed.

The arts other than literature were represented at this Seminar only by Mrs. Jacquelyn A. Mattfeld, who as a musicologist also participated with the historians in the Working Committee on the Teaching of American History. A statement by Mrs. Mattfeld is included here as Appendix E.

It was felt that while the other arts were invaluable in the teaching of literature, they should not be made in themselves subservient to or dependent upon literature but need lives of their own on college and university campuses.

6. Visiting Teams

Many Committee members were interested in the possibility of making available a pool of scholars who, individually or in teams (perhaps including graduate students), could visit in-

terested colleges, especially smaller ones, with a view to giving the English courses an injection of greater life. It was suggested that one-shot visits would be rather useless, unless they were quite prolonged, and that a better procedure might be visits of a week or so made in conjunction with local plans for curriculum revision and repeated as the revision was pursued. This would give continuity to whatever the visiting scholars could accomplish.

7. Mobile Writing Teams

A pool of writers for visiting interested institutions could likewise give life to writing courses, it was thought. Successful visits would probably have to be a couple of weeks' duration, at least. The report by Jack Gelber (Appendix C) touches on plans for mobile writers.

8. "Voice" as Focus of Multiform Innovation

This matter has been treated above under the subhead Functions of English Teaching.

9. Manifesto or Combined Interim Report and Manifesto

The subject of a statement from the present group or members of the present group regarding the weaknesses of present English teaching in the light of the present educational crisis met with mixed response. Many felt this would be just one more statement. Others thought that it need not be: coming from an uncommitted group of some national prominence, it might stir up something. This matter was not pursued far.

10. Foreign Languages and Literatures

Foreign languages and literatures, like the arts other than literature, were represented on this Working Committee by one person only, Seymour Simches. His report appears here as Appendix F. Both he and the other members of the Committee felt that foreign languages and liaterature merited more attention than this Committee had been able to give them.

CONCRETE PROPOSALS

The two most specific and promising concrete proposals generated in this Working Committee were (1) the "Voice" Proposal discussed above under the subhead Functions of English Teaching and (2) a proposal for an Institute for Literary Studies (a kind of "Regional" Laboratory), which will be noted briefly here and explained more fully in Appendix G.

Institute for Literary Studies

It appeared to many of this Working Committee that improvement of teaching of English at the undergraduate level would demand improvement at the graduate level. Not only do aims and procedures in graduate instruction largely determine the style of undergraduate teaching, but also, more than is the case in most other disciplines, graduate studies in English are themselves often actually engaged in teaching undergraduates. It was felt that what was needed most, from elementary through graduate instruction was a live sense of literature as literature, that is, a sense of literature as intimately related to man's real life world and to his values and powers of discrimination--the sort of sense treated above in the DeMott proposal and the Hawkes "voice" proposal. Moreover, it was felt that a feasible way -- perhaps the only feasible way -- to bring about improvement would be to establish some sort of center where a concrete program could be put into effect, with a view to propagating elsewhere what the program found worthwhile.

A proposal for just such a center, possibly at Stanford University, was worked out by Albert Guerard, William Alfred, Charles Muscatine, Father Walter Ong, Esther Raushenbush, Benjamin Nichols, John Hawkes, and others on this Working Committee. It is described in Ap-

pendix G. In general, the idea is to set up a special Institute for Literary Studies with a special degree program for exceptionally promising students, allowing great fluidity in selection of courses, close contact with faculty, normally some creative writing (thought of in part as related to the teaching work of the candidate), and some actual teaching experience not only at the undergraduate level but also, experimentally, even down to the elementary school level. The Institute would involve its faculty, too, in the re-exploration of literature teaching at all levels, from elementary through graduate, somewhat after the fashion found useful for sciences at ESI.

This Institute would serve as a seed-bed, bringing in scholars and creative writers from elsewhere for longer or shorter periods and allowing its students to work for certain periods at other universities as well. Through the inter-university steering committee for the Institute, and later its directors or advisory committee, contacts with other institutions would be fostered which would, it is hoped, lead to parallel or related experiments elsewhere. Institutions mentioned as promising for such parallel or related centers are Sarah Lawrence College (which appears ready to move very soon), California(Berkeley), St. Louis University, and perhaps some university or universities in the South.

It was felt that the presence of such an Institute on the academic scene would do much to stir up or to strengthen local innovations in institutions around the country generally.

Appendix A

LAST TRY

by Benjamin DeMott

What exactly was the "trouble in the English Literature group" all about? The answer lies in the nature of the complaint I felt obliged to make against my profession. The complaint was that teachers of English Literature have a painfully narrow conception of their subject. They do not see the English class as a first rate training ground for all kinds of acts of discrimination. They are not continually and primarily and unrelentingly engaged in the activity of encouraging students to find the bearing of this book and that poem on their own lives. And they are unwilling to subordinate the cause of pure literature to the labor of drawing men into an effort to reflect upon and seek to understand their own experience (a labor that art makes much easier).

On the face of it what I have just said about the "right" way to teach English is a truism. Every teacher has heard these words about literature and self-knowledge and has said them himself, announcing the supreme relevance of literature to the development of character, imagination, responsiveness to life, etc. Given that fact nothing could be more predictable than that a group, any group, of English Literature professors, would find it ridiculous for one of their number to charge the profession with obliviousness to the true end of literary studies. Everybody knows that books "connect." Everybody also knows that anyone who claims he alone knows about the connections must be made.

But my complaint, remember, wasn't that the professional English teacher doesn't know his ultimate concern and purpose. It was that, whatever his public protestations, he does not honor that concern and purpose in his day-to-day teaching. Instead, he concentrates on matters like these:

1. Introducing students to arcane literary hierarchies -- the mystique of "good books," etc. (Take a book, any book, this book.) The high school teacher and the college teacher do this in exactly the same ways. They assign on opening day a reading list -- Silas Lapham or Harvey Swados or Joyce or whatever. Everyone takes in, by implication, that this is it: the first fact about literature is that there is good stuff and bad stuff and teacher knows the good stuff. (The bad stuff is what other people read.) And teacher will tell you even if you don't ask. The key thing he will tell you is that the bad stuff is beneath mention, does not organize life, does not lay an order over against experience, cannot be usefully attended to with an eye toward discovering its relevance to human life.
2. The structure and design of the poem or book. The way its effects are made. The nature of the speaking voice within the book. The particular modes of persuasion. The relations of its images, the linguistic continuities, the kinds of interplay between dramatic units (scene and act, for instance), etc.
3. The history of literature, the history of language, the lives of the great writers, their philosophical ideas, the development of literary form (Shakespeare liberated the sonnet from Petrarch, John Donne liberated the sonnet from Shakespeare, then came the heroic couplet and soon the Romantic poets protested against the heroic couplet on behalf of the sloppier quatrain and then we have Ezra Pound).

The subjects just mentioned are the only subjects in most English teachers' classrooms. English Literature professors are professionally and rigidly committed to the business of opposing student involvement with the text, "identification" with the hero, etc. The student may "identify," God forgive him, on his own time, but please keep the muck of his life out of my

classroom. Yet at the same time the teacher is telling himself that of course he's concerned with the relation, between literature and life. But there is a "field" to be covered, isn't there? We do have to show them what good books really are, don't we?

Let me repeat: I believe virtually everything in literature teaching today is an evasion. Virtually everything that takes place in the name of introducing students to the best that has been known and thought is an evasion. And I further believe that only a demand for a complete shift of attitude, a thoroughgoing redefinition of purpose, in the arts-teaching profession can be counted on to bring people up short about this evasiveness. This opinion isn't, I think, shared by my colleagues either in the profession at large or at the present seminar.

--But calling for a change of attitude is merely prolegomanizing. After the first paragraph, says Joe Turner, what next? After you say, "I'm for a new kind of literature teaching that makes contact with students," what then?

The full answer can't be given here but part of it can. Let me mention one example out of a possible thousand. Instead of starting an introduction to literature course with a list or with one book, or with teacher as authority, let us begin with some scenes from movies. Coming down to cases, start with rock and roll footage from the Polish film, A Generation, from an American bikini and surfboard movie, and from an English provincial movie. The dance footage is shown at the start and the student is asked for his reactions. (Some of this footage in the American film consists of tight shots, held for several seconds, on a girl's ecstatically frenzied face -- titillating stuff. Some of it sees the dance as a dance, not as an orgy; tight shots and fast cutting are avoided and the camera places the activity as less sexually arousing, sexually opportunistic stuff -- comparable in feeling to the peasant dance, festival-like.) Students in talking about what they see feel pressed within themselves to make a distinction and to justify it. They feel that one film "lies," the other "tells the truth," They feel this strongly because they can consult what they know for themselves, they can ask their experience a question. The teacher has no technical language to interpose between them and their need to ask, or if he has one, he forgets it. He encourages them to go on reaching for the terms that express their satisfaction and dissatisfaction, that in effect constitute answers to the question, is this true? Why? Why not? Later we move to Playboy, Sports Illustrated, a couple of short stories, Mad magazine, other movies, a play of Shakespeare, and this week's Bonanza. We never leave the mixture until or unless there is some sense of growing hostility to pop; if no hostility grows, then you don't move. And when you do move to high culture, you move always with the same questions, the same interests. Where and how does this scene connect with my experience? What feelings are at stake? Which feelings, which behavior do I want to approve? Disapprove? Does the judgment in the work itself seem right? What does it leave out? What does it assume? Where is the writer right about human beings and human relations and human issues?

At some level, some day, not at the beginning, middle or end of "the course," problems of how the Art part of art is made, how the effects are produced, can be entertained. Teachers who can't wait to peddle the junk-technology of their trade will of course be at it on the first day. Good teachers will keep the "course" alive longer. They will remember that it is just as possible to work the mind while seeking understanding of human situations and feelings as it is to work the mind by perceiving structure and describing tones of voice in a poem.

To do this kind of teaching you need patience and money and luck and intuition. It took many people many days (in England) to find the right footage for the rock and roll bit. (I know this one works.) I could use a hundred more exhibits than I have. No, a thousand more. Choosing them is a difficult work. You must look for comparisons in which the probable way the student will jump is one you can imagine yourself following with at least a little profit. (A lot of stuff has to be thrown away.) Also you need a willingness to believe that any good training ground for the act of discrimination, the act of choosing between versions of life, the act of deciding what the truth of human situations is, has to be accepted gratefully no matter how lowbrow or highbrow. You have, in sum, to root all the deadening snobbery of your whole literary past straight up out of your soul.

One last word: it would be a favor to me if, when the present seminar is over, people (in any field whatever, of course) who come across promising comparisons, parallels, etc. -- in the popular arts or elsewhere -- would drop me a note about them. I'd also be grateful for any random thoughts on the subject that, for reasons I can't go fully into here, engage me most.. They are (one last repetition):

1. The creation of living contact between student and art at any school level.
2. The development of ways of encouraging disciplined interpretation of art as an instrument for clarifying individual experience.

Appendix B

THE VOICE PROJECT

An Idea for Innovation in the Teaching of Writing

by John Hawkes

Background. The ideas and materials described in this proposal are based on my experience as a novelist and teacher of writing as well as on the exchange that took place between members of the English Group that convened as part of the Seminar to Initiate New Experiments in Undergraduate Instruction.

For the past ten years briefly at Harvard University and then at Brown University, I have taught two kinds of writing courses, the advanced course intended for students interested specifically in fiction, and the intermediate writing courses intended for students with only an ill-defined interest in improving their use of written prose. My commitment to this latter course has always been of a special kind, since it is here that the student's confrontation with language has been most pressing and that his personal growth has been most at stake. Though I have never thought of the intermediate writing course as "creative" in any exclusive sense, I have always approached the varied activity of this kind of course with a belief in creative attitudes and in the imagination potential of all students. The task has been to encourage the non-fiction writing student to discover himself as the center of a writing process which results in a personal or identifiable prose, rather than in mechanical or "voiceless" prose.

In my experience a typical class in intermediate writing is one limited to seventeen students who elect to take the course and who are admitted to it by a screening process. These students tend to be sophomores, though there is usually enough representation of the other three college years to provide an additional and essential diversity within the class activity. The screening process, which involves in-class writing during the first meeting, samples of previous work as well as interviews, is sometimes necessary to handle over-enrollment but also provides an initial groundwork of problems and subject matter and, further, allows the teacher specificity in assembling a class of students displaying a wide range of maturity and intellectual and verbal ability.

The operation of the class is simple. The students are required to write fifty pages during a semester; they are expected to participate in class discussions two hours a week and to make as much use of individual conferences with the instructor as possible; they are encouraged but not required to do related reading wherever possible; they are required to undertake short weekly writing exercises for the first half of the semester, after which they are given complete freedom to pursue the kinds of writing they are most interested in. At the outset the writing exercises are crucial and are concerned with problems of conception, method and form, so that the area of subject matter is left entirely to the individual student. Typical exercises are: to create the impression of imminent motion in a still object; to handle an event or idea in terms of past and present time; to handle an idea in terms of action and an action in terms of reflection; to handle any kind of material in the third person and then in the first person; to make the reader accept something extraordinary as commonplace and something commonplace as extraordinary. Aside from such exercises, the student is generally encouraged to write personal narrative during the first semester, though most students enrolling in the course come to personal narrative with surprise and an understanding resistence. But the point is that personal narrative forces the student to deal with memory, time and himself as the center of the writing process, and allows him to handle both concrete and abstract experience in a single piece of writing. In this way coherence becomes tangible and ideas emerge as dramatic entities. Underlaying the course effort

as a whole is the concept of voice -- the one fictional concept that is most relevant to human growth and to communication activities in general. It is this concept that has been most helpful to me as a teacher of so-called non-literary students, which is to say that it has been a means for helping a large number of students to change considerably their writing skills while discovering that writing is a meaningful, rather than remote and mechanical, kind of behavior. To me, voice stands as one alternative to the crippling, external logic of formal rhetoric or the various other rationalistic approaches to writing which can never allow teacher and student to work together in one of our most difficult areas on the basis of a truly common understanding. Except for the fact that the comprehension and effective use of the concept of voice depends, at present, on the individual teacher, the course I have been describing could be most relevant to innovation in initiatory writing courses, freshman composition and literature courses on a nationalwide scale.

There are three ways of looking at the concept of voice. It is first of all the instrument of oral speech; in writing it may be taken to mean the summation of style; but also in writing it may be taken to mean the whole presence of the writer-as-writer rather than the writer-as-man. This last distinction is based on the observation that we do not always know who we are and that in social situations -- situations in which a person is dramatically engaged with a shifting audience and in turn is himself an audience -- we are not always able to be true to ourselves. On the other hand, it is also a commonplace observation that in the case of the fiction writer for instance, we know the man not from his life or actual behavior but from his work. Writing in general is often more true to the self than is speaking. But at least writing should be as true to the self as is speaking.

Two quotations from the essay "Voice As Summons For Belief"* by Walter J. Ong, S. J. clarify and enlarge the implications of this subject:

"Speaking and hearing are not simple operations. Each exhibits a dialectical structure which mirrors the mysterious depths of man's psyche. As he composes his thoughts in words, a speaker or writer hears these words echoing within himself and thereby follows his own thought, as though he were another person. Conversely, a hearer or reader repeats within himself the words he hears and thereby understands them, as though he were himself two individuals. This double and interlocking dialect ... provides the matrix for human communication. The speaker listens while the hearer speaks.

"Every human word implies not only the existence -- at least in the imagination -- of another to whom the word is uttered, but it also implies that the speaker has a kind of otherness within himself. He participates in the other to whom he speaks, and it is this underlying participation which makes communication possible. The human speaker can speak to the other precisely because he himself is not purely self, but is somehow also other. His own 'I' is haunted by the shadow of a 'thou' which it can never exorcize."

This thinking indicates that if we begin with the word voice as a concept particularly relevant to writing, we are taken ultimately -- but in a special way -- to the areas of psychology, literature, philosophy and religious studies. The mere effort to write is filled with human resonance.

It is unlikely that the voice that emerges from writing will ever correspond exactly with the voice that emerges in speech. But even if these voices were equatable, it is extremely difficult to help the student to arrive at an actual comprehension of the writing voice as single, palpable, real. It is far easier to respond to the speaking voice, and yet within the limitations of an ordinary classroom even the speaking voice, as something with which to work concretely, is hardly available. In other words, until recently it had not occurred to me to attempt to work directly and diversely with the relationship between the "visceral" speaking voice of a person

* From the book by Walter J. Ong, The Barbarian Within (Macmillan, 1962).

and his authorial voice as it emerges from the printed page. But it now seems to me essential to explore fully this many-sided relationship.

I spent five months of last year working in close association with the Actor's Workshop in San Francisco, and it was this for me entirely new and intense involvement in theater life that convinced me that it was essential to approach the teaching of writing in terms of visible behavior as well as in terms of already written words. During rehearsals I was constantly moved by a single observation. That is, the progressive and externally evident effort of the actor working in the rehearsal area corresponded to a creative process which previously I had thought existed only as a psychological process within the individual man or artist. In other words, I was able to see something very like the writing process being acted out unintentionally by people who, as actors in a community situation, were nonetheless closely related to the "silent" writer who attempts to make public his private world -- emotional and intellectual, conscious and unconscious -- as a stance. I became increasingly aware that this activity, which reveals the almost immediately perceivable relationship between gesture and word, and acting and writing, could be the very real means for bridging the various distances that exist in the intermediate writing course and even more obviously in the initiatory writing course, and for making concrete the problems and realities of voice.

One further personal experience crystalized the possibilities. I was able to spend an hour visiting an acting class taught by Gerald Hiken at Stanford University. Several problems were taken up during the hour, but one in particular was relevant to reading, behavior, discovery of the self and expansion of personal capabilities and understanding -- and hence relevant also to writing at the initiatory as well as intermediate and advanced levels.

A young student stood before the group, folded his hands, raised his eyes toward the ceiling lights and recited a Shakespeare lyric. The lyric was about summer as the season of love, and several times during his recitation the student was obliged to imitate the sounds of the coo-coo. The first reaction for the student spectators -- to the effect that the recitation had been ironic -- initiated a discussion of the lyric itself. Next the teacher asked another member of the class to sit in a chair on the stage with the first student and established this second student as someone who had heard bad news and needed not practical help but consolation. As soon as he heard this situation described, the second student wisely put his head in his hands. The reciter's task was to "give" the sufferer the lyric. The change in the spoken lyric was considerable. Next the teacher told the first student to stand behind the second and massage the sufferer's shoulders while again giving him the lyric. At this point the teacher asked the first student to think of something personal and pleasurable -- in this case a field recalled from childhood -- and to recite the lyric. Lastly the teacher asked the first student to look directly at his audience, which he had not done until this moment, and to give the audience the lyric. Now the lyric emerged not as inappropriately ironic but as warm, light and subtly and meaningfully humorous. In it was evident a definite life so that the sounds of the coo-coo, for instance, became a simple clear song instead of the vehicle for a young person's discomfort. In the discussion that followed, the teacher suggested that the physical limits of one student's voice in part accounted for the ironic stance he assumed no matter what role or piece of literature he confronted.

Without involving every first-year college student in formal theatrical training, it is still probably necessary to alter the initiatory writing course experience along these lines.

Some Experimental Activities in the Pilot Course. Efforts aimed at introducing activities analogous to writing at the intermediate writing course level, and aimed importantly at innovation in initiatory courses, which in turn would involve graduate and elementary school level work, should be carried out initially in several institutions. These efforts should lead to specific research -- concerning, for instance, the problem of rhythm in spoken and written prose, or the relationship between bodily expression and oral expression (kinesthesia) -- but experimental teaching should precede research. Wherever possible, pilot courses be conducted at least in part by men who are themselves novelists, poets, playwrights, but who are also interested in

writing as something to teach. Activities to be tried include:

Item: The teacher may encourage group discussion based on an important theme, such as free speech and the problem of censorship and on related readings selected by the students. Class discussions would be tape-recorded from the outset, and, after a reasonable period, played back to the group, emphasizing in each instance an oral report delivered by one of the students. The various inadequacies of the original oral presentation would be immediately apparent. But more important, the individual student would hear himself as a stranger and would no doubt be aware of some kind of discrepancy -- loss-- between his presentation as he remembers it and that same presentation mechanically reproduced, since when played back the student's audible voice would have become in effect disembodied. At this point the teacher would introduce mimeographed copies of the unedited transcript of the recording, so that the student would be confronted directly with his words now fixed in a variety of voiceless fragments on paper. By now the loss involved in this process would be immense. The student's task would be to rewrite the transcript, attempting to restore what he thinks of as his speaking voice, and which in fact would emerge as his writing voice. This written version of the original presentation would be mimeographed and, in class, compared once more with the original tape-recording. In most cases the achievements of the final piece of writing should be considerable. This fall Professor Benjamin Nichols of the Engineering Department at Cornell plans to teach a freshman English class of eleven Engineering students, and expects to experiment along these lines. He has invited me to visit his class at least once during the semester.

Item: The student may become interested in such subjects as story-telling and fantasy-making impulses (in children, fraternity members, etc.), qualities of regional or group-culture speech and their relationship to emotional stance and social problems, speaking as a defensive or liberating activity, the difference between actual life dialogue and dialogue written for the stage. Having created a project, a student might collect his own samples of spoken prose on tape. He would then introduce some portion of this material into the course situation, which would mean that he would provide his own written version of the context from which the taped material had been taken, and might offer comparative selections from comic strips, novels, popular magazines, etc. In this kind of activity, students will no doubt exchange materials and attempt to handle them in different ways, as in pantomime, improvization, dance, various kinds of writing, etc. Films selected by the teacher could be substituted for student tapes -- and mere student observation of public media and some particular experience could be substituted for both film and tape. Note: see Appendix A, Benjamin DeMott's "Last Try."

Item: The teacher may initiate a kind of group activity similar to that of the Stanford acting class, but substituting student writing for the Shakespeare lyric and encouraging students to write as well as speak their responses, which would be personal and impressionistic or critical based on another area such as psychology.

Teachers and Institutions. The assumptions underlying the items just described are first, that the student will initiate his own work and that his reading and writing will be grounded in a variety of activity inside and outside the institution; second, that he will become involved with a variety of people, such as teachers of fiction writing, play writing, English and European Literature, social studies, psychology, etc., as well as graduate students and school children; and, finally, that he will be offered a variety of facilities and experience (theater, modern dance) ordinarily reserved for the student with special interests or already revealed talents. If the student cannot always perform he may at least be a participating observer. And facilities need not be elaborate, since one man who knows something about drama and how the body works can, with the help of students, turn a class room into a kind of theater. The important thing is that the student work on his writing in more than one way and with more than one teacher. Institutions such as Sarah Lawrence College and Stanford University would be ideal institutions in which to undertake pilot courses. It would be necessary for the teachers involved in this project to keep a log of the year and to preserve samples of student work showing student and teacher comments done in their courses.

A model pilot course might consists of one hundred students exempted from Freshman English and allowed to enroll in the Voice Project, which would constitute an experimental unit within the freshman course. Groups of twenty students each would be assigned to five teachers, each of whom would devote full teaching time to his particular students, and would allow the group to divide according to interests into smaller groups. There would be no required amount of work and no grades, though at the end of the semester each teacher would prepare individual reports indicating the quality of the student's work and the amount of progress he had made in the course. Three graduate students of definitely creative ability would be recruited for the course from within or outside the university. These men would assist in the experiments in elementary school teaching.

During the seminar at Tufts, Albert J. Guerard, Father Walter J. Ong. S.J., William Alfred, Benjamin DeMott, Jack Gelber, Sister Jacqueline Grennan, Esther Raushenbush, Charles Muscatine, Seymour Simches and Benjamin Nichols expressed interest in initiating or participating in the Voice Project. Additional persons such as Donald Justice, John Barton, William Melvin Kelley, Edwin Honig and Ralph Ellison might be willing to participate.

Appendix C

Playwriting and University Theatre spelled with a capital T and RE

by Jack Gelber

Read a really good play by one of the grand masters: it'll rub off on you. Take a student, and smear him with a Scund text of quality dramatic lit edited by the local prof and poof! Queen Elizabeth II will be passing out the accolades and delight in lending her name to the Playwrights Of Her Age.

PROBLEM: Who can read plays?
If you answer more than three you are out of your mind and seriously in need of a doctor.

DOCTOR: Calm down. Don't blame yourself for divorcing theater from life. It's the Culture. Sho Biz and Art have been married although legally separated for so many years that neither can remember what the argument was about. Don't worry about it. None of the younger playwrights took any of these courses. Besides they didn't know anything about the theater before they wrote plays either and that can be an inspiration to your students.

QUESTION: If that is the case than what's all the shouting about? The theater is not a formidable force. In Pop Culture it's a dribble. Among intellectuals its been out of the money for years.

ANSWER: The theater can be the one activity (heretofore giftwrapped for conversation) that can inexpensively provide students with a way of expressing themselves. Might keep them out of trouble and then again could spell Big Trouble. Those damn experiments have a way of exploding once in awhile. Wherein the author much to his own astonishment offers a course of ACTION ...

Start with dialogue. It isn't the most important part of making a play but it's the easiest to get going: read cartoon dialogue, read prose dialogue, listen to soap operas, listen to tape recordings of voices. You see you are slipping them a lot stuff on acting or acting out all the while you are asking about the difference between stage dialogue and life. Quickly move on into improvisation to loosen them up and give them idea of scene. You can't improvise without beginning to ask where is the thing going? What's it all about?

Around this time they ought to go away either alone or with a partner and write a scene having no acting directions (crutch, crutch) and as few stage descriptions as possible. After looking the scenes over the teacher begins rehearsal with the students assigning parts to the others. The student writer now must function as a director with guidance and must try to bring off what it was he had in mind or change it to fit his new circumstances. Then we perform it for the class. Bingo! It's different. An audience! And we start off on another journey of what that's all about.

THE NEXT STEP:

It would be reasonable that plays would be written and then performed for a larger community. Not necessarily in theaters and not necessarily on campus. Anywhere the piece demands to be played will do.

CONCURRENT STEPS:

Students ought to be encouraged to go out with some of these techniques and use them in elementary and high school. After all if you want an audience you've got to train one.

Appendix D

THE SEMINAR

by Charles Muscatine

The Introductory Study of Writing

1. Writing must be related to something that engages (the curiosity or) the interest of the student. There is no point in writing unless you have something you want to write about. Ideally, the study of writing should not be isolated subject, but be related to everything the student is studying.

2. Must entail trust between student and teacher. The student will not write honestly for someone he doesn't trust.

3. Must entail lots of writing and constructive criticism of it. The best way to learn writing is to write; the best way to improve writing is to try it out and discuss it with an informed, sympathetic, and critical audience.

4. One of the best ways to teach writing is to use reading as a focus of interest (#1 above); for critical reading, particularly in the same genre as the student is writing (e.g., "expository prose"),promotes an awareness of the possibilities of writing.

5. Rhetoric, grammar, punctuation, and spelling, rather than being taught directly in and for themselves, should be considered as aids to writing (to making clear) what you want to say.

6. Rhetoric, syntax, punctuation, and the like, then, may be observed descriptively in the writing of others, in connection with the appreciation of what they wanted to make clear, but are never taught prescriptively. An experience of the operation of rhetoric, syntax, punctuation, etc., gained through critical reading gives the reader a cumulative sense of the possibilities of the structure of writing, but never gives him a set of fixed rules. This set of experienced possibilities is part of his equipment as a potential writer, and also part of his appreciation of what is read. It is impossible to read, feel, appreciate or understand a piece of writing in the fullest or deepest way without finally recognizing and appreciating the relationship between its structure and its meaning. Furthermore, there is great utility, particularly for the teacher, and for the teacher of teachers, in being able to describe typical situations in which the structure and the meaning of pieces of writing are interrelated, and to describe these situations in accurate and economical terms. This is one use -- of "rhetorical" terminology. We realize that even this use, if the relation of structure and meaning does not clearly shine through it, runs the risk of substituting terminology for insight. But we do not make a rule against it on that basis.

7. The experiment I propose (national implications?) for improving the teaching of first year writing is the "Seminar." It is not called "English" or "Composition." Twelve students (possibly grouped according to a community of interests) meet with a seminar leader once a week or once in two weeks for an academic year. The leader is also their "adviser." The seminar has the status of a regular course, but there are no grades; and the seminar is a substitute for both regular Freshman English and for remedial English. The theory is that if the student is intellignet enough to get into college, the trouble with his writing is mostly with his motivation. The topics for writing come from the interests of the group, as the advisor helps to discover them. There are no set "assignments," required word-lengths, etc., but it is the style of the group to discuss and to write. Writings are freely reproduced and discussed both in seminar and privately. The adviser uses his knowledge and training to recommend as much good reading -- germane to the topics of interest -- as he can. Much (but not all) of the discus-

sion and writing are generated from readings, often of writings that pose problems and contradictions, or that lead simply and directly into natural areas of student concern.

8. The seminar teachers ("leaders" or "advisers") are recruited carefully -- for their sympathy and literacy -- from the entire community: professors of all levels and all departments, graduate students, seniors, juniors, and the cultivated private citizens who can always be found in University communities.

9. My bet is that at the end of the year the seminar students will like reading and writing better, and read and write better, than students in the ordinary Freshman Composition course. For large universities the Seminar solves concurrently the general problems of advising and the related problems of student "alienation."

10. In addition to "teaching" the Seminar, advisers will meet together regularly to exchange experience and advice.

11. As regards graduates and upper division students, the teaching of a Seminar may be related (possibly via the regular meetings of the staff) to a new course in problems of the teaching, of reading and writing, conducted by a graduate professor who is also connected to the Seminar program.

12. The Seminar situation seems to me easily adaptable to such approaches as that of regarding the whole problem, as that of "finding a voice."

13. The Seminar presents some obvious problems of financing. For most big State Universities it would appear to cost three to four times as much as the present Freshman English, which typically puts one graduate student ("Teaching Assistant") before one or two sections of twenty to thirty-five students per section, at (let us say) $1500 per section per year.

14. The money problem should be approached within a new conception of graduate training of college teachers. All graduate students preparing for teaching should be supported with Teaching Fellowships at the level at which all graduate students in natural sciences are now supported. All should be taught some teaching and all required to do some teaching. The most gifted ones could teach Seminars, and the others could free many regular members of departments for such teachings.

15. At a typical large University it might work this way: At present there are 450 graduate students:

60 are Teaching Assistants who teach every year they can.
50 have Fellowships but do not teach at all.
40 are Readers paid by the hour to help with courses.
300 have no support from the University.

Under the plan proposed, all 450 would equally hold teaching Fellowships, 2/3 of which would have to come from new, outside sources. The present University funds for Fellowships, Teaching Assistants, and Readers would all be lumped into the other 1/3. All would, at the time proper to their curricula, teach during part of their graduate school years, and be on full fellowship the rest of the time. Let's say that a student so supported will be teaching one course during half of his graduate career. That gives a graduate-student teaching force of 225 instead of 120. Many will be assisting and reading (or even teaching) in upper division courses; others will be doing experimental teaching in elementary and secondary schools; there will be plenty of them -- as they get experience -- to teach in Seminars. Supporting all the students instead of less than a third of them would save for the teaching profession many who drop out (or don't enter) for lack of funds.

16. For the mythical University cited above, I guess that the cost would be roughly at least $1 million a year of additional funds. Besides helping the staff better the teaching of writing, it would probably double the production of college teachers and train them better too.

Appendix E

STATEMENT OF INTERDISCIPLINARY CONCERN

by Jacquelyn A. Mattfeld

It has seemed to some of us that this conference might have been strengthened by including men and women from departments of philosophy, foreign literatures, the performing arts, the history of art and the history of music, and by giving more explicit attention to the ways in which departments and individuals may support and contribute to each other's educational objectives.

The success of this conference is direct evidence of the productiveness that can come from one kind of cross-disciplinary exchange. A second has been implied or called for within several committees. The English committee has agreed that one component of its complex subject matter is the study of literature within history -- to understand the literary work as a part of its culture. The History Committee has expressed its concern lest students learn only methodology and a succession of political milestones. Discussion on the English, History, and Social Science committees has touched upon the need for students and their teachers to learn where and when to turn to other fields for information that may lead toward the solution of their problems, and for the fresh perspective that leads to new insight. In proposing changes in their respective curricula and in the suggested program for a new degree in the literary arts there is acknowledgment that both students and teachers are critical of the barriers erected by over specialization. Both see a need for the individual work of art, the period, the concept, or the problem to be understood within its total cultural context. Both groups recognize that their students want to find the relevance of what they study to the present and to themselves, and that they often express dissatisfaction when they feel unable to synthesize the various kinds of material they are studying. In spite of these concerns, the English and History committees have in their reports addressed themselves quite closely to their own specific disciplines without serious provision for including the indispensable contributions that must come from specialists in fields not represented at this conference if these committees are to achieve their expressed goals. The following recommendations are made as adjuncts to other innovations proposed by the committees and as examples of the kind of interplay not suggested by them.

1. Undergraduate instruction

a. General "humanities" courses for freshmen and sophomores -- in schools of technology, and large universities where there are many students with narrowly scientific interests, the lectures should be given by the best senior faculty members available, and the discussion sections should be led, not by graduate students from English or History but by Science or Mathematics faculty members who are particularly interested in the topic being lectured upon.

b. In small liberal colleges heavily overweighted with the humanities and in large institutions where students not majoring in science are required to take some courses in mathematics or science to satisfy distribution requirements, materials should be prepared by men such as L. Eisley or J. Bronowski to serve as the introductory study before any course in an individual subject as Math I, Physics I, etc. The preparatory course should be designed to allay the fear of the budding humanist that math and science are incomprehensible; to explain and excite him by some basic concepts of scientific thought and then to involve him directly in simple but valid experiments and problem solving, and to help him discover the impact of scientific thought and technological innovation on life, and hence in human thought and behavior as mirrored in society, literature, and the arts, and philosophy at different moments in history.

c. "Double majors" or "combination majors" should be encouraged especially among the most gifted, not the least, but the program should always include seminars or group tutorials in

which faculty members and students explore together the relationships inherent within the subjects the student is taking. Carefully selected topics for papers would help the student begin to think along lines that will enable him to synthesize his growing knowledge.

2. Graduate instruction and preparation of teachers

a. Advanced graduate students who are involved in apprentice teaching should spend some time observing and possibly assisting in teaching in courses related to but outside his specialized field. Such work should be followed by conference with the teacher in the outside course and his own faculty adviser to discuss similarities and differences of approach to material.

b. Graduate program such as that proposed for literary arts should involve social scientists, historians of the arts, and philosophers as well as the kinds of faculty described in Mr. Guerard's proposal. In such a program interdisciplinary seminars, programs of study, and doctoral dissertations should be encouraged.

3. Faculty education

a. Opportunities should be created for faculty to become familiar with one another's thought, research, and opinion. Students suffer when intellectual and personal communication break down within the faculty, and it is not surprising that they cease to try to relate their various courses, to broaden their interests, or to communicate with those concentrating in different areas of study without the example of their teachers. Faculty seminars "behind scenes," and faculty panel discussions open to students and public, some organized within a single department and others deliberately crossing disciplinary boundaries, would be helpful.

b. Fellowships need to be created to provide full support and expenses for teachers who are not engaging in major research and not finishing a doctoral thesis or writing a book, to refresh themselves by a combination of study and observation of colleagues' teaching at their own or another institution. This might be intensive study in a man's own field, it might be in a subject entirely new to him. Any of these experiences could not help but be reflected by improved teaching. Such fellowships are particularly, though by no means exclusively, needed by faculty in the lower echelons of large institutions, in small colleges removed from the mainstream of scholarship, and in the humanities.

4. College, community, and the arts

Small colleges no less than large ones need to feel responsibility for the support and encouragement of the arts within their own walls and within the community of which they are a part. Their students and faculty need the invigoration that comes from the confrontation with the writer, the actor, the composer or the painter. Since artists in residence are a luxury reserved almost exclusively for a few institutions, there is an immediate need for regional "teams of artists" supported by federal funds who might live and work, say for one semester terms at each of several colleges in an area in rotation.

Appendix F

AN ADDENDUM ON FOREIGN LITERATURES

by Semour Simches

It is imperative that the same effort which is to be applied to improve the training of English teachers be exerted in the area of teaching of foreign literatures (French, German, Non-Western, etc.). The traditional Ph. D. in French, Romance Languages or German over-emphasizes philology and special areas of literature, and does not prepare the teacher for the kind of creative teaching he will want to do at the undergraduate level.

The ways suggested in the "Institutes" (Appendix G) proposal for the improvement of undergraduate instruction in English are equally valid and necessary for the improvement of undergraduate instruction in French, German, Spanish and Italian literature.

A new Doctor of Literary Studies with emphasis on the foreign literature (studied in the language and in cultural context) is a necessary step in the right direction.

Indeed, it is conceivable that some university may wish to establish a Doctorate of Literary Studies which is interdisciplinary in nature, i.e., no separation would be made between English or French or other European literatures. Emphasis would be placed on the common experiences of teaching literature, on the values inherent in literary expression, whether it be French, English, or German.

Appendix G

INSTITUTES FOR LITERARY STUDIES

by Albert J. Guerard

The present proposal was generated with the following background. Seminar members early became aware that responsible persons in United States Government offices dealing in various ways with education have two very serious concerns regarding the humanities and social sciences especially related to the work of this Seminar: (1) the need to get first-rate scholars in the subject-matter fields interested in innovations which will improve instruction in their fields not merely at the level of higher education but all the way through the educational structure; and (2) the need for experimental programs which are to some degree replicable. Programs must be initiated as specific centers, but such programs need to be set up so as to seed themselves elsewhere or to "infect" other centers or levels of instruction. The present proposal is concerned with such a program.

The Seminar was of course not persuaded that all innovation is necessarily good, but its particular business was to explore what kinds of innovation in undergraduate instruction might be promising, and to this it directed its efforts. Back of the planning for the Seminar was the experience of the Panel on Educational Research and Development with highly productive innovations in Mathematics and Science teaching extending from graduate school down to the elementary school levels.

Both the members of the Committee on English Instruction and the full seminar were agreed that radical innovation is highly desirable in literature and writing teaching of the first and second years, especially in the weaker colleges. The English Committee agreed on a number of general proposals, and on two specific ones. The first of these was the "Voice Project" initiated by John Hawkes, with the help of Father Ong (See the latter's "Voice on Summons for Belief" in his book The Barbarian Within, Macmillan, 1962) to involve experiments in improving writing through an increased awareness of "voice" as a reflection of self. The Project (which can be tried in any university and used at any school and age level) is described in Appendix B, and is being worked out further by Mr. Hawkes. The Committee's other major recommendation, which had enthusiastic endorsement by the full seminar, follows.

Institutes for Literary Studies

Since graduate education sets the style for so much in undergraduate teaching (and in secondary-school and elementary-school teaching as well), an essential appears to be improvement of the training of teachers in the graduate schools. The traditional Ph. D. in English, though appropriate enough for the development of historians, some types of scholars, and certain kinds of specialized teachers, gives too little attention to the needs of those who will be primarily undergraduate teachers, and fails to reflect the increasing interdisciplinary nature of the problems the student will face later as a working scholar.

There is a special problem in large universities. Although the graduate student is usually engaged in teaching composition and literature courses for freshmen and sophomores, he is, in his work as instructor, relatively isolated from critical rethinking of the principles that underlie the teaching of English. His teaching work is detached from questions concerning the relationship of his materials to his students' previous experience in school, the relationship of his subject-matter to other possible learners (such as the so-called "Disadvantaged"), or the relationship of his teaching to his research. Faculty members committed to teaching and to the advancement of learning increasingly find themselves called upon to think about the improvement

of the public-school curriculum, ways of teaching literature and composition to the disadvantaged learner in the college as well as the schools, and the uses of knowledge and techniques conventionally assigned to other disciplines (e.g., history, theology, psychology) in the solution of their own scholarly problems. At the same time, they are commonly isolated from their graduate students by a program that makes no curricular room for these concerns. The result is that graduate students are engaged in a study program and trained in a teaching program often more and more removed from the pedagogical and scholarly problems that are engaging the best attention of the professionals in the field.

There are two reasons for experimenting with a new degree program: (1) it would constitute a valid new program in its own right; (2) the existence of an attractive alternative to the traditional Ph. D. might help graduate schools in their current widespread rethinking of doctoral problems. The Committee rather favored a new terminology for the degree: Doctor of Literary Studies (D. L. S.) or Doctor of Literature (D. Litt.). But the Committee is also aware that retaining the "Ph. D." terminology in some form for the new degree program would have some advantages. In any event, the new degree is envisioned not as less demanding but rather as more demanding than the usual Ph. D. though also more flexible and, it is hoped, for those who elect it more rewarding.

The Committee realizes that a number of universities may already have experimental programs that arise from the situation described above and that these programs can be productive. It recommends in addition that a concerted and visible effort be made to experiment with a new degree in four or five institutions. This visible effort would take different forms in: (1) the institution not at present offering a doctor's degree in English but planning soon to do so; (2) the university where cross-departmental Institutes and Committees are vehicles for innovation; (3) the university where innovation normally takes place within a department. The committee proposed the experiment be conducted within the frame of Institutes for Literary Studies.

The Institute, an intergral part of the host university, would normally become a center for research in the problems of teaching literature at all levels, though with particular attention to undergraduate teaching. It might eventually grow into a Regional Center of the Humanities or "Regional Laboratory." But its most obvious function would be to develop a program leading to a new degree. Implicit in the experiment is the hope that comparable Institutes will come into being in many other universities, and that each Institute will have a beneficial influence on surrounding schools and colleges.

The Institute, then, is conceived as both a center for research and as administrative body offering a new degree. However, the research and teaching functions will be closely related. Everyone attached to the Institute will be involved in a regular rather than sporadic interest in the improvement of undergraduate teaching. There will be opportunities for experimental work in teaching in elementary schools and high schools, as well as at the undergraduate level. The teacher of freshmen and sophomores should know more about the high school and about the personality of the adolescent. The high schools in turn should become more aware of the aims of the college teacher. But such "articulation" has a further significance. Experimental programs in improving the teaching of physics in college are already under way, inspired in part by the efforts to improve the teaching of science in the elementary schools. It is conceivable some new ways of truly engaging the undergraduate in literature may be discovered through work with children and younger students. In addition, there will be opportunities for experimental work in predominantly Negro colleges. Through addressing the problem of the English program at the predominantly Negro college, the participants will not only be applying their expertise to the solution of vital contemporary social and cultural problems but will be reexamining the traditional assumptions about the importance of literature in a program of education and about its chief sources of appeal to men.

II. ENGLISH, LITERATURE, AND ARTS

The New Program

Each Institute should plan its own particular program. But the new programs, if they are to be effective, must possess characteristics and aims that carry over from one Institute to another. It might be agreed, for instance, that the degree would normally take four years, and that this would always include a certain amount of supervised teaching, usually in more than one kind of course or situation. It would also imply a continuing scrutiny, in seminars, of the problems of teaching. (This is not to be, however, the cut-and-dried "methods" course.)

The following remarks, not intended as prescriptive, will indicate the committee's thinking on this new degree:

1. There should be no preconceived specific requirements for the doctor's degree to be attained at the completion of the program. The program of each student should be individually arranged within the general specifications worked out at the individual Institute and may include work in English, American, and some Continental literature, as well as in art, music, drama, or a related cultural interest. It might include some creative writing, regarded as part of the preparation of the teacher. It should include practice in acts of real discrimination affecting simultaneously reactions to the most "serious" art and to the mass media and popular culture. The overall program would represent an inter-disciplinary grasp of a field (American culture, the period in England from 1660 to 1780, literature and the evolution of communications media, etc.) at the center of which stands literature, rather than a knowledge of English literature as a more or less exclusive specialty. Dilettantism and superficiality would of course have to be guarded against; entrance requirements have to assure that the program is being built upon a sound undergraduate major.

2. There should be no absolutely set form for the dissertation. Requirements might be met by a dissertation similar to that of the usual Ph.D. in English, or by a monograph that combines scholarship with the pedagogical experiments undertaken by the student and perhaps throws light on the nature of meaning of literature in the light of such experiments.

3. The foreign language requirement should be considered according to individual needs, and to field or period of major interest. It is more important to have a true working knowledge of one foreign language than to have a slight knowledge of three.

4. The oral examination should be based on the individual student's program rather than on some preconceived scheme for coverage. The use of an external examiner may be considered in order to guard against the dangers of parochialism and to dissipate the notion that innovation is akin to superficiality.

5. All members of the Institute, faculty and students (and visitors), might attend a regular "conference" combining reports with conviviality. However, the program should involve no universally specified course requirements and would conceivably demand no grades.

6. Though students in the Institute would work closely with faculty members and visitors attached to the Institute, they would be regular graduate students of the university at which the Institute is located, free to enter appropriate courses in whatever department and to enjoy all other appropriate scholarly and social facilities. In turn, graduate students working outside of the Institute will be free to consult anyone attached to the Institute and to share in its facilities and activities. That is, no social separation between the two kinds of doctoral student is contemplated.

7. Students would have an opportunity to observe and to participate in teaching innovations and Institute experiments, (such as the "Voice Project" concerning the relationship of voice, role personality and oral and written style). Other experimental programs may be developed, involving a healthy interpenetration of all student generations -- elementary school, high school,

undergraduate, graduate, or of more than one kind of college population (well established superior colleges and "developing" colleges, for example). Students might visit, moreover, an institute for the development of discrimination through work in contemporary culture comparable to that recently operating in Birmingham, England, as reported to the Seminar by Benjamin DeMott.

8. All students would do some supervised college teaching, in Freshman English, in Freshman Seminars, possible in other courses, as part of the doctorate program. They would be expected to join any course specially designed for those who will be teaching Freshman English the following year. It is hoped a few master high school teachers will join the Freshman English staff on one year appointments. They too would of course be involved in the Institute's activities. Moreover, the "Voice Project" of Mr. Hawkes (which will involve some four other teachers or writers) could be explored through four or five experimental sections of Freshman English. Thus to be involved in the Freshman English course should be -- whether one comes from the English Department or from the Institute -- a rewarding experience.

9. Occasional public seminars or conferences might increase the influence of the Institute on surrounding colleges and schools.

10. The Institute should have a physical home with ample space for both students and faculty.

11. Last but far from least: a certain amount of visiting and exchange among the Institutes would be encouraged. All students would normally spend part of their four-year fellowship abroad.

The suggested plan is to accept ten new students each year, building to a total enrollment of forty, of which not more than thirty would normally be in residence.

The success of the Institute will depend largely on its choice of students. It should, if it offers full four-year fellowships, be able to choose from among the very best not only of those who had for some time intended to continue on to graduate school but also of those, who, in an alarmingly increasing number, do not want to continue on to graduate school because of their sense of the rigidity and remoteness of doctoral programs in English.

The present committee will continue to confer on general aims. It proposes to invite a number of distinguished professors and writers to serve as an advisory board. It is assumed the present committee, the larger committee on literature of the Tufts Seminar, and the advisory board will take an active interest in all the Institutes that come into being.

Appendix H

USING RESEARCH SUPPORT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

by Charles Muscatine

The progress of our thinking about reforming higher education in Literature (and perhaps reforming primary and secondary as well) suggests some principles that might be readily applicable to reform in other fields.

1. Reform should begin with doers, in our case, college English teachers and professional writers. Educational theorists and philosophers should not be obliged -- perhaps not even allowed -- to go it alone.

2. Reform should start with a concrete, manageable project. It doesn't matter how big as long as you can do it.

3. A good project will also be able to be connected to other projects; it immediately suggests variations and related projects, and thus promises to affect education on a large scale despite its limited beginning.

4. After plans are sharply thought out. Each project for reform should bring in as advisors or consultants a good -sized group of other first-rate sympathetic professionals. Along with good advice, the larger group could provide the focus for other projects, either variations or extensions, and will in any case give the project publicity all over the profession.

The literature project (Appendix G) starts with a new doctorate program in literature designed primarily for college teachers, and radically different from the present philologically and historically oriented Ph. D. programs designed to train researchers. One important new feature of the program will be its substantial focus on teaching ... The program will require practice teaching, and this feature of it will immediately generate several new, related projects:

a) Practice teaching with undergradutes -- especially Freshmen -- need not, indeed must not, be content with the conventional methods. Inevitably it will become a project in experimenting with the introductory courses: it might try a variety of them, including the "seminar" method, the "voice" orientation and the "discrimination" approach that we have discussed.
b) Another valid way to train college teachers would be to give them experience teaching high school, giving them experience with how their students got that way. Here we are generating a high school research project. Here too, experiments such as the "voice" project and "discrimination" approach would be exactly in place.
c) Experience with mathematics and science has already shown that college level teachers can help primary education; beyond that, college teachers learn from young, fresh minds something about their own projects. It would not be too much to predict that even for research in the nature of literature -- a graduate school subject -- the responses of children would provide first-rate material. There is little doubt that concrete experience in the fourth grade and creative thinking about it would teach a future college teacher a lot about literature and about learning that would help in college teaching. Here we have generated an elementary teaching project.

This is one way in which related projects either under the roof of the original project or outside it might be started.

This Christmas the principals in the original project will present their plans to a large group of top professionals in literature and related fields. Some will come from Canada and possibly from England too. (We are getting more and more professors of English from Canada and England.) We hope that the idea will take, and that a number will be moved to start doctoral programs -- variations of the original, not copies of it.

Another plane of possible influence is in related fields: if the doctorate is successfully reformed in English at Stanford -- why not in French, or in History, or in Economics, or in Music?

Other planes of influence could easily be imagined. Our project's hospitality to creative writing might be applied in new and imaginative ways all up and down the curriculum. Its openness to study and use of the other arts has similar possibilities. If it is successful in influencing reform of graduate and freshman teaching, it will inevitably help reform the intermediate levels of college teaching too.

We present this account of the English project, not as the pattern, but only as a pattern. It and a wide variety of other kinds of projects, so long as they are concrete, feasible, propelled by doers, and open to variation by many others, should be supported as "research in higher education."

III. REPORT OF THE WORKING COMMITTEE ON THE TEACHING OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Prepared by William R. Taylor

Participants

Stanley M. Elkins
Eric L. McKitrick
Jacqueline A. Mattfeld
William R. Taylor
Joseph Turner
Byron L. Youtz
Paul L. Ward
Kent Wilson

The Committee and the Conference

A Committee composed of three American historians, one medievalist (now secretary of the American Historical Association), one chemist and one physicist, spent the better part of five days discussing the problem of introducing undergraduates to the study of history. From time to time we were joined by others. Joseph Turner of the Office of Science and Technology was with us most of the time and played the role of gadfly. At a crucial moment Dean Jacqueline Mattfeld of Sarah Lawrence College gave us an account of a freshman seminar she had given at Radcliffe. Some of our recommendations could not have been made without the expert counsel of Dr. Fessler, the Librarian of M.I.T., who introduced us to the wonderworld of library technology, and at the same time, made us fully conscious of its limitations.

We began haltingly, I think it is fair to say. The three American historians knew one another and were initially inclined to look upon the conference itself and the others on the committee as a needless encumbrance. They had discussed the problem of the introductory course beforehand and would have preferred to work alone. Speaking as one of them, we were inclined to be distrustful of easy analogues drawn from the teaching of physics. The next two or three days not only dispelled most of these feelings but convinced us, at first somewhat grudgingly, of the value of the perspective we were given by the conference itself, by the wrangling of the other disciplinary committees, and by the persistent questioning of those who came to us from outside history. Perhaps most encouraging of all was the responsiveness of the plenary session to our committee report.

The Problem

Because of the composition of the comitttee, it was agreed that we would focus our attention or the introductory course in American history, on the freshman-sophomore survey and its equivalents. We therefore began by developing a critique of this kind of course as it is ordinarily given. We convinced ourselves furthermore, that most of the criticisms made of the American survey probably applied to survey courses in European history, Western Civilization and other introductory courses we ourselves had given or knew about.

For purposes of this seminar, we assumed that our task was not to "reform" existing kinds of survey courses but to suggest more radical departures. One question which increasingly preoccupied us was how to introduce students to a process of historical inquiry that would be self-generating. If history is a way of thinking about society, a way of conceiving of social change, and not a body of knowledge about a period or geographical area that has to be "covered," then how does one go about inducting undergraduates into such a way of thinking? Finally, we wondered if it were feasible or possible to involve students from the outset in determining the course of the inquiry. We had been impressed by the description of the unstructured laboratory course given to beginning students of physics at M.I.T. and we found ourselves groping for a comparable experiment in history.

The Introductory Course

As we considered the American survey course from this new perspective a number of deficiencies became apparent. Such courses normally involve a "synthesis" by lecture and by textbook of the area and period to be studied, in our case the United States from 1776 to the present. The student, in effect, is taken on a conducted tour of a succession of presidential administrations and quaintly named epochs. Not only does he visit the "age" of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson and perhaps Roosevelt but "eras" of reform, good feeling, progressivism, expansionism, sectionalism, big business and normalcy and there are "revolts" of the common man, the farmer and the industrial laborer. A string of slogans attempt to do his conceptualizing for him: "retreats," "breakthroughs," "aftermaths," "critical" periods and periods of "transition." As in all conducted tours he is made to stay with the group and take his cues from the briefing provided by the guides. Should his interest be aroused by a particular event, it is difficult to make provision for him to develop such an interest. Within the objectives of such a course, moreover, the development of such an interest is largely irrelevant. Since the object is to provide an overview, qualitative emphasis is almost impossible to attain.

It was this briefing function of the conventional survey course that we came to question, at least as an introduction to historical study. We left open the possibility that such a briefing might prove useful at some later point. In the textbook and in lectures students are provided with a modified narrative, but this narrative is in effect a briefing on the conclusions historians have reached on a succession of subjects -- the implications of the Articles of Confederation, the changing political perspective of Lincoln, etc. Perhaps more serious, such briefing most often does not consist in the conclusions reached through investigation by either the lecturer or the textbook writer. More often than not -- and almost inevitably because of the emphasis on coverage -- it consists in a briefing on the conclusions reached by lecturer and textbook on the conclusions reached by others: in short, conclusions about conclusions are the survey's stock in trade. It is little wonder that students often find such courses "dull" and remote from their interest, especially if it is remembered that most of them have had a similar, if somewhat less detailed, course before -- in high school.

The difference between the high school survey and college survey seemed to consist largely in the degree of expertise, either real or assumed, of the teacher of a college course. If anything, the posture assumed by the college teacher, his greater specialization and knowledge of the subject, seemed destined to produce even greater passivity in his students and a larger degree of helplessness before his assessments. We know that college courses are usually broken down into so-called "quiz sections," generally under the direction of a graduate student, and that supplementary readings and even books of so-called "documents" are sometimes used. These facts, however, did not seem to alter the situation very substantially. It has been our experience that these small groups rarely engage in discussions of a meaningful kind. Their purpose is implied by their name: quiz. They are set up to determine whether the briefing has reached its mark. Perhaps most importantly, they are aimed at testing the student's ability to paraphrase and precis what the textbook and lecturer have already condensed. Even where documents are used to exemplify the conclusions being reached in the course, the nature of these discussions is essentially regurgitational. Had the student "followed" the lecturer's analysis? Is he "getting" it? seemed to be the relevant questions. It appeared to us that only the large enrollment of college courses (and the need at universities to support graduate students in some kind of employment) had led to the adoption of the "quiz section" system. No more advanced educational aim appeared to be involved. In fact, the quiz section, if it was successful, did what the course of lecturing and reading could not do for itself: it supplied incentive in the form of coercion by holding students accountable for what they had heard and read. It "made" the students do the reading and attend the lectures (a problem the high school course is able to handle within the context of the history class itself). It therefore became a convenient means of testing, but what, we asked, was being tested?

It was this problem of what was being learned and with what kind of incentives that ap-

peared to us to limit most severely the usefulness of the American survey course as an introduction to historical study. The fact that such courses are most often given in the first or second year of college and may be the only history course taken by an undergraduate made its limitations a matter of serious concern. In a certain sense, the student in such a course is kept locked in the historian's mind and held fast to his conclusions. Very little provision can be made for allowing the student to see how an historian goes about an historical inquiry, to say nothing of providing him with the experience of undertaking such an inquiry himself. Students are given an answer book, we felt, but they are not introduced to the problems themselves nor to the complicated process of arriving at their solutions. It is doubtful that very many students come to understand what an historical problem is, at least in any operational sense. It was this line of thinking that led us to consider an alternative to the survey proposed some years ago: the 'problems' course.

The 'Problems' Course

Problem courses of the kind given at Amherst College have been available to American colleges and universities for about fifteen years. One of us had participated in the development of such a course, and all of the historians at one time or another had used materials provided for such courses. If they answered the needs of an introduction to American history, it would not be necessary to look further, we felt.

These courses, generally given under some such title as "Problems of American Civilization," have a number of features that are worth noting. They are less comprehensive than survey courses, they do not generally employ a textbook, and they place less emphasis on lecturing and more emphasis on discussion and argumentation, both by the student and by the teacher. While they generally proceed chronologically from problem to problem, they make little pretense of "covering" American history in the usual sense. They therefore allow for a certain degree of qualitative emphasis and they give the student a larger measure of participation and a less passive role in the learning process. Each problem is developed for a couple of weeks in lectures and through reading. Students are then asked to write brief "position papers" on the problem and, after they are read by the instructor, a "seminar" is held at which conclusions reached by the students are discussed.

The difficulty with the problem course, at least for our purposes, lay both in the conception of the problem itself and in the kind of sources that it generally made available to the student. Because such courses are selective, it was felt necessary to make the problems studied "big problems" -- the causes of wars, the character of business leadership, the assessment of major presidential epochs such as the Jacksonian period and a number of cultural or intellectual problems of equivalent dimension: the Transcendentalists, the Pragmatists, the Abolitionists, the Social Gospel. The sources for the problem are contained within a paperback reader of some 100-125 pages. These readers generally contain a carefully selected set of excerpts from the writings of historians and their emphasis in predominantly historiographic: they emphasize, that is, what historians have been arguing about and their stress is upon controversy. The student, after having consulted the readings and heard out the lecturers is asked to make up his mind concerning a predetermined question: did slavery cause the Civil War? was Rockefeller a "robber baron" or a constructive business leader? were the Transcendentalists socially and politically irresponsible? Where primary materials are introduced, the student is sometimes confronted with the task of arbitrating an argument between a contemporary historian and a contemporary spokesman for the period of the problem, between Emerson and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

Part of the rationale for courses such as this is civic rather than historical. Those who offer such courses conceive of their task as one of training citizens rather than historians. In a society such as ours, it is argued, we are asked to make up our minds on a vast range of complicated and controversial issues. It is therefore necessary to train students to monitor the arguments of experts and to arrive at clear-cut decisions on the basis of only a sampling of evi-

dence, as they will have to do once they leave college. These courses, accordingly, frequently end with a few contemporary problems that are treated in a similar fashion: racial integration, the "Cold War" and the like. The nature of the "problem" is therefore obscured by a fundamental ambiguity: whose problem is it? The historian's or the society's? In neither case did it appear to resemble the kind of problem we had in mind. If it is the historian's problem, it left the student only slightly better off than the survey course: at least in the problem course he could argue with the historians themselves rather than submit to the homogenized version of their thinking presented in textbooks. In either case his principal function would be to judge rather than to investigate; in both instances the scope of his judgment would be narrowly prescribed by the terms set for him. It seemed to us that this was a little like asking children to settle quarrels between their parents. It did not, in any event, provide a suitable introduction to the study of history.

The Aim

In introducing students to history, we began to feel, it might be appropriate to introduce them to the kinds of things an historian does. If history is a subject worthy of serious study, it ought to be studied operationally and not simply for the attitudes it is capable of generating. The process of historical inquiry, how and where it begins, how it is pursued, the problem of the relevance and irrelevance of data ought to be taken into account and actively experienced. If history is in any sense a science, then the student ought to be put in a position where he can look upon authoritative historical generalizations skeptically and critically. The kind of problem we were looking for was of a much more workaday character than those of the Amherst series or the textbook writer. We were looking for a kind of problem that would be at the same time an historian's problem and a student's problem

The objective we set for ourselves was one of introducing students to a certain kind of experience, to what it is like to be an historian of America. The process we wanted them to sample was a process of inquiry, of question and answer carried on in series. One of us produced an example provided by R. G. Collingwood in a discussion of his work as an archealogist of Roman Britain. Collingwood had been struck by the wastefulness of earlier archealogical practice that had led to the digging up of whole sites and the subsequent attempt to reconstruct what had been buried there. He himself had been partly responsible for the introduction of a new technique known as the 'exploratory trench.' A narrow trench was dug across a site until some artifacts were uncovered. At this point it became necessary to begin to question the evidence: are these stones part of the foundation of a road? Such a question could be answered by digging deeper. If a road, did it run east-west or north-south? To answer this question it might be necessary to trench some more, and so the process continued, a process to which Collingwood in the chapter containing this account gave the title: "Question and Answer." The usefulness of this example lay in its emphasis upon the essentially self-generating nature of historical inquiry, upon inquiry as a process that is unfolded through the successive questioning of evidence. In this example we felt we had encountered a reasonable equivalent of what physicists meant when they referred to putting students in a situation where they could "mess around" in electricity or sound. In short, we began to feel that there might be some historical counterpart of the so-called "table-top experiment" employed in the new physics courses. The problem was to develop some "exploratory trenches" that would be to the United States what Collingwood's trenches were to the history of Roman Britain.

The Suggested Means

With this aim in mind, we set about developing some "introductory units" that might compose all or part of a freshman-sophomore introduction to American history. We conceived of our objective as two-fold: as an introduction to historical inquiry and as an introduction to American history. For the reasons given above, it seemed fruitless to divorce one from the other. The study of history apart from a consideration of the process of inquiry would lead us back toward the survey course. A study of historical methodology would be pointless and ab-

stract if the student were not to use it and experience the need for it. We had no desire to impose historical method from the outside: we wanted the student to generate a sense of how to proceed -- and how not to proceed -- by confronting him with the materials of history in some manageable form. We wanted to make it possible for him to make mistakes, retrace his steps, start again, hesitate, and try something that would "work." We wanted to let him have the experience of seeing something work, of seeing his investigation progress. We wanted him to see that, by his own terms at least, the writings of other historians were either "wrong" or irrelevant, that they had asked the wrong questions or misconstrued the answers. We wanted him to see his own initial questions transformed by further investigation. Above all, we wanted him to be able to take his time. We were a little shy about introducing the term "creative" but we were reasonably certain that fresh and probing investigation takes time and we wanted to provide as much of it as possible.

With this further aim in mind, we thought of our experimental units as introductions -- in the literal sense -- to a process of inquiry, as initial steps to get an investigation under way. Only in the most general sense did we project these initial steps to conclusions students might be expected to reach, and we did this mostly out of a need to anticipate in some measure the kinds of materials a student might need to consult as his investigation progressed.

Our first "unit" was a version of an experimental course given at Loyola. It is designed to involve the student personally and immediately in historical inquiry. More explicitly, it is aimed at enabling him to develop a point of view from which to investigate. The student is asked to gather information about his grandparents (on either side of his family). He is left free to decide what means to employ: interviewing, the consultation of family records and artifacts and/or the use of standard genealogical sources. If a student's grandparents on his father's side were Polish and living in Chicago, he might want to determine why they came to the United States at a certain point, say the mid-nineties. He might want to know where and how they had lived before and after emigrating. He might, accordingly, proceed to investigate the process of immigration, the economy of the Chicago area in the nineties, the demography of Poland, the nature of an ethnic neighborhood and a whole set of related topics that could follow from his initial inquiry. From this point on, his investigation could move in any of a number of directions. No two students, presumably, would follow precisely the same course. Two things would be accomplished: an obvious kind of curiosity would be created about a period in the "past" and the student would be led to investigate aspects of change that he had uncovered. He would have, furthermore, a point of view from which to examine the materials he consulted, a "principle of exclusion" that would help him determine the relevance of general histories of immigration, for example, to his own inquiry.

A second "unit" takes up a related problem, that of the outside observer. Since historians make frequent use of the testimony of travellers, foreign and domestic, in assessments of a particular period or event, we thought it might prove useful to launch students into an investigation that takes off from such a document. Tocqueville's journal of his ten months in America in 1831-32 seemed almost ideal for such a purpose. Tocqueville and his companion, Gustave de Beaumont, came to America with a well-defined point of view, they travelled widely and kept careful records of what they saw and whom they met. Subsequently they both theorized about American culture and politics. They visited all parts of the country, talked to Indians, boatmen, political figures--men of all occupations. They also made a careful study of institutional life at all levels. Our idea is to turn students loose in Tocqueville's journal and tell them that they can make a probe at any point, say the structure of county government in Virginia, about which Tocqueville has many interesting things to say. Once launched, this investigation would proceed as autonomously as that of the Loyola experiment. It seems unlikely, furthermore, that any two students would settle upon the same problem or follow a similar process of inquiry. This unit would have the further virtue of taking a student into an earlier chronological period and interesting him in sources of a different kind. Once again, it seemed to us, students in the course of investigation would be apt to encounter a fair slice of American history. Since it is our plan to have students report to one another on their research, the collective sense of this and other

periods studied would be far greater than the scope of any individual investigation.

A third "unit" might commence with the study of a small town. Our colleague Eric Lampard (who chose to sup with the social scientists) had talked to us about the usefulness of commencing an historical inquiry from the perspective of a community that had responded to national and regional pressures over a period of time. His own example was drawn from his knowledge of Chesterfield, Massachusetts, a small town some distance from Northampton. The population of Chesterifeld has fluctuated since its founding in the late eighteenth century; its economy has been transformed several times, and the houses on its few streets reflect a succession of architectural styles. Jacqueline Mattfeld's account of launching a similar set of investigations from Harvard, Massachusetts - her Shaker Village freshman seminar -- encourages us to believe that students, once confronted with the rich, physical presence of history in a community of this kind, will move off in many different directions. Town and church records could be consulted, the manuscript census might be studied, as well as local histories and histories of other New England towns that span roughly the same period. At institutions inaccessible to towns of this kind, other localities might provide this initial kind of focus: urban ethnic neighborhoods, a streetcar suburb of the late nineteenth century, or even the college or university itself. The important objective is to interest students in studying some aspect of historical change and to provide them with the kind of focus that would enable them to actually experience the significance of change over time.

The fourth "unit" was suggested by Eric McKitrick under the heading, "breaking the cycle of authority." Students might be given a "classical" account of a given event, for example the transactions leading to the purchase of Louisiana from the French as they are described by Henry Adams or the Presidency of Andrew Johnson as described by Howard Beale. They would also be given the sources cited in the footnotes of these accounts. The objective would not be to determine whether Adams or Beale was correct but to "unfreeze" their interpretation of what had occurred by enabling the students to develop questions of their own and to launch inquiries of their own from the same sources. Hopefully, they would come to see, not the correctness or incorrectness of these earlier accounts but their irrelevance or partial irrelevance to themselves as investigators with a different point of view.

Some of the Difficulties

We are quite conscious of the difficulty of implementing suggestions of this kind at an introductory stage, especially where large numbers of students are involved, but we believe that many of the anticipated problems are less grave than they at first appear. With some modification, these units and other, perhaps better, ones can be used, we feel, in most colleges and universities and in classes of all sizes.

The greatest problem is posed by the kind of sources that will be required in experimental teaching of this sort. College libraries of moderate size will, of course, contain most of the secondary reading students will want to do. Local historical societies, containing church and town records, can also be used by at least small numbers of students. In most college courses, however, it will probably be necessary to use several units at the same time sothat only a small number of students is working on any one at the same time. The need for other sources, we think, can be predicted with some accuracy. These sources can be made available in either mimeographed or microfilm form. The manuscript census for the Chesterfield project, for example, could be easily obtained, as could the documentary sources for unit four. Nonetheless, it may be necessary to adapt each of these units to fit the circumstance of the college in question. The Loyola experiment was clearly designed for students at an urban university who are living at home. The point we want to emphasize is not the virtue of any particular unit but the rationale that led us to develop it: the need for experimentation, the importance of engaging the interest of students in a process of historical inquiry and the necessity of engaging the imagination of students in exploring the significance of historical change in the United States from a series of strategic bases. It is also well to remember that a restriction of sources is a problem

all historians face. Taxing the ingenuity of students in this matter may well have the same kind of educational value as requiring students of physics to construct their own experimental apparatus. Each student will have to take some responsibility for the creation of his own "table-top."

The teacher's part in giving a course of this kind may also pose some problems to those who have become accustomed to survey course teaching. We see a number of options for professors using these units and those who may be assisting them. The units might, for example, be used as a "laboratory" that would parallel a somewhat modified kind of lecture course. Clearly, one important task for the teacher would be that of familiarizing students with the kinds of sources that are available and with some of the difficulties in interpreting them. Courses ordinarily broken down into sections might function as a series of seminars under the direction of graduate students but supervised by the professor through a weekly staff meeting. It is our judgment that graduate students would be able to perform this job as well as many professors, and they would certainly learn much more about teaching history from doing so. The direction, coordination and criticism of student reports would provide the basis for a more general examination of American history. Supplementary lectures and briefings could be introduced as the need for them arose. Students who were already doing research of their own, furthermore, would come to these lectures with trained ears and with specific and experienced needs. A professor's interpretation of certain events might well be criticized, but it is our guess that he would be listened to as he may not have been before. He will confront a living, critical, inquiring audience instead of the inert mass of passive spectators he may have grown accustomed to.

Recommendations for Action

In the expectation of implementing some of these ideas in an introductory course at two or three colleges and universities in the fall of 1966, we are making a number of recommendations:

1) that we be given the opportunity to present the substance of this report to a group of historians from universities and colleges across the country, so that we may solicit their concurrence, advice and, hopefully, their participation in similar projects (A meeting of the kind we requested is now scheduled for December 4-6 of this year).

2) that a "pre-pilot" version of some experimental units be given to a group of undergraduates, perhaps twenty, at Smith College (or some other suitable college) during the summer of 1966 and that this test trial be conducted by members of this committee. It is hoped that through such an experiment we can anticipate and eliminate some of the problems that will be encountered when new courses are developed in the fall.

3) that the committee be budgeted in such a way as to allow for consultation among its members during the coming spring and during the fall. We will need expenses for travel, secretarial help and the preparation of certain predictable source materials. It seems to us very important to coordinate our efforts during the early stage of our work.

4) Finally, we anticipate considerable expenditures in the preparation of materials for use in the fall. As the specific requirements become apparent, we would like to be able to set about obtaining them without first having to go through a long process of requisitioning.

IV. UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING OF THE SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Prepared by Byron Stookey

Some Generalizations

The social sciences have to do with the individual, with society, and with the relationships between the two. (They are thus not readily separable from the humanities, unless questions of value are disallowed.)

It is a purpose of undergraduate education to enlarge the student's interest in, and understanding of, the individual, society, and their interrelations.

It is not the purpose of that education to train professional social scientists. (We seemed to think: a. that undergraduate education in the social sciences might be different and better if the shadow of graduate schooling were removed, and b. that the resulting differences would not, in fact, do disservice to graduate education.)

Disciplinary organization of program in the social sciences is probably reasonable at some stages of undergraduate education. It is probably unreasonable at the introductory level. It is the introductory level that we are principally concerned with here.

Introductory Undergraduate Teaching in the Social Sciences

It should be interdisciplinary.

It should capitalize on the curiosities and preoccupations that students (in the social sciences, all students) bring with them. The most basic and universal of these is curiosity about self. Teaching need not, however, engage that curiosity directly. (A frontal assault on questions about self can have disadvantages at the freshman level: it may arouse defenses, and it may fail to offer the student materials by which to get a purchase on the questions.) Curiosity about self gets "read out," in the student's mind, largely in terms of social questions. By dealing with real questions about society, we can ignite in most undergraduates a very basic kind of fuel.

In dealing with the nature and behavior of society we should not suppress questions of "value." "Right" and "wrong" are the elementary vocabulary of concern with social environment. To ignore this is the surest way to extinguish interest in our teaching of the social sciences.

At the same time it is essential to demonstrate, in our introductory teaching, the importance of rigor in the analysis of social questions -- essential to demonstrate that there are objective ways of looking at social phenomena, that in the social sciences there is good and bad evidence. The student should begin immediately to understand the kinds of data, and of method, that make effective analysis of social questions possible.

We should trust from the beginning, for the sake of interest and understanding, the student's ability to make his own way.

"Coverage" does not deserve, in such teaching, the kind of priority we sometimes have given it. Understanding of the social sciences may grow most effectively, in fact, out of a "limited" investigation.

If we are to make effective introductory use of a "limited" investigation, it should have most of the following characteristics:

a. Its general direction and significance can be made quickly intelligible, at least at a superficial level.
b. It fairly accurately represents the kinds of investigation with which the social sciences are concerned.
c. It requires increasing command of the methods and language appropriate to the area.
d. It demands grasp of a variety of the basic principles or concepts on which knowledge in the social sciences is constructed.
e. It fairly quickly reaches a level at which the interrelation of different disciplines and perspectives becomes evident and inescapable.
f. It leads neither to cheap satisfaction nor to the unrelieved monotony that may be tolerable as a phase of a longer inquiry.
g. Its logistical requirements are simple, or at least readily met.
h. It is not so exotic that the teacher is the only accessible source of information and perspective.

We recognized, in the social sciences, roughly four approaches to introductory teaching:

a. To start with a "rigorous" abstract presentation of the content, roots and methods of a discipline (e.g., Economics 1a, 1b);
b. to start with attention to some of the major concepts we want the student to understand. From the tops of their heads some members of the group suggested the following:

culture	causation
the unconscious	prediction
behavior, attitude	change
environment	growth
order, organization	equilibrium
identity	differentiation
value	defense, adaptation
power	freedom
population	socialization
law	justice

c. to start with real questions about society, (e.g., "How do political attitudes change?").
d. to start with a major social problem (The group proposed a hasty list of this sort, including issues concerning poverty, civil rights, peace, population, and the impacts of technology).

The overlaps here are as large as the differences. Few 'a' courses can, or wish to, avoid dealing with real social questions. 'b' cannot be done without getting into 'a' and 'c'. No "real question" about society, even if not a "major problem" on the surface, can be pursued very far without uncovering problems. And 'd' depends very much on 'b' and thence on 'a'. Nonetheless we developed among us at least two pedagogical camps, caricaturable, in the terms above, as 'db' and 'bc'. To illustrate their views, sample "courses" are describe in the appendix.

Materials

Some attention is paid, in the sample courses, to the use of "didactic materials" whose task is to abstract from the student, from what is real, a conciser representation.

1. audio-visual presentation of course content
The blackboard is the standard device for this. Closed-circuit television and various other

means of projecting images have more recently proven their usefulness in making the "text" of a course more graphic. Self-instruction devices -- in textbook or other forms -- can perhaps be developed, also, to supplement the social sciences' basic form of self-instruction: independent inquiry.

2. audio-visual illustration of course content

Tapes, records, radio and television all can be usefully employed in the social sciences to bring remote or complex situations and events to the classroom. The ideal is for the student to be out of the classroom and engaged in the situation, but that is only sometimes possible. Hence the importance of media that can transport what is out there, in an effective way, to within the reach of the student. The most exotic of those media, and one that deserves experimentation, is games that simulate, and test hypotheses about, dynamic social situations. Another medium that needs wider testing is "pre-machined" data. With the kind of raw data made available, for example, by the Yale University area files, the range of inquiries accessible to students might be significantly expanded. We felt, however, that the most promising, and generally useful, medium is film.

single concept	(illustrating, e.g., the concept of adaptation)
documentary	(illustrating, e.g., characteristics of another culture)
interview	(illustrating, e.g., the operation of a social attitude)
lecture	(illustrating, e.g., a different disciplinary perspective)
training	(illustrating, e.g., ways of conducting a survey project)

Films may be made by students (where practicable a powerful learning experience), pieced together from other films on file in a film library, or obtained from any of a number of sources and used whole. For illustration, and for involving students in situations beyond the classroom, no other medium, at this point, offers as much to the college teacher of the social sciences.

Problems

One problem was mentioned more often than any other: finding faculty inclined, and competent, to devise and teach the kinds of course we have proposed. Faculty for the most part did not learn in this way themselves, their graduate experience did not prepare them for such teaching, and their colleagues and institutions are not supportive of innovation. Thus Pol Sci 1a, 1b continues, despite half-believed faculty confessions that it is not an effective course. At the least it is a handy place for graduate students to earn their keep.

Proposals

1. education of faculty

   a. graduate programs -- If we are to prepare social sicentists for effective undergraduate teaching, we should offer opportunity at the graduate level for:
      - serious involvement of advanced students, as apprentices, in such teaching;
      - inter-disciplinary seminars, inter-disciplinary programs and inter-disciplinary theses;
      - extra-mural involvement in social-scientific problems.

   b. internships for junior, and not-so-junior, faculty -- A small fraction of the nation's social science faculty have been seriously involved outside the academy in social-scientific problems. Such involvement can be an efficient way of discovering the meaning, and resources for the teaching, of social science as an inter-disciplinary venture. It is that kind of teaching that is needed at the critically important introductory level. It might therefore be useful to develop wider opportunities for:
      - postgraduate internship in government, social agencies, field studies or political activities;
      - leaves of absence (not consultantships) to be devoted with the support of coveted fellowships to similar activities. The non-academic world increasingly sends its leaders

back to the academy. There may be good reason for the academy, particularly in the social sciences, to encourage a reverse traffic.

c. "in-service" education -- It is an ironic fact that faculty, though they preach breadth to their students, rarely display much interest in learning from colleagues in other fields. They rarely confront each other even in the faculty club, let alone in each other's courses. Some support of "faculty seminars" might overcome this shyness and contribute to the kind of teaching we have proposed.

2. educational laboratories, and the development of materials

A regional laboratory could serve undergraduate education in numerous ways:

- It could coordinate, and lend status to, curricular innovation.
- It could design, and conduct or sponsor, curricular experiments.
- It could give important stimulus and support to attempts at evaluation.
- It could command the talent and resources necessary for development of teaching materials.
- It could serve as a collection and distrubution center for films and other materials.
- It could develop and operate a data bank to support student research.
- It could operate a computation center for the analysis of data.
- It could offer institutes and fellowships for faculty interested in the improvement of social science teaching.
- It could bring together the people and projects of the schools with those (often closely related) of the colleges.

3. financial support of innovation in teaching

a. specific support -- Perhaps through regional laboratories, funds should be made more readily available for the support of curricular innovation. In this area the most frequent, and unanswered, need is for small, fast grants. It is the individual teacher, or small group of teachers, who will do most of our innovation, in practice, in the social sciences. They should not be discouraged by lack of funds; nor should they be encouraged by massive procedures to inflate their projects and requests for money.

b. discretionary support -- Small grants for the support of innovation are probably best controlled by the institution. There is a serious need for discretionary funds to be used by colleges and universities to stimulate and facilitate the improvement of teaching.

c. support of new institutions -- Improvement of teaching may be accomplished best, particularly in the social sciences, where the institutional environment can be designed from scratch to facilitate it. New institutions may therefore deserve special attention from agencies that are in a position to support improvement of teaching.

4. communication

There is clearly a serious need for better communication about teaching. The Saturday Review will not do. Institutes and conferences help. So do the occasional publications of agencies like the Office of Education. So might the educational laboratories. (It might in fact be a function of the educational laboratories to publish films and descriptions of significant teaching ventures.) But there is need, as well, for an unamateur and inter-disciplinary, national journal on education -- perhaps on education in the social sciences. It would publish, perhaps semi-annually, articles by political scientists and anthropologists, computation experts, and philosophers. It would range from psychiatry to history and economics, geography and sociology to institutional administration. It would be distributed at minimal cost, in a plain wrapper.

The "Course" descriptions which follow are intended to illustrate what has been said here about introductory social science teaching. Only to illustrate. Though it should be possible to package for general use small "bits" of social science teaching, there is probably no place for the kind of packaged curriculum that may be useful at certain levels in the natural sciences.

We have not presumed that such teaching would replace, necessarily, introductory courses in the disciplines. We have presumed that it would cause courses that follow to be well as to be more effective.

THE PROBLEMS APPROACH IN FRESHMAN SOCIAL SCIENCE

by Douglas Dowd and Sister Marie
Augusta Neal

The Problem:

What is wrong with introductory courses in the social sicences, as presently taught?

a) Courses are taught from, dominated, and deadened by inadequate to terrible textbooks;
b) Such courses tend to go to one or the other of two extremes:

   i. Over-conceptualization, which makes a virtue of abstraction as such, in practice, regardless of intent; or,
   ii. a cafeteria approach to social problems, which seldom if ever rises above the analytical level of journalism -- and even excellent journalism is not social science. The former leads to a sterile set of categories that captures neither reality nor the student's interest; the latter robs the student of his one chance to discover the discipline and the system that social science can provide for the understanding of social problems.

The further consequence of current introductory courses is that good students stay away from or leave the social sciences, at the very time when social problems demand for their resolution the finest of trained minds. Those who do remain to become majors, or professionals, join in the institutionalization of aloofness.

Aims of the new proposal, general to education, and specific to the social sciences.

The defect of existing practices is that neither the abstract nor the problems approach, as hitherto used, has been adequate by itself to accomplish the purposes appropriate to the social sciences; indeed, a principal effect of the polarization over time has been to impel the discussion of social problems and the development of analytical techniques to move ever more away from each other, to the detriment of all concerned, in and outside the disciplines.

We propose that beginning social science courses have as their central focus the exploration of one vital social question, for at least one, and perhaps two semesters. To explore such questions, inevitably in depth and with breadth, will not only enhance curiosity (and perhaps not only for the beginning student), it will also provide valuable insights into the significance, materials, and methods of the relevant area.

IV. SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

The social sciences have a special quality in that their focus is -- or should be -- the understanding of and improvement in the ability to cope with society, its relationships, its processes, its problems. Students -- and some of their professors -- must be allowed, or led, to understand that it is both possible and necessary to approach social questions with seriousness, specificity, and system.

These are the aims of the approach now to be discussed. In pursuing that discussion, we wish to emphasize now that much of what must be accomplished and understood for the presentation of such a course will be learned best -- possibly only -- in the working out of the course in practice; secondly, what is presented here is meant to be suggestive of the kind of thing we have in mind. It is not meant to exhaust the possibilities; thirdly, although it will not always be made explicit, an integral part of this approach is the expectation that the student will become thoroughly involved in working through the investigation and resolution of problems in a manner allowing him freedom and placing on him responsibility; that the approach suggested will help to free the student from the role of spectator.

General characteristics of the new approach.

An appropriate question (or problem in question form) around which to organize an introductory course in the social sciences appears to have the following characteristics (liberally adapted from the Harvard freshman seminar experience -- and here repeated from an earlier page):

a. Its general direction and significance can be made quickly intelligible, at least at a superficial level.
b. It requires increasing command of the methods and language appropriate to the area.
c. It demands grasp of a variety of the basic principles or concepts on which knowledge in the area is constructed.
d. It fairly quickly reaches a level at which the interrelation of different disciplines and perspectives becomes evident and important.
e. It leads neither to cheap satisfaction nor to unrelieved monotony.
f. It is not so restricted that the seminar leader is the only available source of information and perspective.
g. If initially broad, it suggests sub-investigations appropriate in scope to the term of the seminar and having characteristics similar to those of the larger inquiry.

The most important of these characteristics are a part of the nature of scholarship.

Specifically, the following are the kinds of questions around which an introductory course could be organized:

a. What are the causes of poverty in a highly developed industrial economy, of which the United States is the paradigm case? What are the implications of the acceptance in the U.S. of the elimination of poverty as a goal of national policy?
b. What developments in modern society tend to promote and/or to curtail individual freedom?
c. Why has it been necessary for a civil rights movement to emerge in America? What are the implications of the acceptance as a goal of national policy of the full achievement of human and civil rights in America?
d. Why are the underdeveloped countries poor? What must they and we do to enable them to move toward a higher, and reasonable, level of social well-being?
e. What are the causes and consequences of an already large and rapidly growing world population? What policies are socially feasible and ethically acceptable that could cope with this problem?
f. To what underlying contemporary developments are student movements a response?
g. What are the factors tending to increase the rate of technological change? What are the social implications of such change? What must be done and can be done in the

realm of social policy to allow the effects of "automation" to be beneficial rather than harmful?

h. How can existing nationalist attitudes and institutions be altered so as to enhance their virtues and minimize their dangers?

A more detailed examination of one of the foregoing possibilities:

Taking the question centering on poverty as an example only, what follows is a very general discussion of the manner in which such a course might well proceed. It must be emphasized that a more detailed outline than this, although it could be worked out here and now, would most sensibly come into existence when responsibility for actually developing such a course fell upon one or more persons. Secondly, many vital aspects of such a course would be created and developed only in the actual working out of the course itself. Only thus would the kind of desirable freedom and spontaneity -- for both student and staff -- be made possible.

One fundamental characteristic of the course we propose is that it be interdisciplinary, that it be a social course. Therefore, the choice of question to be taken up would always be somewhat determined by the representatives of the cooperating disciplines. In the case of a course concerned with poverty, the appropriate disciplines might well be economics, political science, and sociology; in the case of the "student movement" issue, the appropriate disciplines might be social psychology, economics, political science, and sociology; questions centering on population problems, or problems of the underdeveloped areas, would desirably involve anthropologists, sociologists, economists, and political scientists. And so on.

Another reminder: The approach suggested here would constitute a marked improvement for introductory social science course whether the class be of seminar or of lecture size. Depending upon which size was involved, the manner of presentation would of course be affected -- e.g., the larger class might both necessitate and allow one weekly formal lecture by one of the social scientists. Such alterations as might be necessary to allow for small or large classes will be commented on later, but they may be neglected here for the moment.

The course is interdisciplinary. Therefore, in the introductory meetings of the class, the staff in the discussions would be interdisciplinary. (That this might always be so, if personnel considerations would allow, is of course quite possible.) In the beginnning, the staff -- say, an economist, a sociologist, a political scientist -- would discuss and present the nature of the problem of poverty in general terms largely specific to the discipline represented and as each staff member sees it. The class would be given introductory reading assignments, designed to provide a substantial, if quite general and provocative, idea of the problem (e.g., in this case, Harrington). All students would be required to develop a brief but serious paper, to be completed within ten days or so, which would attempt to answer the questions around which the course is organized. They would be expected to use the library and any other resources as they see fit to complete their papers.

The results of this initial endeavor could be expected to include at least the following:

a. Some indications of the substantive and methodological inclinations of each student, as reflected in his paper -- which might be thought of as the social science analog of an initial hypothesis developed in a science lab;
b. A good indication of the principal weaknesses and strengths of each student;
c. A basis for decisions as to next steps for each student and for the class as a whole.

It would be appropriate to plan that each student would then, within the framework of the problem and the individual inclinations just suggested, be placed on a path of inquiry that would quickly immerse him in the necessarily complex and increasingly substantial data, as well as the appropriate methods, relevant to his approach to the problem as defined. Each student would find himself developing an emphasis in one of the several relevant disciplines.

Class discussions by staff, and between staff and students, would be designed to provide breadth of perspective for all in the course. A student who, for example, became hung up on understanding the background and conditions of the Bowery Bum, and who was thus led, say, into urban sociology, would in the classroom and in assigned readings become part of a broader inquiry which would be conducted both verbally and in print -- the aim of which would be that of developing an increasingly sophisticated, disciplined and systematic approach to social understanding.

The problem selected -- in this case, poverty -- and the specific teachers and students who handle it together, will determine which of the materials and methods of political science, economics, and sociology as disciplines are examined. For example, for this problem, the sociological aspects that would be examined in depth might include: social class, ethnic and cultural differences, prejudice, the socialization process, and ecology. The economist might, for example, insist upon a disciplined examination of the appropriate current and historical statistics, an understanding of statistical technique appropriate and feasible for the purpose, the nature and determinants and relevance of productivity, of occupational and regional wage and income patterns, the relevant aspects and determinants of technological change, the basic economic institutions affecting the distribution of income, and so on.

Out of class discussions, readings, and (perhaps) from periodic formal lectures, the student could be expected to achieve a focused understanding of the nature of a capitalist society, the process of social change, alternative theoretical and programmatic approaches to modern society, and so on. Ideally, what would be brought into the course would be clearly relevant to the problem at hand; and whatever was relevant to the problem at hand would be brought into the course. This would include, and in a manner superior to anything now going on in beginning courses, the uses of survey analysis, participant observation, and so on.

Without going into further detail, it would be expected that initial confrontation with a problem would lead next to involvement in the early stages of careful specification of the problem as it will be approached by the student, to identification of the appropriate data, training in how to approach and use and organize that data, appreciation of the conceptual apparatus relevant to the problem, and, taken together with other additions to the student's understanding, the ability over the course of the semester (or year) to develop both an analysis and a policy approach that would reflect what is possible in the social sciences and that would also constitute a measurable improvement in the student's ability to think intelligently about his society. None of this would be designed to alter the values or policy inclinations of students (nor to prevent such alteration); it would be designed to enable values to be placed at the disposal of intelligence.

The final product of the course would be a substantial paper (no exams) for each student again as an "answer" to the questions around which the course is centered. It may be assumed that the initial paper and the terminal paper would in themselves measure the intellectual distance covered by the student between the beginning and the end of the course. It would be our hope that such a course would also provide increased reason for students to adhere to seriousness and system in subsequent months and years.

Some notions regarding implementation.

The foregoing course could be a full-year course or it might adequately serve its purposes if pursued for only one semester. In the latter case, the second half of the social science sequence might be occupied with one of two options: a) a problem concerned with, say, the United States, but centering on questions requiring social psychology or anthropology (inter alia), rather than the three disciplines involved in, say, the poverty case; b) a problem concerned with, say, population problems or underdeveloped areas, which would require that the student become involved in matters outside his own culture.

In any case, the aim would not be exhaustive coverage of either the subject matter or the

methods of the social sciences; intensity of investigation sufficient to engage the attention and abilities of the student would be a persisting criterion.

This course has been designed to be adaptable to the needs of the typical large class, although it is doubtless true that, like most of all courses, it could be best handled in a small class. In our discussions, we have found that it is necessary to distinguish between the problem of class size, and the problem of course content. We believe that meaningful content, enabling and requiring depth and pertinacity, is the only way to bring out the best in both student and teacher -- irrespective of class size, irrespective of the ability of either student or teacher. Assuming the worst -- mediocrity -- student and teacher will both do better and more work when faced with real issues that call forth the desire to bring available resources to bear. That large classes are unfortunate is true; that we can and probably must work with them is a challenge that we believe can be met with our proposal. If the class is small, involvement of student and teacher with each other is no problem; if classes are large, weekly lectures can be mixed with staff involvement (with the help of assistants) to do what can be done -- and that is substantial.

THE CONCEPT APPROACH IN FRESHMAN SOCIAL SCIENCE

PUBLIC vs. PRIVATE INFORMATION

by Benson Snyder, John Rensenbrink, Byron Stookey, Eugene Lichtenstein, and Eric Lampard

A course for first-year undergraduates designed to provide students with an increasingly rigorous introduction to the perspectives and resources of the Behavioral Scientist. The intent is to engage the student in a serious encounter with the dissonances and discrepancies which face him. The development of concepts from data would proceed to the application of those concepts to a variety of social issues.

The course is designed for from 50 to 400+ students and could be adapted to a wide range of college settings. The course begins with the students' examination of their several expectations of college prior to coming. The continuing revision of these perceptions, both private and public, will be examined as the semester unfolds.

The student is to examine, during an entire academic year, the varieties of "private" and "public" information, develop some understanding of the latent as well as manifest factors operating to determine what information will be clarified in what way at a given time. (Examples suggested for course content: a. censorship; b. denial and projection as mental mechanisms; c. examination of college catalogue, research on the institution.

The levels of awareness, within the "subject" and observer, will lead to a consideration of some of the psychological, sociological, and cultural forces inpinging on the individual and affecting the amount, kind, and flow of information available to him.

Finally, such a course would consider the consequences for the individual and for the group of knowing, or having access to, private and public information.

Much work, and considerable innovation, is needed to develop "materials" for this approach. Among the many suggestions the following are representative:

1. Lectures would be structured to maximize the chances of achieving a genuine academic dialogue. To this end, specific faculty would be asked to come to their colleagues' lectures following a coffee or lunch break (where informal communication could occur among the students themselves and with the faculty). The colleagues would criticize and comment. The intent would be to force a different kind of teaching and to provide the students a climate of controversy with respect for difference.

2. Possible film on conditions for dialogue (vs. those for negotiation). Trust, openness, access to information, etc. Suggestion made to film a trial, and also show the "private" performance of the participants along with the public one.

3. The use of a legal model was well thought of since it, by raising the question of what is evidence?, deals with distinctions between appearance and reality in a workable framework.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A SOCIAL SCIENCE TEACHING COMMISSION

by Ernest Lynton, James Dixon, Benson Snyder and Eugene Lichtenstein

Two steps needed to bring about continuing evaluation and improvement of higher education have been discussed in much detail at this seminar. The one involved detailed curricular studies, such as have been carried out, e.g., in the physical sciences, and are presently being proposed in the social sciences, the literary arts, and history. The other, resulting from the first, involves large scale efforts of implementation, including summer institutes, regional centers, preparation of special materials, etc. Both of these require a major and continuing effort which must be supported with appropriate generosity.

There is, however, a third step, or rather a multiplicity of third steps, which are inherently scattered, local, and on a small scale: the specific innovation at a certain campus by a given person or group of persons. This should not only be the end result of all larger efforts, but can and in many cases is in fact their inception -- ideas which lead to major reforms originally come from individuals, and often germinate on a quite modest and limited scale.

It is in this area that there exists both in private and in particular in public institutions a very real financial bottleneck which inhibits this. Even major state universities with multi-million dollar budgets are singularly short of venture funds -- the money which is needed to free someone from a semester's duty or to bring into the institutions someone with novel ideas for a limited time. Circumstances are often such as to limit the possibility of formal application for funds from federal or foundation sources -- in many cases time and money are needed precisely because ideas are still much too nebulous to be described in a proposal; in other cases what is wanted is the application to a local context of ideas and programs developed elsewhere.

Many participants at the seminar, therefore, feel that it is crucial for the widespread origination and dissemination of educational innovation to find effective and responsible ways of making available discretionary funds to an individual or to an institution.

Two characteristics would seem to be essential to any workable process of providing such funds. First of all, it would need to retain a considerable element of informality, with a minimum of bureaucratic procedure, and relying preferably on largely oral contact between grantor and grantee. Secondly, and as a consequence of the first, it should be decentralized, both geographically and in terms of academic disciplines, lest it succumb to Parkinsonian elephantiasis.

This suggests the formation, in each major field, of a small commission, entrusted by a central federal or foundation source with the power and the means to search out, to stimulate, and to proliferate innovation by making small grants to individuals or to institutions on the basis of immediate and personal judgement. This commission would, as it were, act as brokers between client and granting agency. The fiduciary nature of its activity can be accepted by both client and agency by virtue of the professional qualifications of the commission members.

Members of the Committee on the Social Sciences feel that more time needs to be given to a critical evaluation of the feasibility of such a commission, with close attention to its organizational details. They would like to continue their discussion and also draw in a number of people not attending the present sessions.

It is, therefore, proposed that within about a month a group of about twelve people meet for about a day and a half, in continuation of the present seminar. Such a meeting will result either in the abandoning of the idea, or in a specific proposal for the establishment of a Social Science Teaching Commission for a limited period of, perhaps, five years, after which its effectiveness could be again evaluated.

V. COLLEGE STUDENTS

MANIFESTO

by Douglas Dowd

From time to time, at the conference and elsewhere, the question has been raised, "Why are we now so concerned with what is happening in the schools? Why are students behaving, or not behaving, as they do?" And so on. There are many reasons, and we are all familiar with many of them, but it will help to give focus to what follows to identify some of the major causes and characteristics of the problem that underlies our discussions.

We don't know enough about "what the students are like," but we know something. They are restive about their society, or they are what we now call alienated, or they are robots, or aimless, or unfulfilled, or contemptuous, or angry, or wild, or something. They no longer fear the stick, they no longer want the carrot -- or, when they do, their fears and desires are not usually seen as healthy, or constructive, or desirable. We know, of course, that when the stick does hit them, it still hurts; and that when they find, in later years, that they cannot get the carrot, they want it. We hope to help them to avoid the too little too late problem. We also hope in the process to have them work with us to make it possible for individuals to live in a creative and sane society.

Why are "they" this way? It is some combination of having had democracy as an ideal preached at them, but not practiced -- in or out of school; of having an affluent environment where carrots seem to be at hand for, at least, them; of having to scorn existing sanctions because to do otherwise would be to accept existing standards (among other reasons); of finding little in the way of intellectual or political leadership in their intellectual or political leaders; of seeing that enormous problems are sugarcoated, or, when treated, are treated with terribly inadequate means, or palliatives; of living in a world of rapid and pervasive communications and self-consciousness which promotes early desires for independence (in the realms of sex, politics, education, etc.), but which at the same time offers little in the way of guidance as to how either to handle or obtain independence -- or get away with it. There are of course other important characteristics of the young person's world that promote in him tendencies toward either wildness or dullness. It is not idle to state that one underlying characteristic is that which may be summed up in one word: hypocrisy.

Those who teach, and who care about the students and the society they live in and the society they will one day have ushered in, and that is also our society for now and later, must, if they are to speak of reforming certain aspects of the university -- most usually, its curriculum -- must recognize that not one important segment of university activity can be reformed without producing disillusion with reform itself unless important reforms in one area are made part of a comprehensive system of reforms; a system that makes the university a live part of the community (local, national, world) in which it exists. Live, honest, serious, connected. When speaking thusly, it must always be emphasized that far from this being an argument for making the university a service station either for student or community, it is only by attempting something like the opposite that the services the students and the community need can emerge from educated people.

More specifically, what are the elements of the system referred to above? Most easily: students, faculty, administration, society. There is nothing left, of course. But when we say students, we must mean something more than is presently meant. We must mean not only those who are presently admitted into higher education, but many of those who are not. And the former can and should become by their relationships with the latter, an informal part of the faculty, and the faculty of the administration -- in terms of vital decisions -- and all must link themselves as selves moving toward awareness, with the society.

We work toward curricular reform. But curricular reform without changing the relationship of the student to the development of curricula, to the faculty, to the administration, and to the general life of the university or college, is likely to founder on the rocks left unmoved. We wish the student to view himself and his society critically; if so, we must encourage him to view his college critically. But criticism without power breeds cynicism, irresponsibility, foolishness, or, among other things, boredom. If we preach democracy, freedom, creativeness, we must at the same time build a home on the campus where such things can be practiced, and from which they can spread. For we cannot help but know that it is essential to find a healthy center from which such things can spread and strengthen those elements of each which exist so weakly in the larger society.

We must bring in new students, and not bring them in with admissions criteria of the present in mind. We must bring in students whom we do not expect to earn a degree of the usual sort, but who we expect can grow, who must be given a chance to grow, whose growth will be made possible, in part, by those of the more privileged background who can teach them, and learn themselves, and in the process, too, get "connected" to something that lets them know they make a difference.

We must place students in a new relationship with faculty, and faculty in a new relationship with both students and administration. We must educate our administrators to know what we know is wrong and why and how we think changes can and must be made, and must be made in a fulsome way. We must learn to work together in what is relatively the most congenial environment for such things in our society. If not there, where?

We must view the university as the single most promising source of creativity and criticism in our society, but a source that can serve neither function well -- if at all -- unless it is free to find its own way. The university is the only place where it can at all be expected that values can rise a reasonable distance above vested interests. We must not, so long as the dirty word "values" has been raised, shy away from them, or their exercise. It is not values, but hidden values, that corrupt teaching. Values hidden in closets (as they are, e.g., in the social sciences), become mouldy; brought to light, they can be a source of energy and liberation.

We must cease to be afraid of what we must be if we are to be worthy. We must teach our society what a university can be, not acquiesce in what society lets it become. The multiversity, when that term is used pejoratively, is the product not of a pushy society but of a slack faculty. Small and weak colleges may occasionally be raped; the best colleges and universities have been seduced -- not by money, or status, but by fear of finding an alternative way. All that must stop, and stop while other things are being built, or it is useless to speak of curricular, let alone, educational reform.

We must move on many fronts at once, guard against digging a small channel through which we hope a large ship will pass. There is nothing wrong with reform as such, but there is much that is wrong with limited reforms, and we deal too much with limited reforms -- out of timidity, lack of thought, lack of this, that or the other thing.

The university today is not what it was a hundred years ago. Perhaps today's university might have been just fine for a hundred years ago. The university is changing, in all the relationships suggested earlier. The question is: will it change in ways that will enable it, and young people, and the society at large to receive from the university what the university, and only it, can provide? A little reflection reveals that the question asked of the university is merely a narrower way of asking the same question of society; but, we have power in our universities that, however small it may seem, is enormous by comparison with what we hold outside it. We must use that power with verve, and imagination, and confidence in ourselves and the young. When experiments are begun, we must insist that they begin in an environment that makes it possible for them to succeed; and that means that the experiments must comprise all the relevant variables.

SOME DATA

by George Stern

A small college engaged in self-analysis recently used an objective measure of college environments (The College Characteristics Index) to get some sense of what they were and how they compared with others. The entire college community responded to the questionnaires: incoming students, upperclassmen, faculty, administration, and trustees. When the data were sorted out it became clear that the upperclassmen and the faculty had both responded in the same way, giving a somewhat depressing but realistic picture of the school. The new students on the other hand, who had been instructed to reply to the items in terms of their expectations since they had not yet had any experience with the school, described a highly idealized institution bearing little resemblance to the one reflected in the responses of the upperclassmen and the faculty. It was identical, however, with the description given by the administration. Evidently both groups read the same literature, and both believed in it. The only difference is that the freshmen no longer have these illusions by the time they have been around as long as the seniors and the faculty. The trustees' responses, incidentally, were unlike anyone else's.

The point of this incident is not simply that this school misrepresents itself or that its administration has been self-deluding. Similar data from students entering fourteen different colleges across the country suggests that high school seniors may share a generalized misconception about higher education and are unable to differentiate the school they are about to attend from any other school in certain particulars. Over two-thirds of this group, for example, believed that their school expected them "to develop a strong sense of responsibility about their role in contemporary social and political life," and that this would not only involve developing "ideals but also expressing them in action." They thought that other students and faculty were going to be "actively concerned about national and international affairs" and that they themselves would be "encouraged to take an active part in social reforms and political programs," "the expression of strong personal beliefs and convictions being far from rare here." An even higher percentage believed that "no one needs to be afraid of expressing extreme or unpopular viewpoints in this school," "the school has an excellent reputation for academic freedom" and "the values most stressed here are open-mindedness and objectivity."

These incoming freshmen were not themselves political activists. Their responses to a parallel personality inventory (The Activities Index) make it clear that these interests were not characteristic of themselves personally when they arrived but were rather among the things that they expected the college would try to develop in them. Yet less than one-half of the seniors from the large universities in the sample considered these expectations to have actually been fulfilled at their school.

The issue involves more than political beliefs or social values. The widening base of political participation in American life has also been accompanied by increased economic participation through public channels, but it has also aroused a keen sense of threat to the maintenance of personal autonomy and a resistance to psychological collectivization. Students want to know that they can play an active role in the determination of their own affairs, even though they may not choose as individuals to exercise that power directly.

One school on the American scene has explicitly organized itself in such a way as to achieve maximal participation by its students in all areas of college life. Antioch students are involved together with faculty in each of the important administrative committees of the institution, including curriculum and promotions. They are elected by the college community and have full status as committee members, and serve their turn as chairmen. This involves a sophisticated political apparatus and a very considerable amount of effort, but Antioch has been eminently successful in its efforts to include the student as a fully participating member of the academic community. There are many educational institutions in this country that allow

their faculty far less voice in their affairs than the students at Antioch, and the consequences of such exclusion in terms of behavior, motivation and morale are quite apparent. The respective statuses and expectations of students and faculty are not of course the same, but there is nevertheless some extrapolation to be made from one case to the other.

The formal structure adopted by Antioch appears to serve a fundamental purpose that can be achieved in other ways. What is involved here is the character of the institution's personnel practices, one of eleven factors extracted in an analysis of the college environments undertaken at Syracuse University and based on the instruments referred to previously. Five of these factors are associated specifically with the intellectual climate of a school. They involve various ways in which colleges manage certain familiar components: good facilities (teachers and plant), high standards for academic achievement, great expectations for the future after graduation, and the provision of varied opportunities for personal creative endeavor, whether in the arts, the sciences, or the humanities. They also include an unexpected variable -- the extent to which the school gives genuine encouragement to the development of personal independence and self-reliance and minimizes its custodial functions.

This factor emerged originally in an inverted form.* It is based on items which describe an institutional atmosphere characterized by (a) a detailed and rigorously administered code of student behavior, (b) a hierarchical system of enforcement depending on students and faculty as well as personnel officers for supervision and policing, and (c) a paranoid attitude on the part of the faculty which extends beyond mere suspicion of student motives in their social behavior to include the resentment of student questions in class, querulousness among the staff members themselves, and the involvement of students in faculty bickering.

This association of items is so suggestive of the culture of the penal institution that it was first named "custodial care." Scored in that form, it was found to be most characteristic of the state normal schools in the study population, particularly those from the southwest. Students are encouraged to behave childishly at such schools, to be either docile or doltish. Although the submissive fearfulness of many of them evidently leads to their identification with the aggressor, the consequences of withholding opportunities for the exercise of self-discipline from less emotionally constricted students may be observed at certain large state and municipal institutions. Repressive administrative attempts to maintain custodial care are coupled at these schools with high scores on a "student play" factor, reflecting an active and expressive collegiate social life. These are the schools that have adopted rigid student personnel practices in order to deal with an equally strong but countervailing student culture. One surmises that the two processes reinforce one another by their antithesis, establishing an unstable equilibrium in which the administrative restrictions of the winter lead to the student demonstrations of the spring.

All institutions in the original study sample with minimal custodial care scores were found to have extremely high scores on the remaining intellectual climate factors. Antioch was one of these schools, but the group also includes Bennington, Bryn Mawr, Chicago, Goddard, Monteith, Oberlin, Randolph-Macon Women's College, Reed, Sarah Lawrence, Shimer, Swarthmore, Vassar and Wesleyan. These schools are very different from one another in many respects, but they do share certain common characteristics. They are all small in size, exclusively liberal arts, have an intense commitment to learning in general and to self-knowledge in particular, and are attended by students as fiercely intellectual on the one hand as they are iconoclastically dissident and self-consciously non-conforming on the other. The list includes some of the best-known and most highly respected schools in the country, but it also includes several that are scarcely known beyond their own respective states. Among the schools tested they represent the best in the country. They attract the brightest students, graduate the most productive scholars, and are the stronghold of the liberal arts tradition in education.

* The material in the immediately following paragraphs has been taken from G. Stern, Student Ecology and the College Environment, J. Med. Educ., 1965, 40, 132-154.

There are other types of colleges. There are over 2100 institutions offering at least two years of schooling beyond the 12th grade. But few of these actually share the objectives of this small group of colleges. There is little evidence in our data of any continuum here; those that attempt to serve the intellect do so, the rest have other objectives and recruit a different clientele. The data suggest that denominational colleges generally tend to minimize the need for personal academic achievement, emphasizing fellowship, community, and efficient organization instead. These schools attract more dependent, orderly, group-centered students. Neither they nor the teachers colleges which resemble them in many respects, nor the achievement-driven engineering schools with their competitive Dr. Strangeloves or the business schools' anti-intellectual Babbits support the notion of a broadly shared criterion of academic excellence achieved by the few but to which all aspire. There are a few glaring exceptions in each of these categories, but for the rest the only possible consensus would appear to involve a tacit understanding that there are other things more important than merely developing tools for thinking. The various types of American colleges each offer their own substitute. Even the large universities, providing something for every taste, simply project in macrocosm each of the separate facets of the smaller single-purpose institutions.

The only ones in the entire spectrum that have deliberately sought to maximize their intellectual commitment have also come to minimize custodial personnel practices. The position of these schools reflects a respect for the dignity of the student as an individual which transcends any concern for the maintenance of discipline for its own sake. The educational significance of such a policy lies in part in the fact that the student has an opportunity to make errors and therefore to learn by them. Of possibly greater importance is the student's realization that risks are worth taking because failure is particular rather than general. He learns that he can afford to try something novel, that the ultimate restrictions are based on reality rather than on rules, and that the effort is of more genuine personal significance than the actual outcome. He learns self-control in other words rather than conformity.

This may be an easier lesson for adolescents from the social strata that have typically supported these colleges than it is for others. Attitudes towards authority are in part a function of social class and this may account for the difference between responses of self-restraint and of self-indulgence. Those accustomed to riding loose in the harness react less violently to its removal than those who have known only the bite of the cinch. It has also been argued that the case of the experimental colleges is no more than a special case, from which no generalizations can be made. They would produce effective graduates in any event; their success lies less in what they do than in the students with whom they do it. But the experiment is being tried at other colleges, colleges where the students are of more average intelligence and come from homes that have not prepared them to tolerate the absence of formal authority easily. Webster College, a Catholic college for women (but with a fully coeducational fine arts department) in St. Louis, has begun a reorganization that puts a premium on growth rather than on attainment, regarding learning as a consummatory process rather than an end product of education. As the emphasis on intellectuality came more sharply into focus at Webster, many of the traditional but irrelevant rituals of the college began to feel dissonant to students and faculty alike. Regulations on smoking, hours, living arrangements, clothes, classes, and curriculum became trivial because of their lack of connection with the real purposes of the institution.

It is too soon to estimate the consequences of the Webster innovations; but one thing is quite clear. There has been a marked increase in the academic involvement of these students. Whatever its cause, Hawthorne effect or otherwise, the girls have adapted to the new fluidity of their environment and seem to be functioning in ways that are not characteristic of their counterparts in other, more conventional denominational colleges.

The outcome may not be the same everywhere. Students from more repressive backgrounds, from homes and secondary schools characterized by practices that serve to prolong immaturity, may very well rebel for the first time when the need no longer actually exists but the situation finally permits it. Limits will be tested and adolescents under the most favorable

of circumstances will still continue to behave in ways peculiar to these closing years of biological maturation. But the results in the end ought to be the same, and the academic process will at any rate have achieved a degree of integrity that is now lacking in most of our colleges and universities. It may very well be that a large measure of the variance in student behavior can be accounted for in the prejudices and expectations of the adults with whom they must interact. Greeted with constant suspicion the adolescent is only too ready to believe that it may be justified, or might just as well be. Rules in this context are a provocation rather than a restraint. Treated with dignity and deference the same adolescent can begin to explore his capacities for sustaining a more mature response. We are after all, what we think we might be.

THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY

by John Ehle

Students seek to be part of the campus community, not only that part in which students historically have been permitted to have some voice (a student newspaper, student courts, etc.), but all of it. All too often they are treated like children, are told when to come and go and what to do if they are to be educated. It would be better if we could help them and ourselves bring about a true community, in which decisions about living, classes, and government are made together.

Students seek to be part of the on-campus community, and also part of the off-campus community at the same time. They don't want to give up the real world when they enter the world of our campuses; they want to work in the poverty programs as tutors, or debate and take part in the real-life issues of politics, current arts products, and so forth. In fact, very likely they want the wall which separates the campus world from the off-campus world to be, at least in part, done away with. They would like to see the university and college enter the real world, and the real world be admitted to the campus. This would require many changes in courses and content; it might require changes in the make-up of the student body, which does not usually reflect the structure of the total community, at all.

The poor college is restricted to students of such academic quality as it can find, and usually its students are poor scholastically and financially; the rich college is restricted by its own devices to accept students of a certain academic range, and they turn out to be all of a type, too, or all too much of a type. The students of Berkeley appear to be concerned about the Negroes of Mississippi and elsewhere, but these Negroes cannot attend a Berkeley; even the Negroes in Berkeley Township can't very often get into Berkeley, not because they are Negroes but because they have low scholastic scores. To what extent are we discriminating through scholastic standards in ways which will become more and more unacceptable to the students, and make difficult the structuring of community, or a sense of community, in a time of social revolution in our country? It might be that our poor schools and our rich ones ought to consider admitting many students solely on the basis of their desire to learn, and grade them solely on the basis of their progress. Growth is an acceptable criterion of education, one no less worthy than are competence and mastery.

Under such circumstances all young people would have to be provided with the financial resources to attend the school of their choice. The problems involved in compensating for generations of systematic economic, intellectual, and psychological deprivations are enormous, and all three of these must be considered carefully in any such program. But even if the integration of students in this fashion at the elite institutions can only be achieved for the present in special, painstakingly controlled circumstances, substantial funds will still have to be made available to the individual student to cover new and more realistic tuition schedules at the local colleges of their choice. Schools that are poor because of the poverty of their students can do little to break the chain. They must charge higher tuition if they are to provide the faculty and facilities to make a difference.

The universities will need also to be more responsive to the plight of the poor people living in the surrounding community. The slums located around many of our major universities get relatively little attention, despite the rich opportunities they offer for both service and scholarship. The students are seeking a sense of community membership both on campus and off-campus, and they seek to bring the two closer together; beyond that, they long for a community of concern, and a community of learning. We ought not to fragment learning into small parts unless we also take the time to show how the parts are related to a whole that is meaningful to us in our day.

All of this, of course, is somewhat idealized. It is not what the students are saying, for they have not said all of this; it is an extension of what they are saying, a recognition of their current dissatisfaction with us and an interpretation of it which acknowledges the profound social revolution going on about us all.

Our students are often in the forefront of this revolution. They have developed a deep concern for social reform, and this has become a passion with many of them. It is natural that they expect themselves and their institutions to become more democratic and more relevant, even in the face of sacrifice. They have become a main revitalizing force in our society, and it appears that they are turning their attention now to the campuses and are critical of the crusty, out-of-date, aloof, impractical and irrelevant matters and ways which they see everywhere. It would be well to prepare to compromise realistically with them and to admit them into more active participation in determining a more active, serviceable life for our colleges and universities, and a more active, serviceable place for our students in them and in our society. This will not be done by refinements of existing systems; we need major changes before the refinements are made.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE UNIVERSE

by Ernest Lynton

Sometimes explicitly, and more often by implication, the students in American Universities today are raising fundamental questions about the basic function of an institution of higher education. The students have recognized what the institutions have not yet faced up to -- that in its essential educational function the university must demonstrate a relationship and relevance to the outside word. The role of the university is neither that of being subservient to usefulness and immediate topicality, not that of academia with a set of values and a body of interests which

are irrelevant to the world at large. Instead we must convince ourselves, and then fashion our courses and curricula in such a way as to convince our students, that the knowledge and the analytical tools of the disciplines will help them in their search for meaning in their lives, and that this meaning will be found, in part, when they relate themselves to the society in which they live.

The University must lower the wall which separates the campus from the outside world, and which often makes a student leave school early in order to enter the real world. The on-campus community and the off-campus community must be linked in two related and overlapping ways. They must be linked by the basic relevance of the intellectual pursuits to the problems of society in the widest sense, i.e., by the use of the educational function of the University to create that same sense of criticism and analysis toward society and the surroundings that is encouraged toward physical, mathematical, or literary problems. They must also be linked in a more immediate, topical, and self-generating way by a continuing involvement in "real-life" issues and projects.

IMPLEMENTATION

by Sister Marie Augusta Neal

This conference recognizes that the conception of academic endeavor as including direct experience with the serious problems of the local, national, and international community on the one hand and reflection on identity problems of the students on the other are not yet part of the culture of the decision makers within the academic structure nor of family expectations of the purpose of the college. If changes are proposed that consider such experiences and introspections as requisites of education they cannot be implemented unless there is an opportunity for encounter between those holding these ideas and those programming the academic enterprise. For this reason we recommend meetings of college presidents, deans, trustees and students at institutes convened expressly to explore the materials developed from this conference along with its conclusions and recommendations to the express end of considering the adaptation of programs or experiments that implement these suggestions. To this meeting should be invited those persons perceived as most likely to initiate effective action, those located in universities and colleges whose facilities could be most effectively used, those whose willingness to try is at least somewhat evident, and those least likely to be aware of this press.

A number of conferences should be organized to consider a series of issues and ideas that bear directly on the changing role of the student and the university structure suggested by current study behavio , this to be attended by personnel from all levels of the college community. The major objective of these conferences would be the generating of dialogue between students, faculty and administration around issues that should have joint consideration, some of which are so anxiety laden when considered in the current university structure that they would profit by off-campus environments for discussion and mastery. The following suggested topics are hooks for encounters:

a. The development of curricula that establish college credit for student experience in off-campus enterprises like VISTA, Peace Corps, civil rights work, vagabond cultural tours, etc.

b. Examination of new relations which are developing between colleges and local communities, colleges and the world community, and of colleges as community.
c. The reorganization of the freshman year of college to make it a more usable passageway from the high school experience to the greater preoccupation with self-initiated and creative responses to the cultural heritage, scientific investigations, and problems of the contemporary world. (We are aware that this orientation may also in time become the preoccupation of pre-college education.)
d. The examination, together with college and university architects and planners, and with experts in community organization, to consider where and how to build a university that responds to the needs of students, faculty, administration and the relation of all these to the world in which the university exists. This would include size and place of campus and type of buildings, etc.
e. The exploration of new forms for experimental colleges within existing universities and with people already planning such ventures.

Funds should be made available to universities for student developed community activities like the Cornell project in Fayette County, Tennessee, and the inner city projects of a number of different colleges. These funds should be administered jointly by the administration, students and faculty. This is one special way of implementing a project peculiar to the living together group that constitutes the university community, and brings it into direct confrontation with the pressing problems of the wider community of which it is a part.

In view of the inadequacies of American education in its present form it is agreed here that there are students who ought to receive a chance at a college education and who, because of the present admissions policies, lack channels in. To provide for these the following programs are recommended:

a. That colleges willing to take students recommended by the pre-college training programs such as Educational Services Incorporated and the Georgetown summer program be subsidized for the costs involved in providing for the tuition, seminar, and counseling facilities necessary to give them a program geared to their special needs. These students, coming from inner city and rural areas lacking the college preparatory orientation available to the average student, need an on-going orientation at least through their freshman year and possibly longer. Colleges like Trinity College in Washington have admissions offices ready to take the students but there is not yet in the academic community full commitment to this experiment, hence the need of subsidy.
b. that a number of colleges of different types be selected (possibly) five determined by the special interests and needs of applying students, and that these colleges be subsidized to establish a center for recruiting and channeling the students coming from the pre-college programs into the academic community. The experience of this first year will suggest new needs in personnel, experiments, and other facilities to continue receiving these especially prepared students.
c. that colleges willing to experiment with more democratic admissions policies beyond the special programs recommended above ought to be encouraged to do so.
d. That scholarships and forgivable loans should be provided students from economically disadvantaged families, to be used at schools of their choice. These scholarships and loans should be unrestricted and not contingent on anything but desire to attend college.

VI. REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON PROGRAMS FOR COLLEGE TEACHERS

Prepared by John Rensenbrink

Participants

Esther Raushenbush
Herman Long
Paul Olum
John Rensenbrink, Reporter
Sister Marie Augusta Neal
Andrew Gleason
Leonard Fein

Background

The proposals which follow below grew out of a discussion, by the committee, of the Summer Institute Program for College Teachers sponsored by the Educational Services Incorporated and the National Science Foundation. This program so far has run five summer seminars in 1964 and eight in 1965, with membership coming largely from the predominately Negro Colleges in the South. Our discussions were greatly aided by the presence of Dr. Leonard J. Fein of M.I.T. who has been actively engaged in the E.S.I. program.

We feel that the E.S.I. program and others of a similar kind are excellent illustrations of a way to get at the actual problems of teachers, especially those teachers at the freshman and sophomore level. We believe that the summer seminar, in-service approach as illustrated in these programs should be greatly expanded and adapted in order to achieve a maximum impact on teachers, on discipline, on colleges and on curricula.

Statement of Aims

a. We look forward to the participation of the college teachers from every part of the country, from rich colleges and from poor colleges and in-between colleges as well as small colleges and large universities. Though we perceive that the primary focus initially will be on the small and middle sized colleges throughout the country, we expect an increasing participation of teachers from the large universities.

b. We look forward to a growing recognition -- and actions based on this recognition -- of the intimate interdependence of the elementary, secondary and higher levels of American education, so that it will become a matter of course for teachers at any one of these levels to mix freely with those at other levels, to call upon one another for advice and critical encouragement and to involve one another in particular projects devoted to self-improvement.

c. We look forward to the active engagement of college administrators in in-service seminar programs so that they will involve their faculty members in this endeavor and will thereafter encourage them to introduce new ideas, methods and approaches. The extent to which discourse within the faculty is supported and time provided for study and reflection is dependent in large measure, on the climate of the institution. That is: is staying alive intellectually valued within the institution?

d. We look forward to the growth of a large pool of talented professionals in their fields who will give leadership to in-service seminars or will be available for short term and long term visits to participating colleges. We believe that a climate of opinion should grow in which such visits and year long teaching engagements and exchanges of professors become a matter of course, become an accepted academic responsibility. As a further aspect of this, we expect that programs will develop whereby teachers from smaller colleges have an opportunity to teach

and study in large universities (on the assumption that they will return to their home colleges on completion of their stay).

e. We look forward to the growth of a dynamic nation-wide in-service seminar program which provides maximum flexibility in form, length, and content of seminars, and maximum opportunity for follow-up on a year-round basis. We expect from these seminars a situation to develop in which there will be found better and better ways to "feed in" and get "feed-back" from experimentation with new ideas, new programs, and new techniques in education. We believe that as we proceed we may also start chain reactions on ideas and projects for research leading to publication.

f. We look forward to a widespread use of knowledge and experience gained through in-service seminar programs in generating changes in education for graduate and undergraduate

To get started we call for the following actions:

a. Forty to fifty 8-week seminars should be conducted throughout the country in the summer of 1966 for about 40 participants each from a wide geographic area.

In charting these seminars we can build on the experience of the E.S.I. sponsored program and others. For example, a large number of seminars can be run in those subjects in which we already have some experience, such as history, whereas perhaps only one or two should be tried in a subject about which we have little experience. In subsequent years of course the number of these seminars can multiply.

The aim of the 8-week seminar is to regenerate an academic clan, to put teachers in contact with their professional peers, and to be a catalyst for continued intellectual growth.

Seminars should as part of their activity be concerned with finding specific follow-up mechanisms which fit in with the particular style and character of the seminar members and leaders.

b. Regional Seminars. These would start in the summer for a 2-week period and continue throughout the year on a periodic week-end basis at say 4 to 6 week intervals. The members would come from a cluster of colleges in a given area. Deans from those colleges would attend the summer sessions and other sessions throughout the year. Expenses in terms of real cost would be reimbursed perhaps in the form of in-service stipends, and class loads in the colleges should be adjusted to make possible a Friday night - all day Saturday committment. The person or persons leading the summer portion of the seminar must be involved throughout the year. Perhaps graduates of 8-week seminars could also participate in the weekend sessions.

The aims of these seminars would not be dissimilar from those described above for the 8-week summer session. Yet their ongoing and regional character should lead to much sharper concentration on questions of subject matter, more active participation by the members in developing new ideas which arise from their own experience, and a more forceful confrontation of the problem of professional and intellectual isolation.

There are many logistical and administrative problems connected with this type of seminar and it may well be necessary to appoint a full time executive coordinator for each seminar.

We feel that we should aim at 15 of these regional seminars in 1966, five each in three different subject areas.

c. Full year fellowships. We propose that a program of 15-month fellowships be instituted along the following lines:

1. One pilot program should be started in the summer of 1966 for each of the areas, science-mathematics, social science, and humanities. (Science-mathematics may already have passed the pilot program phase.) Depending on the experience with these pilot programs, more should be organized to start in subsequent summers.
2. Each program should be located at a university and accomodate about fifteen Fellows. There should be a senior faculty member who devotes full-time to coordinating the program, conselling the Fellows, and conduction a joint seminar.

3. Fellows would spend the first summer in an intensive seminar designed to give them a broad view of their area and to orient them toward modern developments During the following academic year each Fellow would engage in regular graduate work. He would follow a program tailored to his individual needs. Fellows would be encouraged to enter regular degree programs whenever possible. Some Fellows might teach part time at the host institution. About one-quarter of each Fellow's time would be devoted to the joint seminar continuing the summer work. During the final summer the joint seminar would focus on the significance of the year's work for undergraduate teaching.
4. Each Fellow should be given a stipend sufficient to replace normal salary (including allowance for the summers) travel expenses, and when appropriate, cost of living differential.

d. In addition to the in-service proposals we recommend that a program be developed for providing future faculty, especially for the smaller colleges. Such a program is described by a member of our committee, Mr. Paul Olum, in the report that follows this.

e. In order to effect the proposals we have made, it is necessary to begin serious and detailed planning almost immediately. If all of our proposals are adopted we shall be confronted in 9 months with as many as 2000 participants in various seminars. Our program of activity over the next three months will largely determine the health of our offspring.

To that end we propose:

1. The establishment of an interim planning committee.

2. The early appointment of a program coordinator and staff who will prepare detailed proposals for funding and guide the selection of seminar staff.

3. An early meeting of the interim committee to provide the necessary direction, to draw up formal proposals, and lay groundwork for the formation of planning committee in as many areas as interest and committment are generated.

4. The immediate funding of the preliminary work.

We also suggest the establishment of a permanent high level commission addressed specifically to the educational problems of underdeveloped colleges.

TRAINING FUTURE FACULTY

by Paul Olum

One of our urgent educational problems is that of providing future faculty for the small colleges of the country. Explicitly, this means that we must attract some of our best young people into the field of undergraduate teaching and we must provide a suitable graduate program for them. Inevitably this will involve a great increase in the status of the profession.

There seems to be general agreement that what is needed for this purpose is a radical revision of the doctoral program and that the basic change must be the abandonment of the traditional dissertation with its very special kind of professional research emphasis. In many fields, e.g., the physical sciences and mathematics, the graduate program would still run for three or four years, the basic content program would be unchanged and the same examinations and approximate standards of quality would be expected; indeed one could demand a somewhat broader and richer program of studies in the same period of time since the extraordinarily narrow emphasis of thesis research would be avoided. Very likely we would still want to insist upon research interest and also upon a thesis, but now of some different sort; there are many possibilities for this, ranging from more or less expository presentations of basic research material to new contributions in the direction of course programs, curriculum revision, etc.

It is clear that in creating a new program one would want to consider other possible changes, such as increased emphasis on actual supervised teaching experience; these might vary considerably from field to field. However, in other respects than the dissertation, the new program could very well closely approximate what is presently done for the Ph. D.

A subject of controversy and uncertainty is the question of whether to give the new doctoral degree a new name, e.g., Doctor of Arts, or to continue to call if the Ph. D. This appears to be primarily a matter of tactics, i.e., which one can we get most easily accepted by the academic community. Probably the next step is to initiate discussion of the proposal in some universities -- or, hopefully, groups of universities -- and to leave to this discussion the question of the degree title.

There is a strong conviction among us that the need is so great and the profession of college teaching basically so attractive that the new degree program will rapidly achieve a position of value and prestige. With this, and operating simply with present resources (that is, with no complicated, expensive or visionary changes in university structure or function,) we should be able very soon to be providing many more and enormously better trained people for the profession of undergraduate teaching.

VII. LEARNING BY TEACHING

1. A Tutor Corps

by Henry A. Bullock

This proposal grows out of the brutal fact that there does exist "The Other American College Student." He is the student who, by force of circumstance, has worked out an adjustment to a less vigorous academic norm and now finds himself a noticeable deviant in the society where this norm no longer gives him academic security. He is also the student who seeks an education in the less developed collegiate institutions to which he brings a mixture of academic retardation and significant promise of high capability. For example, he is deficient in such tool subjects as English and Mathematics but he seems to have learned well that which he was taught. His basic problem seems to be that his teaching did not extend far enough. He and his kind of college seem to offer enriched opportunities for potential teachers now studying in the advanced institution, and who want to find a meaningful experience at the frontier of a basic phase of American Social Change.

It is proposed, therefore, that help for this student be extended and an opportunity to "learn by teaching" be created through an innovation which joins the developing institutions and those of the more advanced kind in an academic commitment at the student level. The aim here is that of strengthening the academic program of the former institutional type through two basic mechanisms: a) The development of a go-as-you can program in the lower division of the developing institution, affording an organized means by which the deficient student can "take up his slack," and b) the utilization of national Teaching Fellows, graduates or undergraduates, drawn by a selective process from the more advanced institutions and mixed with the more gifted of the developing institution. These Fellows would teach (at the tutoring level) those students of the developing institution who must move through the lower college division at varying speeds.

The organizational mechanism through which such a program would operate basically involves a tutoring relationship between National Teaching Fellow and selected lower division college students. The Fellows could be cast in the role of "teacher without portfolio"-- one who, though respectful of the host institution's authority structure, indentifies with the student, sheds the academic robe and thereby strengthens the bridge over which the penetration of personality and real communication must pass if the inhibited and deficient student is to be involved in the learning process.

More specifically, his work could be mainly centered around the task of helping deficient students build strength in those subjects matter areas which are indispensable tools for normal advancement through a standard college curriculum. One subject could conceivably be English, particularly in the areas of writing, reading, and verbal communication. Another could be Mathematics, especially as related to various number systems, concepts, and computational methods required for advanced study in science and technology. A more adequate orientation to science, social studies, and the general realm of great ideas could be achieved through the reading, writing, and discussion activities afforded by experiences in these core areas. Administration of the total experiences would operate through small groups of students -- not more than eight to each group -- under the direction of a Teaching Fellow responsible to a Faculty Supervisor of the host institution and (for want of a better term) a critic teacher of the more advanced institution.

The teaching could be done in colloquia, somewhat unstructured, where the freedom to discuss and express one's self exists within a climate unfettered by the threat of rigid academic judgment and the haunting promise of punitive reprisals. One can see that within such a setting

psyche-groups and socio-groups could be made to correspond in such a manner that the student's moves to find security within the college community become important steps toward academic adequacy. When these steps reach academic adequacy as measured in terms of acceptable tools, the student could then be considered ready to undertake upper division college work.

It is probably better that such a program be initiated by a group of developing colleges rather than by these colleges individually. In such a joint undertaking, the colleges could look at the performance of their entering freshmen as related to the norms of a college-bound population; bring academic deficiencies more sharply into focus; and assess the adequacy of this kind of program to meet their needs. Once concurrence is reached, they could solicit and obtain the cooperation of the more advanced institutions; work out a conditional relationship with them; and submit, individually if not collectively, proposals to carry forth the program.

2. An Education Corps

by Douglad Dowd

The aim of this proposal is to provide a means of meeting the needs of two quite different groups of young people: 1) the present college undergradute, and 2) the young person of grade or high-school age whose education is meaningless, whose possibilities of using his mind, or even knowing that the mind can be used in its many ways, are limited at best.

The aim of the following proposal is not to get the latter group of disadvantaged young people to gain a high school certificate, or to stimulate them to get to college, although such pleasant results might occasionally stem from the proposal were it to be adopted. The aim is to provide the college student with something he can do that is meaningful for him and at the same time provides an experience for the disadvantaged children that might send them in a constructive direction. The latter children will be found both in the rural South and the urban North, and in the urban South and rural North.

The direct concern of this proposal, as it affects the northern college student (who need not be northern, but is likely to be,), is with the sophomore or junior who lacks the motivation, or the spirit, or the will to continue his college education in any more than a perfunctory fashion. But the proposal would allow in also students whose motivation is high, etc., who nonetheless find themselves attracted by the kind of activity discussed below.

At present, the education of the disadvantaged young is fitful, and conducted mostly in classrooms that promise little; or, it is conducted even more fitfully by tutors in the Northern Student Movement, or in the Freedom Schools of the South. Some of it goes on through Vista. What is proposed here is something that combines all three. It need not involve Negroes at either end; it could and probably would involve Negroes at both ends.

What is proposed is an Education Corps. The teaching members would be drawn from colleges and universities. They would recognize the activity as a legitimate and respectable activity for the participating students. Credit or not seems to be an unimportant question; it seems beside the point. What is important is that the student who either needs or desires this kind of "work-study" program (which should extend for two semseters, at least and perhaps at most) be looked upon not as someone who has inexplicably turned away from the advantages of the higher learning, but as someone who is part of a large and growing group of young and relatively privileged people in our society who have failed to develop a sense of purpose, who are aimless and dispirited and suspicious. These young people are as much a product of modern society as the computer, and they must be seen as such.

The youngsters they would teach, in the areas where the latter live, living much as they live, would be expected to be taught in a greatly unconventional manner, probably in unconventional surroundings (e.g., churches, homes, fields). The teacher might know nothing but Math well enough to teach it to another; or English, or History, or Economics. "Well enough," in this context, would mean simply that a youngster who had done well enough in high school to get into a decent college would know the materials well enough. The alternative for the children to be taught is not something better, but fairly much nothing at all -- or, in many cases, something worse than nothing at all, for it carries with it demoralization and a neglect of the possibilities either of material or mind.

Such a program would require pre-training, careful screening, and some supervision in the field by graduate students, (and hopefully a faculty member) able and motivated to move with and in the program -- again with the support of his institution, and the recognition that something meaningful and respectable was being done.

The "teachers" should be paid along Vista lines -- i.e., something like $50 per month; if they lived in the homes of those they taught, they would pay for room and board. The model is the civil rights project in the South -- SNCC, CORE, etc.

This is the kind of program that should be begun as soon as possible. But "possible" probably means an experimental year, perhaps with many pilot projects. It is probably something that would have to be initiated at a great university or college, and something that would entail foundation rather than governmental support. It has many wrinkles left in it, as stated above; they could be ironed out if there were hope of the proposal becoming a reality.

3. Experimental Programs Coordinating Center

by Verne Rockcastle

For some years a number of experimental programs in various subject matter areas have been in the process of development, trial and testing. These have included Physical Science Study Committee, Biological Sciences Curriculum Study, Chem Study, School Mathematics Study Group, Elementary Science Study, Elementary School Science Project and many others. Each has shown that given good teachers, lively materials, and a challenging array of opportunities for intellectual and social engagement within that particular discipline, pupils learn better and faster. What has not been shown, however, is what these superior programs and approaches would do in concert.

It is proposed, therefore, that there be set up one or more Experimental Programs Coordinating Center(s) whose features would be several. It would be a school system from which good to superior teachers at all grade levels from K-12 could be drawn. It is necessary that good to superior teachers be used in this center because they would have a four-fold responsibility: 1) to engage in the best possible presentation of parts or all of recently developed curricular programs; 2) to interrelate these disciplines in a useful and meaningful way, i.e., to use many portions of the SMSG (mathematics program) in earth science, biology, chemisty, and physics, and to draw upon as much of the sciences as possible to support the principles being learned in mathematics; (At present there is far too much insulation between disciplines from K-12, to say nothing of college.) 3) to build upon the learnings of preceding grades, each year improving and advancing the material at one grade level to take advantage of what the pupils in preceding grades will have absorbed; and 4) to serve as supervising teachers for teacher-trainees apprenticed to the Coordinating Center.

The Center should be set, insofar as possible, in a sizable school system whose population is relatively stable to minimize the inflow of pupils who have not had the requisite training for smooth absorption into a continuous program.

Only a single school should be involved at first. As the program continues more and more class units from the system would be drawn in at the lowest (K) levels as curricular evolution and revolution were required to keep pace with on-coming grades. Also, a single school system has the advantage of a single administration with its flexibility in staff assignments, school organization, and possibility of unit or across-the-board curricular innovation. The possibility of administrative and financial innovation should be an integral part of the Coordinating Center.

The Coordinating Center should be in a position to draw upon the resources of several not-too-distant colleges and universities. The colleges and universities, in turn could make use of the Coordinating Center as an educational laboratory. An example would be Wilkes-Barre or Scranton in northeastern Pennsylvania. This school area could draw upon the resources of the University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State University, Swarthmore, Cornell, Lehigh, etc. In turn, the Wyoming Valley schools could serve as a series of small laboratories in which to try out ideas generated by the David Pages of the cooperating colleges.

Colleges and universities cooperating with the Coordinating Center should have a disciplinary link with the Center. For each major discipline represented in the program of the Center, the collegiate institutions involved should be expected to supply an outstanding scholar for consultation with Center staff. This scholar also would meet on occasion with teachers of several disciplines to insure continued cross-fertilization and selection of ideas.

From the master teachers of the Center might come a number of ambitious and capable

graduate students to pursue advanced degrees at the cooperating collegiate institutions. They might do this with a view toward teacher training on the college level. At the same time, the teacher training programs of the cooperating colleges would be immeasurably strengthened by the opportunity of teaching apprenticeships offered in the Center.

In the final analysis, the Center would have as its aim to show what is possible when a single administration, its teachers, its pupils and current curricular reforms are combined in a continuous, coordinated effort. There then would remain the problem of investigating ways in which a similar result could be achieved in other school systems, given their peculiar structure, locale, and willingness to innovate.

In this educational concert, the conductor must have an exceptionally experienced, sensitive and creative ear. The musicians need not be virtuosos; they need only to play well on good instruments. But somehow there must be put together an orchestra, and they should be allowed to render at least the first movement of a composition that to date has been heard only as an interrupted series of solos.

4. Reading and Writing

Without a ready store of good books, true teaching is impossible. We therefore offer the following proposals to bring the work of the College Corps to the best success:

1. The creation of library-packages for disadvantaged institutions from book-letters to be made up by a canvassing of the best authorities in the fields of Literature, English and Foreign, Social Studies, the Natural Sciences, and Mathematics, Theoretical and Applied. We members of the present seminar would be honored to help set in motion the drive towards the composition of such letters.

2. Research libraries of microfilm to be located in a college, central to as many disadvantaged institutions as geographically possible, and to be made up by the same procedure as that followed for books in the first proposal.

3. Foot-lockers of paperback books for distribution in undergraduate housing and facilities, to be patterned after the brilliant series of Overseas Editions prepared for the Armed Services in the Second World War. Poets like W.H. Auden, novelists like Saul Bellow, critics like Edmund Wilson and Alfred Kazin, and publishers like Jason Epstein of Random House would, we feel sure, lend their gifts and prestige to the accomplishment of such a fruitful venture.

4. Book-vouchers for students such as those authorized by the GI Bill. Such vouchers could provide the crucial help in fostering the best for independent study which is so telling a factor in making an educated man. As in the case of the GI Bill, these vouchers could be countersigned by the counselling instructor.

Since reading without writing is a mute endeavor, we offer the following proposals to dramatize the importance and pleasure of dealing with words either as a skill or an art:

5. Presidential prizes of 300 to 500 dollars to be awarded annually to the best essay in each discipline written by a student in a disadvantaged college. Any first-rate college or university in this country could produce a committee to judge such essays overnight. Similar prizes could be given in the same way for the best story or poem.

6. Writers and performing artists combining to bring the experience of theater to school and college groups in disadvantaged areas, the writers to be commissioned to write for the students and to help the students write better, the performing artists to be commissioned to participate with the students in the production of the works written, What holds true of proposal 3 holds true of this proposal; our best writers and artists are deeply committed citizens.

VIII. THE EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE - "THE COLLEGE WITHIN"

Prepared by Seymour Simches

Why is it needed?

The principal reasons for establishing a college for educational experimentation and innovation at a university are to provide a mechanism for continuous self-renewal and to make it easier to carry out significant experiments. At present, innovation at most universities is discouraged by many factors. Even in a single department, it is sometimes necessary to gain the consent of the majority before any innovation is undertaken. Frequently the members of the department are so concerned with their own areas of research and teaching that they may be simply uninterested in changes elsewhere. To secure approval it becomes necessary to make serious compromises before beginning any change. This is particularly true if the proposed changes involve the interest of many departments and difficulties become almost insuperable if the innovation involves changes in structure that cut through the whole structure of the university. Furthermore, if the innovation proposed is at all imaginative and daring, the man who has initiated the proposal has no assurance of success. He cannot spell out in detail the exact nature of his project because he will need to adapt what comes later to what has happened in the early stages.

It is apparent that experiments whose results are uncertain need to be done with a small number of students before attempting to extend the procedures to larger classes. Furthermore, trying something very new with a large number restricts the flexibility required at the early stages of development. An Experimental College provides the possibility of trying things out quickly on a small scale.

The effort needed for serious educational experimentation is much greater than is generally recognized. A significant part of a faculty member's teaching load must be devoted to the College to make it possible to provide him with the time required for experimentation.

In addition, experimentation may require various kinds of assistance such as documents, filmed material, development of prototype laboratory equipment, etc. An Experimental College could provide this assistance.

Extending beyond the limits of the university is the need to involve faculty and students in curriculum innovation in the elementary and secondary schools. This has many evident advantages to the university and schools but perhaps most important, the teaching of a subject to children provides great insight into the teaching problems at all levels.

What is its nature?

A College for educational experimentation and innovation is a mechanism or laboratory for the soliciting, trying and assessment of innovations in curricula. in teaching, and in administrative procedure within the framework of the university as a whole.

It is based on the belief that no single pattern exists for a student to learn, and that there is no single set of prerequisites (be they credits, examinations, class hours, or number of years) which are suitable criteria for awarding a degree.

The College is fully integrated into the life of the university. It has no permanent full-time faculty, and no full-time student body. It is headed by a board of faculty members selected from different areas. The board may solicit, initiate, or encourage proposals for innovation from the faculty at large; invite faculty members to its meetings to consider proposals, and help articulate and set in motion proposals which are considered to be fruitful. Innovative

courses and experiments are carried out by members of the regular faculty who want to participate (with the mutual understanding and indeed the cooperation of the particular department or departments involved).

Regular students may enroll for any one or more of the innovative programs subject to the limitations imposed by numbers. Any student may register for one or more of the Experimental Course offerings of the College.

The College provides a proving ground for all levels of experimentation in university undergraduate education. The exact nature and content of the course offerings would be determined by the participating faculty members. Students in the Experimental College would select their individual programs in regular consultations with a professor who has accepted this responsibility.

The College permits the introduction of new courses that treat standard subjects in daring new ways. Such courses must be tried with a small number of students to find out the best ways to proceed and develop prototype material (laboratory equipment, original sources, films, guidebooks) for student use.

The College makes it possible to offer new courses that have never existed before. There would be an opportunity for cutting across departmental boundaries to decrease the fragmentation of learning that results from excessive preoccupation with established subject areas.

While the College involves only a small number of students, results obtained in the experimental courses could lead to important and large-scale changes in the University as a whole.

What is needed to initiate and operate an Experimental College?

A nucleus of faculty members who are intensely concerned with college education and who are respected by their colleagues in their disciplines.

Student participation in the deliberation and in the searching for innovative experiments.

The support (and not just financial) from some administrative office - the President's, Vice President's, or Dean's - A commitment to educational experimentation as a university policy and responsibility.

Creation of a format among students, faculty, and administration that will jog complacency, encourage the expression of dissatisfactions, and stimulate the emergence of worthwhile ideas. For - after all -- the product of the "College Within" must be good ideas and the willingness and eagerness of faculty. students, and administration to try them out.

What is the relation of the Experimental College to the University?

The Experimental College is intended as an addition to university facilities and resources devoted t course and program innovation. It would not, of course, shut off or otherwise preclude any existing departmental or divisional practices. Rather, it would permit experimental developments to be designed and financed without reducing resources and funds already committed. Existing staff members could be released from some or all of their departmental obligations, while others could be brought in from outside under the joint auspices of the department and the center. The question of joint auspices is very vital.

The Experimental College would be an institution separate from the standing university curriculum and divisional committees although relations would obviously need to be close and continuing. Ultimately the absorption of successful experiments into the regular offerings would be subject to the approval of the appropriate authorities and committees.

Range of experiments possible in the Experimental College.

Initiation and Organization of Interdisciplinary Seminars.

These would be interdisciplinary in every sense of the word, not simply courses which bring together the sociologist, anthropologist and economist, but those which promote a dialogue between the scientist and the humanist, the teacher of literature and the sociologist. As an example, one college has initiated a project for the study of economic and sociological problems of blighted areas in southern Italy with relation to the novels of Carlo Levi and Ignazio Silone. Another example is the proposal made for an interdisciplinary course in Humanism and Science.

Other kinds of experiments possible are:

Experiments with new degree programs which evaluate student growth in terms other than credit hours, exams and number of courses taken.

Experiments with ways of teaching large numbers of students.

Experiments with college admissions - admission of numbers of students who do not fit prescribed criteria of any kind.

Experiments which relate the students' residential and social activities with their learning experience in the classroom.

An experiment in the whole new concept of what might be called the "invisible college," i.e., a group of students who are obtaining their degree in ways completely different from their fellow students.

Money

We recognize the advantage of large regional centers for experimentation. We also feel strongly that one should use the talent for innovative ideas in many small good universities, and governmental agencies should be encouraged to make available to these institutions smaller sums of money for establishing Experimental Colleges.

It is important to consider as an Experimental College not only one which produces new ideas but one which seeks them out from other sources and creates a favorable climate for putting them into practice in the home institution.

IX. MONEY

by Andrew Gleason

There is a clear trend toward the expenditure of more money for education. This increase is clearly necessary. However, it is essential to recognize that, as the importance of education to the continued functioning of our society increases, we must devote a greater proportion of our national resources to education. It will not do merely to increase educational budgets in step with the gross national product as population and individual productivity increase. Education must be alloted a progressively larger share of the gross national product if we are to maintain social equilibrium and intellectual vitality in the face of automation of production and the attendant emphasis on mental skills. While ultimately this means that more of our best minds must be drawn into teaching careers, it is easier to express in terms of dollars, Furthermore, it is through the allocation of dollars that changes can actually be effected.

At present we spend about 36 billion dollars or 6% of the gross national product on education. In the next ten or twenty years this proportion must increase, perhaps to 10%, which would mean increasing the total educational budget to over 100 billions of dollars in the 1980's. Since most of this money is budgeted at state and local levels, national action can only steer the general change.

We are recommending many projects to improve the quality of education. The sum required to carry out these projects will start on the order of ten million dollars per year and increase. By comparison with the total expenditure for education, this is a trivial cost. But we must remember that no program of improvement can be sustained unless we change the public image of the teacher, from the kindergarten teacher to the university professor, so that the appropriate proportion of our best minds will elect careers in teaching. Bluntly, this means a general increase in salaries.

It would, of course, be absurd to propose a simple, across-the-board raise of salaries, but we must aim for a slow general increase for a number of years. Only as the public becomes aware that greater talent is moving to the schools will it be politically possible to raise salaries and only as salaries are raised will it be possible to steer talented young people toward teaching careers. To break this circular interdependence considerable expenditure of federal money is necessary. The projects recommended here can be regarded as part of this process.

A num' of factors have combined in recent years to increase the salaries of teachers, but in many c. the increases have affected only the lower salary brackets and have left an inadequate differential between beginning and final salaries. Everything we recommend will be vitiated unless salary structures and teaching loads are adjusted to convince teachers that a higher level of performance is seriously expected. No one can maintain a fresh, professional attitude toward his teaching unless his teaching load is reasonable and his salary is high enough that he need not seek additional employment.

We can also consider the expenditures recommended here as general research and development in education. No competitive industry today spends less than 5% of its budget on research and development aimed at improving its product or the efficiency of its production, even 10% is a low figure. It is not unreasonable to suggest therefore that ultimately 5 to 10% of the total educational budget be devoted to the design of curricular materials and improving the general level of teaching.

X. FAREWELL - AND TO ARMS

by Douglas Dowd

We pick up loose ends, pack duffle bags, and prepare to do battle at our respective home fronts and, hopefully, elsewhere. As we do so, I have been stimulated by Sister Marie Augusta to see that the battle we prepare to fight is but a part of a war we are losing.

We hope to achieve curricular reforms, and within (and using) new institutional constructs to facilitate, initiate, spread such reforms. Godspeed to them, us, all. But have we confronted the nature of the spreading war, the big war? It is that the university and the role it plays must be re-examined and changed. We need not only curricular reforms, or colleges within, or new colleges. We need a new relationship between the university, its local community, its regional and national communities, and the world. We do not need, but we do have, a multiversity sprawling over us and our society -- an institution that has willy-nilly come to serve its society and its component parts -- business, military, political, etc. Meanwhile, the students hit the streets, chew their cuds, muse, yawn, and dutifully study -- or dropout. When they serve, it is like sheep, or in rebellion.

Another way must be found, and the university must have a central role in it. We must have a university that leads students, some of them at least, to see that the meaning that they seek in their lives will be found (in part) when they relate themselves to the society in which they live. We must have a university environment that will produce students who will approach their lives as we members of this conference approach our present tasks -- not as a duty but as something we can do, and which, in the doing, nourishes us. I am not saying that the university should teach the student to serve, but something like the opposite. The university is, whether it wishes to be or not, the prime source of subversion in our society, for it has been the prize source of scientific advance and technological innovation.

The university has been a revolutionary in those areas, but some combination of sleeper, conservative or reactionary, in its relation to society as concerns the social sciences and humanities. The university should produce students who can look with an honest and clean eye, unblinkingly, at their lives and their society. If they do so, if the university promotes genuinely free inquiry, there may be more or less rapidity of change in society; at least there might be more shock, fewer ugly surprises, the stains might spread less quickly and widely, there might even be moments of pleasantry for large numbers.

To start again: the student should link himself voluntarily to his world, in a positive way, not as a duty, but as the sane, interesting, decent way. At the moment, his university does not inspire him to do so. At the moment, and more so with time, the university serves the community -- for money, for security, for convenience, for other ends less easy to dignify with words. The university does not serve the student so much as it services him, while it prepares to speed him on his way to do his duty. The students don't much want to do their duty. They will be less inclined to do so, with time. We must give them a chance, and give many others, we do not yet think of, a chance to find themselves, and we must teach others that only thus can we teach students.

Our task is to impart understanding and appreciation. When that task is successfully fulfilled in the university the student will wish to serve, the university will become a source of balanced subversion.

XI. PARTICIPANTS

Most participants came for the full period, but some came for shorter periods. Included are Government and foundation personnel who attended one or more days.

William Alfred
Department of English
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

Albert Baez
Director of Science Teaching
UNESCO
Paris 7, France

Alex Bavelas
Department of Psychology
Stanford University
Stanford, California

H.A. Bullock
Chariman, Division of Social Sciences
Graduate School Research
Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas 77004

William B. Cannon
Chief, Education, Manpower and Science Div.
Bureau of the Budget
Washington, D.C. 20503

Benjamin H. DeMott
Department of English
Amherst College
Amherst, Mass.

James P. Dixon, President
Antioch College
Yellow Springs, Ohio

Douglas F. Dowd
Department of Economics
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14850

John Ehle
Public Affairs Program
The Ford Foundation
477 Madison Avenue
New York, N.Y.

Stanley M. Elkins
Department of History
Smith College
Northampton, Mass.

Emerson J. Elliott
Education and Science Branch
Labor and Welfare Division
Bureau of the Budget
Washington, D.C. 20503

Joseph Farrell
Executive Assistant
Carnegie Corporation of New York
589 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10017

Leonard Fein
Department of Political Science
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Carolyn Fitchett
Educational Services Incorporated
Watertown, Mass.

Jack Gelber
250 Riverside Drive
New York, New York. 10025

Hendrik Gideonse
Bureau of Research
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Andrew M. Gleason
Department of Mathematics
Harvard University Cambridge, Mass. 02138

Sister M. Jacquelyn Grennan, S.L.
President
Webster College
St. Louis, Mo. 63119

Albert J. Guerard
Department of English
Stanford University
Stanford, California

John Hawkes
Department of English
Brown University
Providence, R.I.

XI. PARTICIPANTS

Wyman Holmes
Lincoln Filene Center
Tufts University
Medford, Mass.

Robert Hulsizer
Commission on College Physics
Department of Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Mass. 02139

Christopher Jencks
Institute for Policy Studies
1900 Florida Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

Sarah Karwoski
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Morris Keeton
Dean of Faculty
Antioch College
Yellow Springs, Ohio

John King
Department of Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Mass. 02139

Eric Lampard
Graduate Program in Economic History
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Eugene Lichtenstein
Economist of London
National Press Building
Washington, D.C.

Herman H. Long
President
Talladega College
Talladega, Alabama

Ernest A. Lynton
Dean, Livingston College
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Eric L. McKitrick
Department of History
604 Fayerweather Hall
Columbia University
New York, N.Y. 10027

Barbara McNeill
Special Assistant to the Director of the Bureau of Research
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Jacquelyn A. Mattfeld (Mrs.)
Dean, Sarah Lawrence College
Bronxville, New York

John M. Mays
Program Director
Science Curriculum Improvement (undergraduate)
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C. 20550

Charles Muscatine
Department of English
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California

Sister Marie Augusta Neal, S.N.D.
Department of Sociology
Emmanuel College
400 The Fenway
Boston, Mass. 20115

Benjamin Nichols
College of Engineering
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Paul Olum
Department of Mathematics
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Walter J. Ong, S.J.
Department of English
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Mo. 63103

Richard E. Paulson, Program Director
Special Projects (Undergraduate)
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C. 20550

Esther Raushenbush (Mrs.)
President, Sarah Lawrence College
Bronxville, New York

Isaias Raw
Faculty of Medicine
University of Sao Paulo
C. P. 2921
Sao Paulo, Brazil

John C. Rensenbrink
Department of Government and Legal Studies
Bowdoin College
Brunswick, Maine

Sister Mary Rhodes, S. L.
Vice President and Dean of College
Webster College
St. Louis, Mo. 63119

David Robinson
Office of Science and Technology
Executive Office of the President
Washington, D.C. 20506

Verne N. Rockcastle
School of Education
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Seymour Simches
Department of Romance Languages
Tufts University
Medford, Mass.

Benson R. Snyder, Psychiatrist-in-Chief
Medical Department
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Mass. 02139

George G. Stern
Psychological Research Center,
123 College Place
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Byron Stookey, Jr.
Director of Academic Planning
University of California, Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, California

William R. Taylor
Department of History
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Jack R. Tessman
Department of Physics
Tufts University
Medford, Mass.

Joseph Turner
Office of Science and Technology
Executive Office of the President
Washington, D.C. 20506

Homer C. Wadsworth, President
Kansas City Association of Trusts and
Foundations
1002 Insurance Exchange Building
Kansas City, Mo. 64105

Paul L. Ward
Executive Secretary
American Historical Association
400 A. Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C.

Nils Wessell
President
Tufts University
Medford, Mass.

Kent Wilson
Department of Chemistry
Tufts University
Medford, Mass.

Byron L. Youtz
Department of Physics
Reed College
Portland, Oregon 97202

Jerrold R. Zacharias
Department of Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Mass. 02139