DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 013 HE 007 036

TITLE Contemporary Perspectives on Higher Education: Proceedings of University Day (Ball State University, February 7, 1975).
INSTITUTION Ball State Univ., Muncie, Ind.
PUB DATE 7 Feb 75
NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *College Planning; Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; *Higher Education; Post Secondary Education; *State Universities; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Ball State University

ABSTRACT

This collection of papers commemorates the 10-year anniversary of Ball State University's designation as a state university of Indiana. The papers discuss: higher education in national perspective, the dimensions and relationship of a statewide system of postsecondary education, and the individual characteristics and aspirations of an institution undergoing stable change. (Author/KE)

Contemporary Perspectives on Higher Education: Proceedings of University Day

February 7, 1975

Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana 47306

Preface

Benchmarks provide convenient points in space for locating oneself in reference to the surrounding terrain. The year 1975 provides an important benchmark in time for individuals as well as institutions to assess the past and to take new bearings for direction in the future. Thus, University Day this year held special significance for an institution conscious of its identity in respect to both its past and its emergent role in higher education.

Ball State University commemorated on February 7, 1975, ten years as an officially designated university by the State of Indiana. The occasion provided an excellent point from which the next twenty-five years might be viewed for its potential impact on the affairs of the university. This collection of papers captures both the sense of accomplishment and that of expectancy inherent in the celebration of University Day. We hope they will suggest also the scope of contemporary tasks and the necessity for planning for an uncertain future.

The first address by Dr. Samuel Gould casts higher education in national perspective. In many respects the tasks of this University are not unlike those which comprise the total system in that they reflect a changing economy and a society laden with a crisis of confidence in traditional institutions. At a different level this University pursues its purposes in concert with a state-wide system of post-secondary education. The dimensions of this relationship are remarkably drawn in the second address by Mr. Smith whose experience and leadership of the Indiana Commission of Higher Education provide him a special vantage point for analysis and observation. Finally, the individual

3

characteristics and aspirations of an institution undergoing stable change are described on the scene by President Pruis. The three perspectives, although unique to their respective authors, provide a current picture of higher education which should have useful applications elsewhere in the country.

For those interested in the concept of the "emerging university" these papers might be read as a sequel to the questions asked when this institution celebrated its fiftieth anniversary seven years ago. Then we asked if such institutions could fashion a destiny of their own. It should be clear, in retrospect, that higher education in all its representative forms reflects far more than is readily discerned the changing circumstances of the wider society. The emergent university has consolidated few of its claims to uniqueness; instead its problems and promises are still common to the other institutions that comprise a national system of post-secondary education.

At the close of this volume is a list of thirty forums whose focus was on the special tasks of the university in the future. As a significant aspect of University Day, they were designed to encourage an exchange of ideas between the various constituents of this University. Along with the principal speakers, the forum leaders and resource persons are responsible for whatever measure of success this celebration may have achieved. Our special gratitude is extended these and others who shared in the several events of University Day.

April 1975

Victor B. Lawhead
Dean of Undergraduate Programs

Contents

5

Today's Education with Yesterday's Goals

Samuel B. Gould

I

Back in the nineteenth century His Royal Highness Prince George, the Duke of Cambridge, said, "Gentlemen, there have been great changes in my time—great changes. But I can say this. Every change has been made at the right time, and the right time is when you cannot help it."

It is a great pleasure to be here again after an absence of a number of years and to see that you are not waiting for change to be thrust upon you. I recall visiting this campus during President Emens' administration when Ball State was moving into a full university status. So much then was a series of plans and hopes and dreams. Now all these are rapidly becoming realities. I congratulate President Pruis and all of you here today not only on what you have already achieved but even more on the clear indications you give that you recognize so much still to be done. The nature of this day with its full set of activities gives ample credibility to your desire to be a dynamic and vibrant institution.

II

While every period of history has been the target of criticism in its own time, the past decade appears to have been unusually so. Understandably, ours is a most vocal and articulate period. When we look upon our inability to adjust to swift change and to the erosion of fundamental values by an essentially technocratic society, and when we add to this an equal inability to cope with today's instantaneous communication by reacting with good judgment and proper perspective, we know why the outcries become louder and less reasoned.

More and more voices are being raised against the bureaucratic weight of government, the frightening impersonality of science and technology, the waywardness of the young and the hypocrisies of adults,

the manipulative trickeries of the mass media and the credibility gap in national leadership, the callousness toward human suffering and disregard of equal opportunity, or the glaringly evident shortcomings of education. It is a period of protest, of confrontation, of mutual suspicion, of deep-rooted unhappiness. The cacophony rises and falls from month to month, but it never is totally stilled. And it orchestrates the general malaise in which we appear to be caught up and held. It seems sometimes to reach the proportions of a self-destructive, suicidal disease.

The charges against higher education in particular come from both sides of the aisle, right or left, and are easily identified. Claims are made that education is irrelevant, impervious to the pressures of change, insensitive to current needs, or, conversely, that it has changed so much that its institutions are now becoming no more than substitutes for social agencies; that it is weak and even cowardly when it is confronted by unorthodox sorts of opposition, or that it is obtusely arrogant and authoritarian; that it is too general in its purposes or that it is too specialized; that it is too intellectual and aloof, or that it is not intellectual at all and has sold its academic heritage for a mess of materialistic pottage; that it fosters and protects alien ideologies and philosophies, or that it is too much wedded to a capitalistic establishment; that it is improperly organized and atrociously governed; that it does not instill moral values in the young, or that if it does, it chooses values that are no longer important to this generation; that it offers little attention and few rewards to good teaching; that its research is largely misdirected either because it is too dangerous or because it has no relation to reality; that it is financially incompetent and is profligate in handling its resources.

When we examine individual instances, we find some truth in all these charges. But this is not the *whole* truth. Over against these negative indictments should be set the accomplishments of higher education, accomplishments more and more frequently forgotten. If there are minuses, there are also many pluses. The solid achievements of education are evident to each person if he is willing to look for them without prejudice.

It should be remembered, for example, that we lead all the nations of the world in educating the highest percentage of college-age youth and in the development of graduate study, professional schools, and research. A nation that has tripled the number of college students in a single decade cannot be said to be lacking entirely in its zeal to offer education. And imperfect as the education may be, it moves steadily toward the democratic goals of enlightenment and competence for all.

Colleges and universities have made fantastic contributions to the growth of the nation's economy and to its service functions, governmental

and private. This has come about through advancement of knowledge and provision of manpower in every area of human concern.

And let us remind those who shrill endlessly about repression that the colleges and universities are foremost among the few remaining bulwarks of intellectual independence. "Among all social institutions today the university allows more dissent, takes freedom of mind and spirit more seriously, and, under considerable sufferance, labors to create an environment closer to the ideal for free expression and for free interchange of ideas and emotions than any institution in the land. By its very nature the university gives birth to criticism, scrutiny, and dissent."[1] If credit is to be placed somewhere for the increased degree of audible protest in our land today, then education can claim at least a part of it. For years it was criticized when it presumably did not teach youth to think for themselves. Now that it does, the results are obviously not popular but they are part of the democratic process we all insist we prize so highly.

These are only a few of the positive achievements that can be cited. But they are rapidly fading from public consciousness as they become overshadowed by an unrelenting series of attacks. There is a danger that the outcries of criticism, some of them well-intentioned and justified and some designed to identify a scapegoat for the errors of society itself, will render completely ineffective and eventually destroy the present system of higher education before another and better one is devised to replace it. In a time of financial stringency like the present, it is easy to deny support to higher education because of its alleged or real deficiencies. The taxpayer's money can be saved and education, of whatever sort, can be reserved for a chosen few who can afford it. So goes one of the arguments.

But there is self-delusion on the part of the more rabid critics in their belief that the answer lies in wiping the slate clean and starting over again with a new and more revolutionary approach, whether it be elitist or more fully democratic. No real solution emerges from this view. History attests to the unreality and lack of pragmatism either in turning back the clock by ignoring the expectations of the many or in believing that a totally new system can suddenly spring forth full grown and capable of meeting all of society's needs. Educational change cannot be other than evolutionary even though the process of evolution can and should develop with far more speed than heretofore. New, more non-traditional approaches are sorely needed, but they will not suddenly supplant all that is traditional. They will augment, they will fortify and enhance the traditional philosophies and methods, they

---

[1] Gould, Samuel B., *Today's Academic Condition* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970), p. 7

will often add new perspectives and horizons to educational opportunity and possibility, they will open doors to new and unserved parts of our population, and sometimes they will show clearly that the traditional forms also have a role to play. We must not expect quick panaceas to cure all our educational ailments.

III

I have used the title, "Today's Education with Yesterday's Goals," and this seems to suggest that there is general agreement as to what yesterday's goals were. I am not quite certain that this is so, except in our more specialized institutions. The problem, however, is not merely one of agreement. It is rather that yesterday's goals, so far as they can be identified, present serious dilemmas in the context of the wishes of modern society. Some of the goals are still valid, but they run counter to the motivations, the objectives, and the actions of the greater world that surrounds the college or university. We have not only to answer the question of "Education for *whom?*," which is so great a preoccupation of the American people today, but also "Education for *what?*," which offers a separate set of inconsistencies or dilemmas.

Not too many decades ago, the goals of higher education were predominantly elitist. Even though great public universities existed or were being developed, collegiate education was still for the relatively few and it prided itself on its humanistic studies. Even the secondary schools were influenced by this in that there was a sharp division between college preparatory and other students. The former were the hot house flowers, to be nurtured carefully and never to be sullied by the more practical courses. I remember my own unsuccessful efforts as a high school student to be granted permission to take courses in typewriting and shorthand even without credit. Nor was my school too untypical in reflecting the attitude of the time.

Today the goal of elitism has presumably changed to one of equal opportunity for all, or more accurately, an equal *right* to education for all. As a result, the number of college students has tripled in the past decade. But the demand for more education remains far greater than the ability to meet it. And serious questions are raised as to whether the kinds of education offered are indeed of most benefit to the new types of students.

Furthermore, there is still considerable reluctance in higher education to adopt new forms, new organizational patterns, new devices by which more students could be accommodated within reasonable expenditures. All

the new forms and patterns and devices are suspect because they represent such breaks with tradition and because they carry with them the fear of even greater depersonalization of our lives than we suffer from already. Whether these suspicions and fears are justified is beside the point; the fact is that they exist and will remain with us for years to come.

Meanwhile, as a democratic nation we are hoist on the petard of our own declarations of principle. We say, for example, that everyone is entitled to as much formal education as can be of benefit, that one should be educated to the full extent of his or her capacity. But then we discover that we cannot as yet deliver on the promise such a principle reflects. We say, also, that we believe learning is a lifetime process and that one's education continues and should be encouraged regardless of age and circumstances. But we still have many segments of an adult population for whom nothing or relatively little has been done.

A new wave of interest is now sweeping the country in what is called the "external degree," an opportunity to earn an associate or baccalaureate degree by non-traditional means. An old idea that has suddenly found its time, it offers promise to all sorts of populations: women who wish to take up studies again once freed of so many household duties, returning war veterans, retired men and women, inmates of penal institutions, employed people who wish to improve their situations, college-age students who prefer to carry on their education according to a more flexible pattern.

The idea offers promise, but it also presents dangers, not the least of which is that of a dilution in educational quality. The external degree needs the most careful supervision as it develops lest charlatans take advantage of its appeal and mislead the public with programs that are anything but educational. It also needs most careful examination in terms of the new agencies or new machinery it will require to broaden the opportunities for access, fashion the means for study, and develop appropriate kinds of recognition for achievement.

We seem to be on the threshold of a breakthrough in answering the question, "Education for *whom*?" and the goal of a more democratized approach is more and more visible as a realistic expectation. Paradoxically, however, this is occurring at a time when there is great distrust of education and educators generally and when financial austerity is becoming the order of the day. It is occurring also when the educational necessities of minority groups are dramatically clear and cannot be ignored. And it is occurring when our people are confused, dismayed, and frightened by the swift deterioration of humane values in our land and the stark revelation that, like other countries we have always suspected, we too are not always what we seem to be. All these combine to add to the complexity of the issue at the

same time they point to the enormous importance we must attach to resolving it.

When we turn to the second question, *"Education for what?,"* we are again baffled. Yesterday's goals, at least its broadest and most important ones, are still valid in concept but pose dilemmas for any college or university facing the realities of our modern world. Higher education's traditional purposes cause it to be alienated from its own people, not because they are inappropriate for today or because they are unattainable, but rather because they are now looked upon as either radical or naive, depending on the looker's point of view.

Suppose we examine just three of these goals to illustrate my point. The first is that of emphasizing the liberal arts and humanities and thus providing a broad, general education that prepares students to be effective members of society as a basis for any more specialized career opportunities, the second is that of inculcating values in the human mind and personality so that the student is moral and humane, the third is that of teaching the principles of peace as cornerstones of democracy and as the only means toward the survival of mankind. Each of these goals appears desirable, yet each runs counter to the real wishes and actions of the society called upon to support them.

A materialistic and technologically oriented land does not offer very fertile soil in which to plant the seeds for the growth of meaningful lives. We see the results of technology all around us and are so accustomed to them that we are blind to their implications. We are blind to their effects upon education, where now the greater part of time is devoted to assuring to students the means for making a living, acquiring social status, and obtaining more of the comforts of life. In and of itself, this motivation would not be so bad if it did not so completely dominate the educational scene through high school and the undergraduate years. By so doing, it overshadows those aspects of education that are more selfless in purpose and probe more deeply into the proper shaping of human character. Concentration upon self and personal well-being shunts to one side the broader and far-reaching aspects of life. It places limitations upon thought and action that tend to weaken the deeper motivations we hope for in each individual. But these are the very limitations expected and accepted by society. For colleges and universities to instruct otherwise is to risk adult approbrium, especially that of the taxpayer.

Closely linked with the goal of a liberal education is that of strengthening human values. Here again the college or university finds itself in a dilemma. It continues in every way it can to press for acceptance of and belief in the moral attributes that have seemed desirable for centuries. Yet,

even as it urges youth to accept and believe and practice what appears to be good, it sees the larger society, whether individuals or groups or even nations, ignoring these values and setting examples that range from the ludicrous to the terrifying. And our youth watch these examples with intensity and are ultimately disenchanted or revolted to the point where they outdo their elders in cynicism of attitude and action.

Caught on the horns of such a dilemma, higher education retreats to a position of insisting that the exploration of values is not its business at all, thus trying to remove itself from any value judgments. it escapes, if it can, to a preoccupation with pure intellect while youth escapes to a total preoccupation with emotion. This has done no more than widen the already great gulf between the generations. When adults rarely practice what they preach, the young drift toward nihilism. And as this happens, education becomes a marvelously convenient place to put the blame.

The third goal, that of peace for our world, creates the largest dilemma of all. As Americans we have prided ourselves on being the most peace loving nation on earth, and education has done its fair share of instilling that pride within us. Our pride has encompassed all the wars in our history, which always purported to be a step nearer to our ideals for peace. The Vietnam war was challenged more than any others, but it still had its firm adherents. And many people changed their minds about it not only for ideological reasons but because the country was being milked dry economically and the costs were intolerable. Defense industries are major keys to the health of our economy and defense funds have priority over domestic reform. The wars against poverty and disease and urban or rural blight and drugs and manmade pollution are much on our minds, but not so much as the military war. Our concentration on military survival has made us forget that there are many other ways by which a nation can die. But is higher education to teach these truth without being called treasonable? Is peace really yesterday's goal or is it tomorrow's? One finds the fact hard to believe that it is today's, even with all the expressions of good intention.

Higher education cannot and should not be the sole preceptor in behalf of adult society. It can only continue to search for truth and report its findings. It can only cling to what is good and beautiful and promising and try to persuade others to that goodness and beauty and promise. But society itself must also participate in the educational process by example and by conviction. It must be equally committed to its ideals or we are merely shouting into a wind that blows all our hopes back to us unheard.

I am saying, then, that it would be unwise to abandon yesterday's goals in spite of their difficulty. Indeed, they must be striven for more assiduously than ever.

But there are new approaches to education in the seventies, possibly confusing in their variety yet with clear signs of great promise. The easiest way to understand them is to think of the concepts on which they are based. Then the multiplicity of programs and models and plans and techniques becomes merely illustrative of what is happening. We are only beginning to discover how far-reaching this multiplicity is. But the broad conceptual foundations are easily identifiable. Let me try to list them for you.

The first of these concepts is familiar since we are at least theoretically committed to it by tradition and sometimes by experience. It is that of full educational opportunity. It means delivering on the promise of a democratic society that is convinced its destiny hinges on a fully informed and educated people. It applies to students of high school age and college age, whoever they are. It applies also to students of other ages who come to us out of many differing circumstances and with differing needs, students from populations previously inadequately served but all united in a desire to better themselves. If these needs are to be met, significant changes must take place in our present formal system of education. And if such changes are to occur, they must do so at every level of education. Otherwise, as students move from childhood to adolescence and adulthood, they will be ill prepared to undertake the independent actions the new approaches demand of them. We often confuse rigor with rigidity; we cannot soften the rigor and be true to our profession, but we cannot be stiflingly rigid and expect education then to be a lifelong process designed to meet individual needs.

A concept of full educational opportunity is in essence a declaration of the validity of individual human dignity. It offers everyone the chance to make of oneself all that he or she can be, to function in society at the highest level one can attain through crossing as many thresholds to learning as one finds within his or her ability. It is the culmination of the struggle that has gone on for centuries in which individual man and woman have gradually emerged out of the shadows of caste status, various forms of despotism and deadening controls into a new realization of equality.

The second concept is a logical extension of the first. If it is the individual who matters, then education should be so shaped as to afford every individual an opportunity to grow according to individual need. This seems a simple statement but it is fraught with implications for our present educational structures and patterns. Individualized opportunity means measuring the abilities and motivations of each student and then creating a series of educational steps particularly suited to the person rather than to an age group. This is never easy to do, whether in developing the measuring

process on the program to follow, but once done, it can save time and money, lessen frustration, and sharpen individual goals. Especially at the college age and beyond does its necessity become more apparent. And individualized opportunity carries with it the assumption that the same general program or course pattern or even the same time limitations are not similarly suitable for everyone.

Lest anyone assume that individualized opportunity is simply a way of making things easier for the student, let me say that this concept has within it the balancing aspect of individualized responsibility. Mapping a pattern of study and experience to match the person's needs makes it necessary that he fulfill his part of the bargain according to an agreed upon plan and time schedule. It is a part of adulthood. And we should not forget that adulthood in our time should begin long before we presently allow it to. There is good reason to believe that our young people can undertake far more than we expect of them. As for the new populations of adults now pressing for more education, any program without individualized opportunity will be questioned by them and probably found unsuitable to their needs.

The third concept derives logically from the second. An approach to education based on individualized opportunity calls for the maximum amount of flexibility in the creation of its structures and programs. It calls for many options among which the student may choose. It calls for many different combinations of such options. It can, for example, combine the use of traditional and non-traditional materials, residence and non-residence on a campus, new and old methods of instruction, alternate or concurrent times of work and study, work experience and academic study, full courses or modules representing parts of courses, independent study, correspondence courses, television, cassettes, campus lectures, and so on. The diversities of possibility and the similar diversities of combination are enormous. They may even include work done through one or more of the alternative systems of education that are becoming more and more significant in our country, the courses and experiences offered by business, industry, labor unions, the military, social agencies and the like.

The concept of flexibility inevitably brings about new models such as the external degree, the open university, the university without walls, or the metropolitan college, each of which represents some sort of structural departure from the conventional. Within such structures, the student's program is fashioned according to individual goals, abilities, previous education and experience, and the time it will take to complete what he or she wants to do. We are describing, therefore, a flexibility of access for the student of any age in higher education that could be revolutionary in its

effects upon existing institutions and in creating new ones. We are describing also a kind of student/mentor relationship that puts great emphasis on guidance and counseling.

In considering the options that can be developed within the concept of flexibility, we should not forget that one of these options is to stay within the traditional framework of structure and program with which we are so familiar. Many students, young and old, will choose this approach because they know it better, are temperamentally suited to it, and are more comfortable within it. This is to be expected, especially during the present decade when non-traditional approaches will go through their most difficult time for development, evaluation, and acceptance.

The fourth concept overturns one of the most accepted and revered traditions of academic life, one that bases the measurement of success in college on the number of courses taken, credit hours earned, and information assimilated. Today the feeling grows stronger in many quarters that what should really be measured is the competence of the individual regardless of whether there has been a prescribed course of study, and in some cases such as career education, the quality of performance.

There are cogent arguments supporting the validity of this concept. To begin with, much of the information hitherto considered the monopoly of schools and colleges is now acquired by students from many sources—the news and broadcasting media, books, films, travel, etc.—a pluralism of information that revises sharply the functions of the educational system. Then, too, the swift pace of change places new emphasis upon mastery of principles that apply regardless of such change, that make the student able to cope with societal transformations rather than be preoccupied with elements of knowledge that tend to become quickly obsolete. And finally, the competence of the individual, a competence reflected in an ability to demonstrate what one knows and can do with what one knows, regardless of how that competence was acquired is, after all, one of the major reasons for being educated in the first place.

The implications for curriculum revision and for testing are obvious, if one follows this concept. They are implications with which the educational establishment has not yet come to terms. Indeed, there is much resistance to the whole idea. And not enough research has been done, either on the curriculum or testing side, to give us the confidence we need to proceed with making competence and performance a truly important factor in offering educational recognition and reward. But the concept will continue to haunt us until we prove its value or show its ineffectiveness as an educational measurement. There is no way to ignore it or, at this point in our educational studies, to rule it out.

The fifth concept relates to something more fundamental than structures or programs or methods or opportunities, if we are truly concerned about education rather than what surrounds it. What the student learns is the end result of everything else with which we surround the process of education. And so this concept, as the foundation for a new approach, becomes one of breaking away from traditional, departmentalized, discipline-centered, formalized content. It reflects rather a belief that a good deal of higher education must call for new interrelations of knowledge, interrelations that can be applied to major problems of our society. Education may not solve these problems, but it should at least make them understandable, should make clear that no one area of knowledge or no one single set of techniques will solve them, and should then lead us to an awareness of how a great many facts of learning and experience can be combined in our efforts to grapple with such problems.

Problem-solving as an aspect of curriculum does not lessen the need for information and particular skills (such as language or mathematics or science), but it places them in a different and more relevant perspective. They become tools for a larger, more creative process; the need for them therefore takes on new meaning. Furthermore, problem-solving can be an important means whereby the schools and colleges draw closer to the community and can give young people particularly a sense of participation that may affect their public service attitudes for years thereafter. And it can also draw upon a new sort of adjunct faculty member, a specialist in some public service or business or technological or professional skill, who adds to the richness and the timeliness of the academic program.

The final concept underlying the new approaches in the seventies is not new at all; it has been expounded and practiced for many years. It is the belief in lifetime learning, the conviction that a person's education never comes to an end. The adult and continuing education movements in this country are familiar to you all. I need not describe them except to say that they have a commendable record and involve several millions of people annually. They are inevitably a part of the new, more non-traditional developments emerging around us. But now, with a changed set of circumstances in our educational institutions and additional pressures from new and hitherto unserved populations, these movements have new opportunities to adapt and adjust and expand.

The idea that formalized education is only one part of the learning process and that it can and should be supplemented by other educational experiences all through life is getting new encouragement from the wave of non-traditional efforts now sweeping the country. The emphasis on the individual and his or her own program adds to this encouragement. Lifetime

learning may still be all too often an ideal rather than a reality. But I think we shall come closer to that ideal in the next decade than we have up to now.

V

As we think of all these matters today, we are literally at the beginning of a process that seems extraordinarily promising yet has many unknowns. But Justice Holmes once said that every year if not every day, "we have to wager our salvation on some prophecy based on imperfect knowledge." We are aware of strengths and weaknesses in what we now do educationally even though we know them imperfectly. We are aware of the learning desires and needs of our people even though we know *these* imperfectly. We are aware of new ways and new combinations of old and new ways to meet such desires and needs even though we know *these* imperfectly. But the importance of the need and the greatness of the desire should be enough to make a beginning.

The world we once knew familiarly and thought we could always rely on seems to be disintegrating before our very eyes. The values by which people have always proposed to live with other people seem to be discredited or at least reinterpreted so that we are uneasy as individuals and as a nation. We were so sure of everything, and now we are suddenly unsure of anything—with one towering exception. We are still certain that we need to know the truth, whatever it is and with whatever joy or pain it brings in its wake. And that means we are still dedicated to the concept of an informed citizenry, informed and enriched in understanding through every possible learning resource. All of us are instruments to strengthen that dedication if we choose to be.

Post-Secondary Education in Indiana

Van P. Smith

Mr. Bracken, President Pruis, President Emens, and all members of the Ball State community, who on this memorable tenth anniversary celebrate with justified pride, it is a pleasure to join the legion who salute your fine progress.

More significant than a name change alone are the accomplishments of the Ball State community. They certainly entitle you to carry your colors in a parade of distinguished universities, whether or not a legislature had statutorially designated the title, "university." Congratulations are in order for great achievements during these last few years. The College of Architecture and Planning within your university, the academic achievement displayed by your receipt of final doctoral level accreditation, the athletic recognition that accompanies inclusion in the Mid-American Conference, and the significant facility improvement embodied in construction of the new library are only a few of the major items so easily recognized by interested and enthusiastic supporters of Ball State University.

Your academic achievements, cultural contributions, accomplished faculty, and ever broadening student body complement 927 acres of campus, over 130 million dollar book value in capital assets, and an annual payroll of over 37 million dollars to support fully today's recognition of having operated your five colleges and many departments, centers, and schools as a distinguished university.

Ball State also serves as a respected member of a great Indiana system of post-secondary education, a system which contains the home and regional campuses of Indiana, Purdue, Indiana State, Vincennes, and Indiana Vocational Technical College. Approximately 150,000 students currently matriculate on about thirty campuses in this group of public institutions which together will expend well over one billion dollars in this biennium. In addition, Indiana's independent colleges and universities operate thirty other campuses with a total enrollment of just over 50,000 students.

Hoosiers have appropriated state financial support to build schools and underwrite college education for emerging eighteen year olds in a very traditional manner. As the number of students of college age increased, so did state support. What does the future hold? In the decade which ended a couple of years ago, The Growth Decade, Indiana experienced ten years in which the number of young men and women reaching eighteen years of age rose steadily from about 70,000 in the beginning year to about 110,000 two years ago.

In the next decade, The Declining Decade, we will see the number of Hoosiers reaching eighteen gradually but steadily drop from the 100,000 plus during the first year back down to a rate of just over 70,000 per year.

That initial Growth Decade presented even greater admissions pressure to the public supported institutions than indicated by these numbers alone; for the *percentage* of eighteen year olds applying for admission increased substantially, the numbers of students staying on for graduate work increased markedly, and the proportion of total students attending the public rather than private colleges and universities in Indiana increased from about two to one to about three to one.

Throughout that Growth Decade each one of the universities and colleges in our public and private Indiana system could make all of the individual ambitious expansion plans their own respective academic, political, and financial bases would allow, while collectively still not developing capacity any faster than the market provided student applicants. But now even if we succeed these next few years, and I believe we can, in dramatically changing enrollment patterns to include a larger percentage of the eighteen year olds, and if we are also able to induce more extensive use of programs by more mature citizens in continuing education or retraining curricula, or in the introduction and expansion of any variety of non-traditional programs, there certainly will no longer be dramatically larger numbers of students seeking admission to the state system. As a result of lower traditional enrollment numbers, pressure to reduce state funding increases.

This does indicate that if we are to make any serious and effective effort toward the most productive future use of our resources, the plans of each of the institutions which comprise our fine system must now begin to develop within a more coordinated atmosphere.

We could easily conduct full day meetings to just explore the opportunities, ramifications, problems, and advisability of establishing coordinated state policy on any one of the many vital issues. A word can suggest entire areas awaiting policy attention:

1. Student fees
2. Compatible missions
3. Doctor of Arts or Associate in Arts
4. Tuition equalization for students at independent colleges
5. Student grants or scholarships
6. Independence for larger regional campuses
7. Access to the system
8. Coordination of efforts of the many institutions rushing to fill the single biggest student growth area—"Vocational Education"
9. Academic program development including non-traditional studies
10. Minimum equal state support for like programs on all campuses

But in these limited remarks allow a glance for just a moment as to how we will organizationally make these necessary responses to change within our Indiana system. Some mechanism of coordination is needed to assure the development of consistent and understood policy in these and other areas of total statewide concern. Hopefully, policies can develop with respect for public need and opinion as well as respect for, and thoughtful input of, professional academic opinion.

Certain academic or political interests will, and do, oppose any effort toward state-wide coordination by citing the justifiable and legitimate desire to maintain local campus autonomy, to preserve the individual character of a school, to encourage development of selected areas of academic excellence within a particular institution, to avoid another government office, or to protest trustees' management prerogatives—the implication being that coordination would stifle such efforts. In an attempt to recognize and balance the merits of both of these positions Indiana has established a coordinating body—supported by a small but highly competent and academically experienced staff—rather than an all powerful state board of regents with broad operational responsibilities. Such coordinating effort can be the meeting ground for a productive and thoughtful comingling of *professional* opinion and *public* opinion wherein a consistent and progressive state-wide policy can be developed which will justify more adequate future appropriation support and understanding. Such a system can retain respect, in fact encourage effective participation, of trustees in the establishment of policy for the operation of their individual schools. Trustees in some institutions have yet to solve all the problems in such areas as student selection, faculty selection, remuneration, promotion and retention, facility design, construction and maintenance, establishment of degree criteria, or clearly understood systems for budgeting and allocation of internal funds, curricula design, and employee organization.

Interested citizens may wish to consider the predicted alternative to the establishment and support of a professional state-wide effort of coordination. Allow me to quote a thought from remarks delivered by Dr. Roger Heyns, President of the American Council on Education, not a traditional supporter of such coordinating agencies. He is a respected educator, who incidentally delivered last May's commencement address at this university and was a recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree:

> Let me add that even if we are not persuaded by the need for such agencies, there should be a good deal of self interest within education in making them work. Up to now the agencies that have been developed are education entities—at least, once removed from an exclusively political body.

Dr. Heyns goes on to say,

> If we don't become partners with these agencies, planning and coordination will be performed by strictly political entities. Indeed, where such agencies don't exist, the decisions are increasingly made by political agencies.

This view comes from the professional educator's position.

My pleasure in having had experience in the legislature led me to hold great respect for the prerogative of legislators in establishing public policy. Also it led me to realize the impracticality and undesirability of solving all questions or establishing all policy by the enactment of statutes. The ultimate measurement of public support for the system does lie in the legislative control of the purse string. However, as George Romney has articulated so well, when public administrators look to a strictly political body for administrative direction or development of professional policy, they will find frustration, for decisions come from strictly political bodies as a result of crisis.

If the institutions within our system can cooperatively chart progressive future directions, served by a coordinating effort which respects the need for academic professionalism, while assuring consistent policy within the system, then we can offer the greatest opportunity to all Hoosier students and avoid creating crisis. In addition, we avoid the danger of actions which seek primarily to protect institutional opportunities or outmoded programs and practices during this challenging period of enrollment realignment.

Great potential for creative and rewarding public contribution lies within the grasp of our fine Indiana colleges and universities these next few years. It would be my prayer that ten years from now we may review the accomplishments of the entire Indiana system of post-secondary education with the same justifiable pride that the Ball State community today exhibits on review of its ten years as a distinguished university.

The University in the Decades Ahead

John J Pruis

It is fitting that a university, and above all this University, commemorate the tenth milestone of its life as a university. I say "above all this University" because, far more than most, this state university owes its founding to the acumen and the faith of a known group of individuals: Mr. Frank C., Mr. Edmund B., Mr. George A., Mr. William C., and Dr. Lucius L. Ball. A somewhat unique beginning for a state university. Additionally "above all this university," because, again far more than most, this University continues to draw strength from the dedicated and unselfish work of thousands of students, faculty, staff, alumni, trustees and local and area citizens over the years which has created a university truly dedicated to the human needs of its members and its neighbors.

Once a meadow which provided sustenance and solace to herds of cattle, a gravel pit, and who knows what else, our campus is now a busy center of living, working and learning; of examination and extension of knowledge; of performance and appreciation of the highest arts of human achievement; of reaffirmation of the abiding truths of human society as well as adventuring into new forms of individual and group behavior.

While we may appear at times to suffer from the modern malady of infatuation with newness and purely individual authenticity, we return again and again to our heritage of the cumulative labors of those who have gone before. And while we may appear at times to wish to fashion a world all our own, but a moment's reflection reminds us that we are heirs. And happy heirs we are.

One outcome I covet from our program today is that we might sustain the vigor and the continuity of our life in the decades ahead by renewing our energies from the knowledge of the accomplishments of the past. Great institutions, transcending the efforts and the limitations of individual life, are the carriers and the fashioners of the hopes and dreams of society. We ourselves are what we are today because of what we have been and what we hope to be.

Yes, I have the temerity to suggest that what we will be depends in large measure on what we hope to be. The educational seas, like all other seas today, are restless, to be sure. The prophets of doom and their followers are legion. Even within the Academy, some are expressing painfully pessimistic views of the future of the family of colleges and universities.

Stephen Graubard, editor of the recent two-volume *Daedalus*, entitled "American Higher Education: Toward an Uncertain Future," invited a large number of prominent schoiars and spokesmen to submit statements on the current higher education scene. In the Preface he reported that certain of the responses received ". . . suggested all too eloquently the frenzied character of modern academic life." Reading the papers in these volumes reveals concerns, to be sure, but also disagreements about the future. At least some of the press stories reporting this work, however, failed to note Mr. Graubard's observation that "while the problems confronting colleges and universities are acknowledged to be serious—some would go so far as to say that they are grave—faith in the possibilities of higher educational reform remains remarkably high."

And why not? America's colleges and universities have demonstrated over and over their ability to meet extraordinary challenges. There is no reason to believe that the challenges of today cannot and will not be met.

One of these challenges is the issue of learning, its content and form; some would call it curriculum. With appropriate employment upon graduation admittedly difficult for many, though certainly not most (more a result of societal conditions, it is to be noted, rather than a result of inadequate teaching and learning), the alarming suggestion is sometimes heard that too many young people seek to be educated. I would submit that a democratic society can never educate too many of its citizens. To do less than the maximum in increasing the intellectual competence of our people is to suggest that we do not really wish to be a democratic society at all.

This is not to suggest a blind or stubborn faith in the current curriculum. Ever more meaningful and effective programs of study must be sought and devised in order that individual lives may be more richly enhanced and society better served and improved. The broadening of the curricular offerings of Ball State University in the ten years of our life as a university is nothing short of dramatic. If we are honest, however, our methodologies, in too many instances, have been less-than-dramatically improved, though it would be unfair to imply or infer that there has not been improvement. I would hope and do believe that there will be substantial changes and improvements in our methodologies, in our curricular offerings and in our delivery systems in the decades ahead. If this be true, we shall be

a better University and our contributions to our people and the State will be the greater.

An always-present challenge (and in this case "challenge" is a euphemism for "problem"'), but one which appears to be ominous today, is finance. It is not unusual to hear or read of the "economic plight" of colleges and universities today. And in many cases that is a thoroughly, even painfully, accurate description. Yet it is important to recognize that in the ten years we celebrate today budgets have increased almost spectacularly. In our own case, our operating budget this year is 284 percent greater than it was ten years ago. Our state appropriation has increased by 243 percent. Taking our larger student body into account, the state appropriated dollars per student have doubled (actually 2.12 times) during this period while student fees have grown 2.5 times.

Even so, finding the dollars to support a more complex instructional program utilizing much more sophisticated equipment and an expanding research program—all of which is guided and led by a more highly trained faculty and staff—is ever-more difficult.

It is not popular to speak of financial needs. A presidential colleague from another state has observed that "we are witnessing a process that has transformed the statistics of budget analysis into the pornographic literature of higher education." I dislike pleading for simply adequate financial support for our University, but I shall continue to do so as long as I am President because I believe deeply in this University and in its purposes, its contributions and its needs. And I also have faith that these efforts will produce the necessary results. With the understanding of our citizens, I am confident that Ball State University in the decades ahead will be supported financially by our lawmakers and our friends.

One of the more-exciting challenges to us in the years ahead is that of the clientele, if you will, of the University. Almost forever, our colleges and universities have been viewed and have functioned primarily as centers of influence and activity for the young. The literature and the conversations of higher education, until recently, have been replete with terms such as "college-age youth," "18 to 21 year olds," or even "18 to 24 year olds." Whether by design or as a result of myopia, most of us have at best tolerated interest in the pursuit of education by those outside the pool of recent high school graduates. It is not to our credit that this has been our posture.

Spectacular medical breakthroughs in this century have stretched the ordinary span of life by more than twenty years and significantly altered the pattern of population characteristics. Life expectancy in 1900 was 47 years; today it is 71. By the year 2000 it is estimated that 30% of our population will be over age 50.

At the same time the average work week has been shortened substantially, falling from 62 hours per week in 1900 to 37½ today. More people have more time at their disposal.

Still another factor central to the need to extend the learning opportunities of the University to those who in the past have long been ignored lies in the changes in knowledge and skills required in today's rapidly changing world of work and living. Everyone needs to be updated.

Ball State University's interest in serving better the realities of our society and the needs of our people can be established in numerous ways. Perhaps a recent action and a proposed change will suffice. This Autumn saw the beginning of a new instructional unit, the Center for Lifelong Learning. At our Board of Trustees meeting later this month we shall recommend the renaming of our Office of Continuing Education to School of Continuing Education, a designation which will reflect our heightened concern for expanded efforts to serve a broader range of what I have called "could be," "would be" and even "should be" students if only we stand ready to recognize them and respond to their needs.

There are, of course, other challenges which might be mentioned. Some we know now; others will appear. But it has always been thus, especially within the university. If we live up to Disraeli's observation that "a university should be a place of light, of liberty and of learning," the status quo will never actually be. This is what makes participating in the life of a university, directly or indirectly, so exciting.

The University, then, in the decades ahead, to return to an earlier statement, depends in large measure on what we hope it to be. That hope, however, is not enough. Contrary to the lyrics of a popular song, wishing will *not* make it so. It will take work and it will take devotion to the task.

Perhaps that devotion requires special attention, for I am convinced that, if we truly dedicate ourselves to the future of our University, that future is assured. That devotion has been our hallmark is readily seen in the extraordinary development of our fine institution. Such growth does not just happen. Nor does it automatically or naturally continue.

Frequently on our busy campus the words of others strike me as being particularly apt. Such has been the case again twice this past month. In one instance, from the University Theater's production of Aristophanes' "The Birds," Euelpides, in speaking of the democratic Athenian society said, "Everybody equal. Every man has absolute freedom to pay taxes. Every man has a constitutional right to ruin himself." In the other instance, in George Bernard Shaw's "Don Juan in Hell" from "Man and Superman," as presented in Emens Auditorium, Don Juan spelled out his evaluation of the inhabitants of that lower place in a magnificent series of critical statements.

A few of them were: "They (the inhabitants of Hell) are not beautiful: they are only decorated. They are not dignified: they are only fashionably dressed. They are not educated: they are only college passmen . . . They are not loyal, they are only servile; . . . not courageous, only quarrelsome; . . . not self-respecting, only vain; not intelligent, only opinionated; . . . not progressive, only factious . . ."

It is my fervent hope that our opportunity to help fashion the future of our University in the decades ahead will not find us either exercising our constitutional right to ruin ourselves or striving for the trappings of university men and women without the substance. If we will continue to strive for excellent teaching rather than slipping to sophistic misleading in our classrooms; if we will continue to promote and perform meaningful research and not simply seek to add perfunctorily to our bibliographies; if we will continue to address ourselves to the real needs of individual people, our community and other societal groups and avoid the development of public service activities for their own sake; if we will continue to apply ourselves diligently to the cultural imperative rather than working to destroy, we shall be worthy of our trust.

In the Durants' volume, *The Age of Voltaire*, the "Epilogue in Elysium" suggests a dialogue between Voltaire and Pope Benedict XIV. In the conversation Pope Benedict observes: "I believe that we should be allowed to question traditions and institutions, but with care that we do not destroy more than we can build, and with caution that the stone that we dislodge shall not prove to be a necessary support to what we wish to preserve, and always with a modest consciousness that the experience of generations may be wiser than the reason of a transitory individual."

The years, if not the decades, ahead will require the best within us. With the substantial collective wisdom, faith, devotion and energy that are ours, I am confident that future milestones will be accomplished and the institution we know today as Ball State University will be revered even more than we properly celebrate tonight. And I would invite each person interested in this University and in the future of our society to join in this magnificent task.

Official Greetings

The University was pleased to have representatives from its immediate and wider community to extend official greetings from their respective constituencies. Their remarks convey the sense of allegiance and interdependence between the University and the citizenry at-large.

Ten years ago most of our present students were less than twelve years old. Although some may have been aware of Ball State University, most of them probably were not; and yet at that very time of unawareness there were many people striving to bring a dream to reality. On behalf of today's students I would like to thank those who shared in this responsibility. We would like to thank the Board of Trustees, the administrative officers, the faculty, staff, architects, engineers and—yes, the "hard hats" who actually planned and built the physical environment of this University.

Most of all, however, I would like to speak of the students' gratitude to the citizens of Indiana who had in mind "an investment in the future." Looking to the future, perhaps twenty-five years from now, students then might say with great satisfaction that this University had indeed truly prepared them for the twenty-first century and that our present investment in young people had not been misplaced. I would like to stress again our thanks for the opportunity for higher education at a great university whose anniversary we celebrate today.

Michael Closser
President of Student Association

It is a privilege, as well as a pleasure, to speak both on behalf of the University Senate and as a representative of the faculty of Ball State University; I welcome you here today as we commemorate our tenth anniversary of service to the people of Indiana. An anniversary is an occasion for happiness and celebration; and, indeed, we are happy and will be doing some celebrating during the course of this day. It is also a time for re-examination, reflection, and re-dedication; and, indeed, today we will be engaging in these activities as well.

An act of legislature, of course, cannot create an instant university. The university, rather, is a by-product of long and hard work and dedication. Its success depends upon an able administration, a dedicated faculty, an inspired student body, and the support of citizens of the state. Ball State has been blessed with exactly these elements. On behalf of the faculty, then, I thank you for being here today to share this memorable occasion with us, and I pledge that the faculty of Ball State will continue to meet its responsibilities.

Morton Rosenberg
Chairman of University Senate

Ball State Alumni and friends have shown remarkable commitment to the ideals of higher education and to the role of this University in fulfilling these ideals. One of the tangible ways that such support is illustrated is through financial contributions. In 1974, Alumni and friends contributed a total of $404,960.08; 10,370 Alumni donors made an average contribution of $18.63. Ball State appeared on eight of nine honor rolls in the American Association of State Colleges and Universities' classifications comparing Alumni giving in almost 400 member institutions. In this manner, Alumni and friends are saying, "We believe in what this University has done."

Is the University, however, tapping all of the Alumni resources available? What about the resource of Alumni input through service? Such current service programs as using Alumni to identify prospective students and to place graduates could be expanded to other areas of the University. Alumni Advisory Task Forces, for example, could help answer the question: "How does the University avoid being isolated from reality and avoid preparing the students for things they will not be doing?" The "product" of Ball State, its Alumni, could aid in curriculum evaluation and might make meaningful recommendations in the effort to assure that programs are

meeting the needs of the future. The potential for input from "the real world" is present in Alumni. We, the graduates of Ball State care; please call on us.

Paula Webster Carter
President of the Alumni Association

John Pruis became President of Ball State at approximately the same time I was elected mayor of Muncie. We have both seen remarkable changes in both the University and in the City. In the past ten years, under the leadership of Presidents Emens and Pruis, Ball State has done much to solve its problems in physical plant development, in student housing, and in general program planning. Moreover, the University has come a long way in providing help in solving the problems of Muncie. The city definitely values its University. I look forward to continued good relations with Ball State University. Together, town and gown can work on mutual problems to the benefit of our City and our University.

Paul Cooley
Mayor of the City of Muncie

Getting here this morning in the inclement weather brings to mind the problems I had in introducing legislation to rename Ball State Teachers College to Ball State University and seeing it through the Indiana Senate, The House of Representatives and getting the Governor to sign it. Ten years ago on February 8th at 2 p.m., Governor Roger Branigan signed into effect the law that changed the name of Ball State Teachers College to Ball State University. That was a day of which the University, the City of Muncie, and the State of Indiana can be justly proud. That was the day that Ball State University moved forward to a bigger and better educational system.

I hope Ball State University can look to the future in the era of today and tomorrow. I believe that our educational system has many dangerous, unsolved, long postponed problems—problems that will explode to the surface during the coming years. Changing the name from Ball State Teachers College to Ball State University was a step in the right direction. Important to our struggle for educational excellency and to our efforts for a

decent way of life for all American citizens is a strong, healthy, and vitally educated people.

Realizing our dependency upon an educated citizenry I will continue to champion education in the State of Indiana. We cannot, we shall not, we will not lose our American way of life if we invest today in the future of America through the preparation of tomorrow's leaders. In looking into the future, let us look at the people who will make this future, let us develop both the minds and bodies of the leaders of tomorrow in order that they and their children may be equipped to face the realities of a life in a democracy where competition and the pursuits of talent are based on the ability and the initiative of each person. Let us never forget that we get out of life what we put into it, and in education this proof is self-evident.

Congratulations Ball State University on your tenth anniversary. It was my pleasure to give you a helping hand.

Rodney Piper
Senator, Indiana General Assembly

I am pleased to represent Governor Otis Bowen on the occasion of the Tenth Anniversary of Ball State University.

When I graduated from Ball State in 1964, it was still Ball State Teachers College; and I recall that one of my major concerns as a student was seeing that the residence hall hours for girls were changed from 12:00 midnight to 1:00 a.m. Somehow, my colleagues and I never thought that there might be a possibility of students participating in policy decisions as members of the Board of Trustees. Indeed, much has changed in ten years. The growth of the University has been incredible. It has been our pleasure to work with you in the past; and on behalf of Governor Bowen, we congratulate you on these ten productive years. We look forward to working with you in the future.

James Smith
Representing the Governor of the State of Indiana

Ball State University: The Next Twenty-Five Years

A Celebration of University Day
February 7, 1975

9:00-3:00	Registration of Visitors	Emens Auditorium
9:30 a.m.	Opening Session	Emens Auditorium

Presiding: Richard Burkhardt, *Vice President for Instructional Affairs and Chairman of University Day Planning Committee*

Concert Choir: Lemuel Anderson, *Conductor*

University Welcome: John J. Pruis, *President*

Greetings:

Mike Closser, *President of Student Association*
Morton Rosenberg, *Chairman of University Senate*
Paula Webster Carter, *President of Alumni Association*
Paul J. Cooley, *Mayor of the City of Muncie*
Rodney Piper, *Senator, Indiana General Assembly*
James Smith, *Representing the Governor of the State of Indiana*

"Today's Education with Yesterday's Goals"
Samuel B. Gould, *Chancellor Emeritus, State University of of New York, and Chairman, Commission on Progress of Non-Traditional Study*

11:10-2:00 The University in Action

Class Visitations, Exhibits, Departmental, Collegiate and Administrative Units, Campus Tours

Luncheon, 11:30-1:15, Cafeterias of Noyer, Studebaker, and LaFollette Halls

2:15-4:00 The Future of the University—Its Special Tasks

A choice of concurrent forums on several challenges confronting the University. The topics, program participants, and locations are listed elsewhere in this program.

5:00-6:00 Reception — Browsing and Music Lounges, Student Center

Host: Ball State Student Foundation

6:00 p.m. Dinner — Cardinal Hall

Presiding: A. M. Bracken, *President, University Board of Trustees*

"Post Secondary Education in Indiana"
Van P. Smith, *Chairman, Indiana Commission for Higher Education*

"The University in the Decades Ahead"
John J. Pruis, *President*

8:00 p.m. A Musical Celebration — Emens Auditorium

Master of Ceremonies: John R. Emens, *President Emeritus*

Muncie Chiefs of Harmony, SPEBSQSA, Benjamin Yaeger, *Conductor*
Trombone Choir, Bernard Pressler, *Conductor*
Banevolks, Yaakov Eden, *Director*
Yemenite - Segments from a complete Yemenite Suite that the Banevolks have in repertoire.
Contemporary Dance Theatre, Sara Mangelsdorf, *Director*
Obmil - A state of being, a journey with death.
Banevolks, Yaakov Eden, *Director*
Venzelia - Russian gliding dance with show-off steps.
Noriko Kitagaki, *Violinist*
University Wind Ensemble, Roger McConnell, *Conductor*
University Singers, Larry Boye, *Conductor*
Finale - University Singers and Wind Ensemble

The Future of the University – Its Special Tasks

These forums are designed to encourage an exchange of ideas between students, faculty, administrators, and community representatives.

2:15-4:00 p.m.

1. Interests and Conflicts—The University and Its Communities

   Discussion Leader: Nan Barber, *President, League of Women Voters*
   Resource Persons: Oliver Bumb, *Vice President, Public Affairs*
   Mike Closser, *President, Student Association*
   Galen Colclesser, *Director, Fort Wayne Office of Continuing Education*
   David Grindstaff, *Mayor's Office*
   Vern Schranz, *Vice President, Ball Corporation*
   Warren Vander Hill, *Director of the Honors Program*
   Location: Baker Lounge, Noyer Complex

2. How Will Preparation for the Traditional Professions Change in the Future?

   Discussion Leader: Charles Sappenfield, *Dean, College of Architecture and Planning*
   Resource Persons: Jan Abbs, *Student*
   Anthony Dowell, *Director, Muncie Center for Medical Education*
   John Fallon, *Regional Coordinator, Community Education Development*
   James Gooden, *Local Architect*
   Herbert Hamilton, *Professor of Political Science*
   James Mitchell, *Dean, Teachers College*
   Warren Schaller, *Chairman, Department of Physiology and Health Sciences*
   Location: Baker Dining Room, Noyer Complex

3. Serving a Changing Student Clientele

   Discussion Leader: Janice Nisbet, *Director of Academic Opportunity Programs*
   Resource Persons: Shirley Alexander, *Rockefeller Intern*
   Marc Galvin, *Student*
   Al Garringer, *Muncie Career Center*
   Donavon Lumpkin, *Professor of Elementary Education*
   Robert Seitz, *Professor of Special Education*
   Ben Shively, *Director of Field Services in Continuing Education*
   Location: Klipple Dining Room, Noyer Complex

4. What Aspects of University Life Deserve Special Attention in a Period of Contracting Enrollment?

   Discussion Leader: John Hannaford, *Associate Dean, College of Business*
   Resource Persons: Paul Baker, *Student*
   Betty Harrah, *Director, Residence Halls Personnel and Programs*
   Glenn Rosenthal, *Director of Placement*
   Richard Rowray, *Assistant Dean for Student Services*
   Location: Klipple Lounge, Noyer Complex

5. Women and Higher Education—Now and Tomorrow

   Discussion Leader: Betty Newcomb, *Director, Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Program*
   Resource Persons: Carson Bennett, *Professor of Psychology-Educational Psychology*
   Pat Callard, *Trust Officer, American National Bank*
   Joanna Campbell, *Student*
   Carol Fisher, *Director, Women's Programs, Continuing Education*
   Barbara Maves, *Executive Director, Planned Parenthood*
   Dorothy Rudoni, *Associate Professor of Political Science*
   Location: Klipple Recreation Room, Noyer Complex

6. How Can We Enhance the Quality of Student Life beyond the Classroom?

   Discussion Leader: Nancy Schwartz, *Student*
   Resource Persons: Welker Bishop, *Assistant Dean for Housing*
   Anne Courtney, *Student*
   Duane Deal, *Chairman, Department of Mathematical Sciences*
   Richard Hester, *Student*
   James Marine, *Assistant Dean for Student Programs*
   Ruth Peters, *Assistant to the Director of Residence Halls Personnel and Programs*
   Location: Hurlbut Lounge, Studebaker East Complex

7. Restoration of Confidence in Higher Education

   Discussion Leader: Richard W. Burkhardt, *Vice President for Instructional Affairs and Dean of Faculties*
   Resource Persons: Sara Chapman, *Rockefeller Intern*
   Richard D. Gibb, *Commissioner, Indiana Commission for Higher Education*
   Will Parker, *Member, University Board of Trustees*
   Samuel Reed, *Representative, Indiana General Assembly*
   Linda Riley, *Student*
   Bradley Sagen, *Professor of Higher Education, University of Iowa*
   Philip R. Sharp, *U.S. Congressman, 10th District of Indiana*
   Thomas Teague, *Senator, Indiana General Assembly*
   Location: Fitch Conference Room, Noyer Complex

8. The Twilight Years—A University Response

   Discussion Leader: John Craddock, *Director, Gerontology Institute*
   Resource Persons: Michael Carlie, *Assistant Professor of Sociology*
   Robert Coatie, *Assistant Director of Special Programs*
   Karen Gardner, *Area Coordinator, Federal Older American Act*
   Yvonne Giles, *Director, Delaware Retired Senior Volunteer Program*
   Rev. Allen Jump, *Delaware Council on Aging and Aged*
   Location: Baker Recreation Room, Noyer Complex

9. How Can the University Respond to the New Ethnicity?

   Discussion Leader: Robert Foster, *Director of Special Programs*
   Resource Persons: Ethan Janove, *Director, Institute for Community Education Development*
   Caroline Nisbet, *Student*
   Charles Payne, *Director, Multicultural Program*
   Andreas Poulakidas, *Associate Professor of English*
   Frank Sciara, *Director, Education of Teachers of the Disadvantaged*
   Joseph Tamney, *Associate Professor of Sociology*
   Location: Hurst Lounge, LaFollette Complex

10. How Can the University Deal with the Current Crisis of Confidence in All Traditional Institutions?

Discussion Leader: Eric Boyer, *Coordinator, Residential Instruction Project*
Resource Persons: Ralph Baker, *Associate Professor of Political Science*
Charles Battle, *Lecturer in Marketing*
Dorothy Harms, *Associate Professor of Finance and Management*
George Jones, *Director of Religious Programs*
Steve Laughlin, *Student*
Lou Piotrowski, *Regional Coordinator, Institute for Community Education Development*
David Snively, *Student*
Location: Edwards Lounge, LaFollette Complex

11. Whither the Humanities in the Next Twenty-Five Years?

Discussion Leader: Harry Taylor, *Professor of English*
Resource Persons: Eloise Behnken, *Rockefeller Intern*
William Liston, *Associate Professor of English*
Alexander MacGibbon, *Professor of English*
Martin Schwartz, *Indiana Committee for the Humanities*
Richard Wires, *Chairman, Department of History*
Location: Swinford Recreation Room, Johnson Complex

12 How Can the University Serve Better the Needs of Physically Handicapped Students?

Discussion Leader: Richard Harris, *Director of Orientation*
Resource Persons: William Hickman, *Executive Director of Camp Isanogel*
Miriam Kamback, *Assistant Professor of Special Education*
Steve Povolac, *Transportation Supervisor*
Greg Thomsen, *Director, Disabled Students in Action*
Location: Teachers College 200 F

13. What Are the Unique Aspects of Ball State University Which Enhance or Thwart the Development of the University as a Viable Institution of Higher Education?

Discussion Leader: Morton Rosenberg, *Chairman, University Senate*
Resource Persons: Joseph Black, *Dean, College of Business*
William Lucas, *Student*
Robert Fletcher, *Director of Curricular Advising*
Location: Clevenger Lounge, LaFollette Complex

14. Whither the Social Sciences in the Next Twenty-Five Years?

Discussion Leader: Everett Ferrill, *Professor of History*
Resource Persons: John Condran, *Assistant Professor of Sociology*
Bernard Freund, *Muncie Businessman and Civic Leader*
Harry Izmirlian, *Chairman, Department of Anthropology*
Myron Mast, *Administrative Assistant to the Head, Department of Political Science*
Benjamin K. Swartz, Jr., *Professor of Anthropology*
John Van Atta, *Student*
Location: Schmidt Recreation Room, Johnson Complex

15. Are There New Tasks Which Will Determine the Mission of the University?

Discussion Leader: Charles Greenwood, *Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Programs*
Resource Persons: Merrill Beyerl, *Vice President, Student Affairs*
Joe Rawlings, *Dean, Continuing Education*
Ross Van Ness, *Associate Director, Institute for Community Education Development*
Location: Swinford Lounge, Johnson Complex

16. Collective Bargaining in Higher Education

Discussion Leader: Sam Dickson, *Chairman, General Studies Committee*
Resource Persons: Jack Reak, *Ball State AFT Union*
Stan Richey, *Student*
Robert Thornberry, *Indiana State AFT Union*
Location: Schmidt Lounge, Johnson Complex

17. What Are the University's Responsibilities for Meeting the Environmental Crisis?

Discussion Leader: Betty Guemple, *Assistant Professor of Natural Resources*
Resource Persons: Kenneth Davis, *Associate Professor of Art*
Harry Eggink, *Assistant Professor of Architecture*
Clark Judy, *Associate Professor of Natural Resources*
Charles Mortensen, *Assistant Professor of Natural Resources*
Robert K. Priddy, *Student*
Location: Architecture Auditorium

18. What Should Be the International Dimension of This University's Commitments and Purposes?

Discussion Leader: Larry Roberts, *Campus Coordinator of Graduate Education Programs, Europe*
Resource Persons: Agha Iqbal Ali, *International Student*
Robert Carmin, *Dean, College of Sciences and Humanities*
James Danglade, *Director, Ball State Program at Grissom Air Force Base*
David Gadziola, *Campus Coordinator, London Centre, 1974-75*
Fisseha Haile, *International Student*
William Lindblad, *Director, London Centre, 1972-73*
Phyllis Yuhas, *Director, Institute for International Studies*
Location: International House, 215 N. College

19. University Master Planning to the Year 2000

Discussion Leader: O. T. Richardson, *Dean of Instructional Services*
Resource Persons: William Brown, *Director, University Computer Center*
Anthony Costello, *Professor of Architecture*
Louis Ingelhart, *Chairman, Department of Journalism*
Jerry March, *Student*
Thomas Ray, *Assistant to Vice President for Instructional Affairs*
John Russell, *Professor of Landscape Architecture*
Robert Showalter, *Director of Physical Plant*
Stephen Wurster, *Assistant to Vice President for Instructional Affairs*
Location: Menk Small Meeting Room, Studebaker East Complex

20. Whither the Natural Sciences in the Next Twenty-Five Years?

Discussion Leader: Edward Lyon, *Chairman, Department of Geography and Geology*
Resource Persons: Keith Ault, *Associate Professor of Chemistry*
Norman Norton, *Head, Department of Biology*
Location: Painter Lounge, Studebaker Complex

21. Expanding the Service Dimension of the University

Discussion Leader: Michele White, *Assistant Director of Religious Programs*
Resource Persons: Joseph Brown, *Director of Bureau of Business Research*
Earl Dunn, *Assistant to the Director of the School of Music*
Peter Murk, *Community Education Consultant*
Location: Rogers Small Lounge, Woodworth Complex

22. What Emerging Fiscal Problems Deserve Our Greatest Attention?

Discussion Leader: Robert Lawson, *Chairman, University Senate Finance Council*
Resource Persons: Jeffrey Baldwin, *Student*
Robert Bell, *Vice President for Business Affairs*
Ethel Himelick, *Director of Budgeting and Assistant Treasurer*
Tom Kinghorn, *Coordinator, State Fiscal Affairs*
Location: Rogers Small Lounge, Woodworth Complex

23. Interpreting the University through Public Media

Discussion Leader: Tracy Norris, *Director of University Relations*
Resource Persons: Lee Allerton, *Vice President, Tri-City Radio Corporation, WLBC Radio*
Joanne Douglass, *Public Information Consultant for WIPB-TV*
John Eiden, *Assistant Station Manager, WBST*
Mark Hansbarger, *Editor-in-Chief, Daily News*
Location: Crosley Small Lounge, Woodworth Complex

24. What Are the Responsibilities of the University in Helping Students Develop Values?

Discussion Leader: David Annis, *Associate Professor of Philosophy*
Resource Persons: Richard Brosio, *Assistant Professor of Secondary Education*
Kenneth Collier, *Associate Dean of Students*
John Fuller, *Student*
Robert Hayes, *Associate Professor of Psychology-Counseling*
Sarah Hewitt, *Instructor, General and Experimental Psychology*
Location: LaFollette Complex, Room M16

25. Expanding the Research Dimension of the University

Discussion Leader: Alice Bennett, *Professor of Biology*
Resource Persons: Ross Koile, *Student*
Denise Peters, *Student Member of University Research Committee*
Charles Smith, *Director of Office of Research*
Location: Beeman Lounge, DeHority Complex

26. What Should Be the Role of Non-Traditional Studies in Undergraduate Program Development?

Discussion Leader: Shirley Trent, *Chairperson, Undergraduate Educational Policies Council*
Resource Persons: John Barber, *Assistant Professor of History*
Jeannine Harrold, *Career Analyst*
Victor Lawhead, *Dean, Undergraduate Programs*
Alexis Olson, *Student*
Dick Poppa, *Student*
Location: Shales Hall, LaFollette Complex

27. What Are the Special Curriculum Needs of the Future at the Graduate Level?

Discussion Leader: Paul Parkison, *Head, Department of Accounting*
Resource Persons: Blake Anderson, *Assistant to the Dean of Graduate School*
Chuck Ball, *Senator Representing Graduate Students*
David Haire, *Senator Representing Graduate Students*
Robert Koenker, *Dean of Graduate School*
Leslie Mauth, *Associate Dean of Teachers College*
Location: DeMotte Lounge, DeHority Complex

28. What Are Viable University Responses to the Challenge of Increased Technology?

Discussion Leader: Lloyd Nelson, *Dean, College of Fine and Applied Arts*
Resource Persons: David Nelson, *Assistant Professor of Finance and Management*
Andrew Seager, *Associate Professor of Architecture*
Edgar Wagner, *Head, Department of Industrial Education and Technology*
Location: Menk Lounge, Studebaker East Complex

29. Meeting the Needs of Young Children and Their Parents

Discussion Leader: Joe Strain, *Professor, Department of Elementary Education*
Resource Persons: Suzanne Foster, *Director, Huffer Memorial Children's Center*
Frieda Fowlkes, *Director, Munsyana Day Nursery*
Sue Roscoe, *Director, Day Nursery Psi Iota Xi*
Charles Wiley, *Assistant Professor of Elementary Education*
Location: Teachers College 200 A

30. Channel 49 - Forging a New Link between Town and Gown

Discussion Leader: Thomas Sargent, *Associate Professor of Political Science*
Resource Persons: John-Paul Glenkey, *Student*
Floyd D. Lee, *Associate Professor of Physics and Astronomy*
M. Edward Ratliff, *Director of Contract Programs, Continuing Education*
Ronald Warner, *Associate Professor of Foreign Languages*
Location: Tichenor Lounge, DeHority Complex

University Day Planning Committee

Richard W. Burkhardt, Vice President for Instructional Affairs, *Chairman*

Robert P. Bell, Vice President for Business Affairs

Merrill C. Beyerl, Vice President for Student Affairs

Oliver C. Bumb, Vice President for Public Affairs and University Development

Mike Closser, President, Student Association

David Grindstaff, Mayor's Office

Ron Hutson, Executive Vice President, Muncie Chamber of Commerce

Victor B. Lawhead, Dean of Undergraduate Programs

Richard C. McKee, Assistant to the President

Morton M. Rosenberg, Chairman, University Senate