PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DS1501

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
11 3 D MAR 2 8 2012		

11/00 c:/CIRC/DateDue.p65-p.14

ABSTRACT

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY: ITS FIRST FOUR YEARS AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF ITS DEVELOPMENT AND ITS ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES

by Herbert N. Stoutenburg, Jr.

This study presents an historical analysis of Oakland University (formerly Michigan State University Oakland) during its first four years of operation with particular emphasis on its development and its administrative policies incident to this process. It is assumed that the establishing of a new institution of higher learning is a series of complex functions requiring a delicate balance between ideas, things and people. An effort was made to describe the dynamic quality of the people and their influence on the successful blending of these three ingredients. Further, this history was written first to assist the individual or group charged with planning a new college or university so that they may recognize potential areas of difficulty, and second to assist the future Oakland University historians to better know the early years as a base for judging subsequent action.

Because the demands of establishing a new institution require a great amount of time and energy by those involved an effort was made to record the events while those individuals who made the policies and decisions were available as sources of information. Every effort was

made to capture the impressions, attitudes and thoughts of key people before the passing of time and intervening activities could dim or distort their memories. Many interviews were held with planners, community volunteers, students, faculty and staff people to insure that the data used represented the actual situation as accurately as possible. Primary sources including letters, memorandums, minutes, university and student records and statistical reports were examined for information pertinent to the development of the University. Secondary sources were used to expand an idea or give credence to a primary source. The abundance of data available required a careful selection of materials and subjects to be reported. Therefore, the decision was made to describe the influence of the following areas of interest on the progress and growth of the University--the Wilson gift, the summary of the preliminary surveys, the role of key personalities, the development of the philosophy, the establishment of the curriculum, the recognition of community participation, the recruitment of students, the progress of the "Charter Class" from freshmen to graduates, the selection of a faculty and staff, the development of student personnel policies, the planning and implementing of a workable organizational structure, and the review and analysis of some of the more important administrative decisions.

Oakland University's success during the period of this history was directly related to the influence and impact of its faculty and staff on ideas. The competence and flexibility of these individuals found solutions to problems which helped the University to justify its image of dynamism.

A review of the University's announced innovations proved to be, as it is in so many of man's "new ventures," a repackaging of the old and tried, but it was noted that the repackaged product can be exciting and meaningful at a given point in time.

It was discovered that a new institution must be promoted to be attractive to college age individuals. A well planned curriculum and an outstanding faculty are not enough to draw young men and women to an university. The unique features must be heralded and there must be a rallying point to assist the student's identification with the institution.

The character of any institution of higher learning is determined by the people who work for it, plan for it, administer it and govern it. Oakland University's first four years is an example of what responsible, well trained and creative people can do toward making an idea live as long as men will support it.

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY: ITS FIRST FOUR YEARS

AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF ITS DEVELOPMENT

AND ITS ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES

By

Herbert N. Stoutenburg, Jr.

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

College of Education

1968

G54681
2-12-69

Copyright by
HERBERT NATHAN STOUTENBURG, JR.
1968

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer takes this opportunity to acknowledge the great debt he owes to Dr. Max S. Smith, Chairman of the Guidance Committee, for his assistance in the preparation of this thesis and for his helpful counsel and infinite patience throughout the doctoral program. Appreciation is also extended to Drs. Clyde M. Campbell, Walter F. Johnson, and John Useem for encouragement and advice.

To those who have been generous in sharing their time, experience, and material on specific areas, the writer expresses his sincere appreciation. They are: Chancellor D. B. Varner, the late Mrs. Matilda Wilson, Dean Lowell Eklund, Mr. J. Robert F. Swanson, Dean Laszlo Hetenyi, Professor Kenneth Coffman, Provost Donald D. O'Dowd, Registrar Thomas H. Atkinson, and former President of the University of Hawaii, Thomas H. Hamilton.

The writer wishes to express his thanks to the following people for their help and encouragement: the late Robert S. Linton, former Registrar Michigan State University, President Glen L. Taggart, Utah State University, Professors Floyd Reeves, Paul L. Dressel, Alfred Du Bruck, and Donald Iodice, and Mesdames Louise de Beauclair, Mary Wood, and Pauline Scott.

Finally, for his wife Arlene, and children, Kathryn, Brian, and Nancy, the writer declares a singular expression of love and

appreciation for the encouragement, understanding, and support that they have given him through the years of the doctoral program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

> No contrast could be greater than that between the early years at Stanford and the beginnings of the University of Chicago. Rockefeller as a benefactor was a model of non-interference; Leland Stanford referred to "my University," and after his death Mrs. Stanford thought of herself as its owner, as in fact she was until she was ready to relinquish her proprietary control . . . . The contrasting experiences in Chicago and California were proof that the United States was now wealthy enough to support one man's achievement and another man's folly. But they were much more than that. They were reminders of how much difference it made who the benefactor was, who his advisers were, who the President was; . . . .[1]

If given the choice, Michigan State University Oakland (now Oakland University) could not have chosen benefactors more interested in the progress of the University but without any hint of pressure to control. Mr. and Mrs. Alfred G. Wilson, following the gift of their estate to the Michigan State University's Board of Trustees, chose to continue to live the dynamic and purposeful lives of busy people. Their relationship with the University was one of friendship and inspiration to the many who knew them.

This freedom from interference characterized Michigan State University Oakland's beginning. The University started as if with a clean slate upon which to develop a program to liberally educate all

[1]Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University, (New York: Alfred A. Knoph, 1962), pp. 352-353.

students who enter its classes.[1] The series of Meadow Brook Seminars on Higher Learning were an innovation that permitted the University planners a free hand to develop a fresh new approach to education without the limitation of vested interests. The suggestions gleaned from these meetings served as guidelines for the development of a curriculum designed to release students from the traditional role of spectator to the potent role of participator in the learning experience.

With a backdrop of enthusiastic anticipation, Michigan State University Oakland inoculated all those who came in contact with it with a sense of purpose and optimism. The "MSUO Story" like most ventures of men had its moments of success and failure. However, its resiliency to adversities was a part of the potential which gave it its dynamic quality. This quality was the result of many forces being brought to bear on an idea by people, an idea which in itself was an inert and useless thing until supported and implemented by human beings. This "idea," Michigan State University Oakland, was based on the highest motives to provide young people with the opportunity to find new insights into themselves and a means to advance the technical and scientific knowledge of man. The University set about molding an educational program to awaken its students to their greatest potential and to make them aware of their responsibility as educated individuals. As John Milton wrote in his paper, Of Education, "I call therefore a complete and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously all the offices both private and public of peace and war."

The character of any institution of higher learning is deter-

[1]"Introductory Comments for the Meadow Brook Seminar on Higher Learning, Engineering Science," (Michigan State University Oakland, August 16, 1958), p. 4. (Mimeographed)

mined by the people who work for it, plan for it, administer it and govern it. Michigan State University Oakland's first four years is an example of what responsible, well trained and creative people can do toward making an idea live as long as men will support it.

Statement of the Problem

All too often the demands of establishing a new institution of higher learning are so energy consuming and so varied that the daily duties and crises leave little time for recording the beginnings of the institution. This history needs to be written now to record the events of a period while those who are personally involved in making that history are available as sources of information. To wait another ten years, impressions, attitudes, and memory would be dimmed and distorted by the passing of time and the intervening activities of the University.

The building and managing of a new university has many of the rewards and pitfalls of a more established institution. Administrative decisions whether right or wrong are the result of the staff attempting to implement the stated objectives as set forth by the planners. This study will analyze the progress of Michigan State University Oakland for the effectiveness of its administrative actions in the areas of community relations, curriculum development, student recruitment, student personnel, and faculty participation.

Purpose of the Study

An educational history is of greatest value when it serves the individual who looks to the past as a means of planning for the future. The record can be used as a guide to indicate those things which worked,

and as a caution to indicate those things on which one should not waste additional energy. It is perhaps fitting in this connection to recall the pronouncement of George Santayana that "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

Only on rare occasions does one have the opportunity to describe the inner actions of individuals and groups working and experimenting together to achieve the lasting aims and objectives of an university. The problem of founding a new university is complex even when it has the support of a major state university. For example, on the day it opens it is faced with the "instant services" needed by those using the facilities; the organizational structure must be complete if only in outline form; the traditions, policies, and procedures normally available for students, faculty, and staff are lacking and must be formulated on a daily basis; and the decisions made must be flexible enough to permit adjustment by groups of individuals who are unknown to each other. This study is to preclude the loss of the story surrounding the people, events, and decisions of starting Michigan State University Oakland.

Providing better educational facilities in Michigan at all levels has been a concern of its citizens and its governmental units since the early days of this state. The writer proposes in this study to describe the progress of one of Michigan's newest state universities as a source of information for the future researchers concerned with the history of Michigan State University Oakland. However, this study may prove to be of more immediate value for those persons or groups charged with the planning of other new institutions of higher learning in or out of the State of Michigan. The elements of the University with their emerging problems will be studied and reported in the framework of re-

viewing the pitfalls for the unwary and innocent. Finally, the relevant background needed to describe the founding and planning of Michigan State University Oakland will be presented to give greater clarity to this document.

The Methodology

As has been indicated previously, this study is chiefly an historical account and an analysis of the development and administrative policies of Michigan State University Oakland during its first four operational years. The method has been a conventional historical process in which all known sources were examined for information pertinent to the subject. From this accumulation of material a refining process was attempted to isolate and determine those trends and causes which affected the progress of MSUO.

The data for this study was gathered from many primary and secondary sources. Because the writer was a participant in the events recorded in this history, the secondary sources are used to expand an idea or to give credence to a primary source. Of significant value to the study are the following categories of materials:

Primary

1. University publications (catalogs, bulletins, and promotional brochures).
2. Original letters and memorandums.
3. Minutes of the Board of Trustees.
4. Personal interviews with students, faculty, administrators, and alumni.
5. Minutes of the Academic Senate and Administrative Group.

6. Student publications (The Oakland Observer and Contuse).

7. Annual reports.

8. Student and University records.

9. Statistical reports prepared by University offices.

Secondary

1. Professional journals.

2. Educational reports from other states.

3. Documents from the Office of Education (Washington, D.C.), and the Department of Public Instruction (Lansing, Michigan).

4. Catalogs of other colleges and universities.

5. Histories of other institutions and books on educational philosophy, trends, and administration.

Although the quantity of data accumulated is massive, a researcher is constantly alert to the possibility that particularly essential information may elude him. However, this writer believes that the kind and number of sources open to him and used by him will guarantee the reader that a sincere effort was made to minimize any omissions of pertinent information. H. G. Good has said,

> Having collected some information upon a subject the student will desire to arrange it and present it in such form that others may get the benefit of his studies. This is partly a mechanical problem, the problem of documentation. It is partly a logical problem also, because it involves the question of the relative importance of the several items and topics. Finally, it is a philosophical and artistic problem, because every historian, deliberately or in spite of himself, interprets what he presents.[1]

In this case an honest effort was made by the writer to maintain utmost

[1]H. G. Good, "Historical Research in Education," Educational Research Bulletin, IX (February 5, 1930), 78.

objectivity and report term by term events and decisions without personal bias or interpretation becoming interlaced with the facts.

Limitation of the Study

The limitations which are inherent in any type of historical research were experienced in making this study. The abundance of data available both in professional literature and University records required a careful selection of materials and subjects to be reported. The more difficult task was to determine to what extent those areas chosen should be explored. An attempt was made to support these subjects with written documentation in order to report the actions and responses of individuals to the events of the period.

This history will be a description of the Wilson gift, the summary of the preliminary surveys, the role of key personalities, the development of the philosophy, the establishment of the aims of the curriculum, the recognition of community involvement, the recruitment of a student body, and the progress of the Charter Class from freshmen to graduates. Also included will be a review of the administrative decisions dealing with the selection of a faculty and staff, the development of short and long term student personnel policies, the choosing of the appropriate courses for the curriculum, and the planning of a workable organizational structure.

Only minor attention will be given to the subject areas of the University's administrative structure which includes the financing aspects, the physical plant, and the clerical-technical-labor staff. Any reference to these areas will be done only to clarify the narration at a specific point.

Organization of the Following Chapters

Chapter II is to provide information about the early development of Michigan State University Oakland and to identify personalities with their contributions to the planning and organizing of this new institution.

Chapter III describes the similarities and differences of other new four-year institutions (Hofstra University's New College, Florida Presbyterian College, the University of South Florida, the University of California's Santa Cruz, Harvey Mudd College, Wayne State University's Monteith College, Grand Valley State College, Florida Atlantic University, New College, Sarasota, Florida) compared to Michigan State University Oakland. An effort will be made to relate these comparisons to administrative concepts and principles.

Chapter IV will describe the moments of elation and periods of despondency of the Charter Class--its attitude toward pioneering and establishing tradition, its flexibility and elasticity to change, its lack of cohesiveness as a group, its stubbornness to achieve as individuals, and its value in decision making to the faculty and the administration.

Chapter V pertains to the University's administrative action as it deals with the following areas as they are related to the student body, faculty, staff, and community:

1. Curriculum development
2. Student personnel programs
3. New student recruitment
4. Faculty selection

5. Community relations

Chapter VI will examine the administrative actions which guided Michigan State University Oakland from an idea to reality. The University's progress will be reviewed in light of the following elements:

1. Institutional philosophy
2. Community relations
3. Student recruitment
4. Curriculum development
5. Faculty hiring
6. Administrative effectiveness

Finally, a projection of the University's future development will be made with a prediction of its chance of success.

CHAPTER II

THE BIRTH OF AN IDEA

The late Russell Wheeler (Mitch) Davenport, former managing editor of Fortune Magazine, declared that, "every human undertaking is at some point an act of faith." The generosity of Mr. and Mrs. Alfred G. Wilson, in January 1957, to give to the Michigan State University Board of Trustees their Meadow Brook Farms Estate, was such an act of faith. The 1,400 acre gift was to become the site of the first four-year publicly supported institution of higher education in Michigan in 54 years. (Western Michigan University, formerly the Western Michigan College of Education, was established in 1903.) The acceptance of the Wilson gift by the Board of Trustees on January 13, 1957, the Michigan House of Representatives on January 23, 1957, and the Michigan Senate on January 24, 1957, identified the use of the land and pledged the support of the State to make an idea a reality. In the intervening short period of 32 months, the idea was transformed into an operating entity of 570 students, 24 faculty, and approximately $3 million worth of buildings.

The story of Michigan State University Oakland had its beginning in the spring of 1955 when the Oakland County Planning Commission, chaired by J. Robert F. Swanson, of Bloomfield Hills, became convinced that the time had arrived when Michigan's second most populous county should acquire the educational services of its own institution of

higher education. As Chairman of the Oakland County Planning Commission, Mr. Swanson carried the responsibility of pursuing a vision to the ultimate gift.

The Commission, in its deliberations, considered for awhile the possibility of a junior college which might eventually become a four-year college or university center. The fact that Pontiac had had a junior college from 1917 to 1936 was the reason for the Planning Commission to think along these lines. However, it was soon realized that because of the potential student population in Oakland County, the location of a campus near the heart of Michigan's industrial center and the knowledge that ultimately a local community would find it financially impossible to support an institution of the magnitude being dreamed, it would require a broader base for support than that which could be expected from this county alone.

Oakland County was fortunate to have Mr. Swanson, who was nationally known for his leadership in college and community planning, on the Planning Commission. His interest and talent included the development of the cultural values as wlll as the physical aspects of a project. Because of his total commitment to this idea, he willingly provided the resources of his architectural firm, in the normal course of its daily work, to gather the data needed by the Planning Commission for their deliberations and decisions.

The first question to be raised by the Commission was where should this campus be located? Following an intensive information gathering period and after considering all facts, the conclusion was that such a facility should be built someplace between Square Lake Road on the south, Walton Boulevard on the north, and east of the City of

Pontiac. This area had within a radius of fifteen miles, including a portion of Macomb County, a potential student population of 103,000 by 1970. The logical site within this area, where sufficient contiguous land existed to handle the potential higher education needs for this locale, was Mr. and Mrs. Alfred G. Wilson's 1,400 acre Meadow Brook Farms.

When Mr. Swanson discussed this plan with Mr. and Mrs. Wilson in late 1956, they revealed an immediate interest. Mrs. Wilson (the widow of John F. Dodge, co-founder of the Dodge Motor Company) told Mr. Swanson that she had had numerous suggestions for the eventual use of their estate, but this one, which offered the opportunity to serve the youth of this State and the nation through an educational institution, had the greatest appeal. Mrs. Wilson said that some of the suggestions were rather bizarre but the one that she found the most humorous was to convert Meadow Brook Hall into a rest home for tired and broken down automotive executives.

On December 1, 1956, the Wilsons came to a personal decision that they would give their estate to the Board of Trustees of Michigan State University. The public announcement was made on January 3, 1957, at Bloomfield Hills Country Club. President John A. Hannah, of Michigan State University, accepted the gift and told the group of 32 county business, educational, industrial, and political leaders,

> It is difficult to put into appropriate words the gratitude all of us feel toward Mr. and Mrs. Wilson for the generous gift of what had been their home for many years, and for the additional endowment to get this new educational project under way. It is a gift which surely comes from their hearts, for no one lightly gives into the care of others a property which means what Meadow Brook Farms has meant to them. This, the most generous benefaction ever received by Michigan State, reaffirms the abiding interest in young people and the desire to help them achieve their full potential which characterized

> her service as a Board member and her subsequent activities on behalf of Michigan State.[1] (Mrs. Wilson served on the State Board of Agriculture, the governing Board of Michigan State College, from 1931 to 1937).
>
> It is unaccountable how Oakland County has been by-passed in the development of Michigan's outstanding system of higher education, but despite this handicap, it has grown in population and wealth. I am sure the Legislature, which must approve the establishment of branches of existing institutions, will agree that it is high time that the young people of this major economic area had educational opportunities equivalent to those provided in other parts of the State. It is to the eternal credit of those who live in this area that they have combined their thinking and their resources to make available for the young people of Oakland County and vicinity what in time can become one of our State's outstanding educational, cultural, and technical centers.[2]

Mrs. Wilson, speaking for herself and her husband, revealed their pleasure in turning over to Michigan State University their vast Oakland property. She said,

> My long association with the University has shown us the tremendous contribution it is making to our education and cultural life. Mr. Wilson and I have admired the institution's policies and believe it to have great possibilities for this area. We are very happy to help achieve this objective.[3]

For 15 or more years, President Hannah had been warning the State of Michigan and the nation that higher education should prepare for the bulging enrollment ahead for two very sound reasons. The first was the increase in birth rate immediately following World War II. The children born during this period were now reaching college age, and the first year to feel this bulge would be 1964 followed by a crushing enrollment in 1965. The second was a trend established during recent

[1]News Release from Department of Information Services, Michigan State University, January 3, 1957, 12:30 p.m. (in the files of the Department.

[2]The Birmingham Eccentric, January 10, 1957, p. 2-A

[3]Ibid.

decades of a higher percentage of students in each high school's graduating class going on to college. This trend was the result of the mobility of our nation, the continued high level of our national economy, and the rapid advancement in technology since the turn of the century. Although this may sound as though the sociological patterns of our people have been fashioned only by recent events, the fact is that these and many other factors have been working on America for decades. Even in the days of Jefferson and Jackson, higher education for those who could benefit was promoted. However, the signing of the Morrill Act in 1862 was the action which gave impetus to the popular view of higher education today.

Legislative Action to Study Educational Needs

Michigan, in some of its legislative actions, has been among the more forward-looking states in planning for higher education. "In 1955, the Michigan Legislature adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution #30, creating a joint committee of ten members with an equal number from both the Senate and the House of Representatives."[1] The Senate members were: Don Vander Werp, Chairman, Frank Beadle, Patrick Doyle, Edward Hutchinson, and Carlton Morris. The members from the House were: Allison Green, Vice Chairman, Charles Boyer, Arnell Engstrom, John Penczak, and Frank Williams. The Committee's charge was, "to study and recommend ways and means whereby the increasing needs of the State for higher education may be met in a most effective and economical manner."[2]

[1]John Dale Russell, The Final Report of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan, Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education (Lansing: 1958), p. v.

[2]Ibid.

After several meetings and two additional resolutions, Senate Concurrent Resolutions #2 and #36, 1956, the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education was established. This joint legislative committee then added ten citizens-at-large from the State who were not involved directly with any of Michigan's institutions of higher education. This group was named the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Higher Education.

In June 1956, Dr. John Dale Russell, Chancellor and Executive Secretary of the New Mexico Board of Educational Finance, was appointed director of the survey. His full time assistant was Dr. Orvin T. Richardson, then on the faculty of Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

The Legislative Study Committee outlined the responsibility of the Citizens' Advisory Committee as follows:

> The Legislative Committee recognized the necessity of providing adequate opportunities for an increasing number of young people who will be wanting to continue their education in the years immediately ahead. There is no question that the burden of providing adequate support for the facilities of higher education will increase, and it is hoped that an equitable distribution of this load through public and private enterprise and at local and state levels can be encouraged.[1]

A statement made by Russell in the preliminary report to the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, significant to Oakland County and Michigan State University's Board of Trustees was,

> The highest rate of college attendance in Michigan is found in counties that have a state-controlled institution. The presence of a privately controlled college in a county also tends to raise the percentage of young people attending college but not so markedly as in the presence of a state-controlled institution.

[1]John Dale Russell, Preliminary Report to the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, P. O. Box 240, State Capitol, (Lansing: 1957), p. 12.

> The significant conclusion from the study of the county origins of students attending Michigan colleges is that an important stimulation to college attendance arises from the presence of an institution in the locality. It seems clear that, if the goal of the State is to provide the widest possible opportunity to young people to continue beyond the high school, one of the important means of achieving that goal is to distribute facilities for higher education as widely as possible. . . . It seems much wiser to create new institutions at strategically located centers in the State where facilities for higher education are not now available than to attempt to concentrate more and more students at the existing centers as enrollments increase in the future.[1]

Russell's statement was not true for Oakland County, because here was the county with the second largest number of students in the State attending Michigan colleges without a post-secondary institution within its boundaries. However, the two primary reasons for this anomaly of college enrollment were: (1) Oakland County's suburban relationship to the City of Detroit, and (2) its high average socio-economic status. If the Board of Trustees was looking for a rationale to establish MSUO, Russell's statement was ready made for influencing the people of the county.

Dr. Russell and his associates finished their work in September 1958, and submitted to the Legislature a preliminary report, twelve staff studies, and a final report to meet the legislative charge.

Staff Study #11, "Institution Planning for Higher Education in Michigan," dealt with the need for new institutions. This included private, public, community, and branch colleges. The study had two specific recommendations regarding branches of existing state-controlled colleges and universities. The first was, "It is recommended that it <u>not</u> be the policy of the State of Michigan to make further necessary extensions of the facilities for publicly controlled higher education

[1] <u>Ibid</u>., pp. 58-60.

through the establishment of branches of the state-controlled colleges and universities."[1] The second was,

> It is recommended that, as rapidly as it is feasible, each of the existing branches of the state-controlled institutions in Michigan be set up as an autonomous state institution, with its own board of control and administrative staff. It is recognized that a considerable time will be required to carry out this recommendation and that the solution reached may be different in various locations.[2]

Russell summarized, based on his experience in other states, the advantages and disadvantages of establishing branch campuses. The advantages he listed as follows: (1) The branch may benefit by administrative and instructional "know-how" of the parent institution and thus may avoid mistakes in its early operation. (2) If some kind of physical plant exists, the operation can get underway without the usual wait for construction. (3) Costs for maintenance of a major central services can be reduced if handled at the parent institution. (4) The branch's accreditation is assured and immediate through its affiliation with an established institution. (5) The prestige and glamor of the parent institution furnishes a "halo effect" for the branch which provides immediate acceptability . (6) Local citizens benefit from the increased dollar resources added to the community as well as an educational institution easily accessible to its young people without the great burden of financing it alone.[3]

Among the disadvantages, he cited the following: (1) The parent institution is reticent to give a branch much autonomy over its own affairs. This action usually curtails the strength and individuality of

[1]Russell, The Final Report . . . 138.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid., p. 136

the branch's educational program. (2) When the power of decision rests at the parent institution an absentee landlordship is felt by the administration, faculty, students, and community. (3) If re-entrenchment is necessary because of the lack of resources, the branch will usually suffer disproportionately to the parent institution. (4) Educational opportunities on a branch campus are usually inferior to the main campus because the programs and services are less broadly developed at the branch. (5) Little creativeness or individuality is allowed at the branch campus, because generally the curriculum parallels that which is taught on the main campus. Community needs are not considered. (6) Branches foster a spirit of competitive empire building among the major universities. (7) Duplication of some services on a distant branch campus increases costs that reduces resources for institutional purpose. (8) The Legislature's authority to establish new institutions is taken away when parent institutions create branches.[1]

In the case of MSUO, it was possible for Michigan State University to establish this new institution without the Legislature's permission because of its constitutional power. However, Michigan State University, like the University of Michigan when it established the Flint and Dearborn branches, courteously referred the question of establishing these branches to the Legislature. Politically, this was the only sensible approach to take if subsequent financial support was to be expected.

This Legislative study ran concurrent with much of the original curriculum and planning sessions for Michigan State University Oakland. The Board of Trustees was interested in the study and its recommendations,

[1]Ibid., p. 136-138.

because one of the locations identified in the study needing a four-year institution was the area of Oakland and Macomb Counties. The reinforcement received from the study assisted the Board of Trustees in proceeding with transforming the nucleus of an idea into a reality.

Planned to be Different

As will be seen later, the curriculum of Michigan State University Oakland was to differ markedly from nearly all of its contemporary public institutions in purpose, philosophy, and attitude. It was felt by the several groups that worked on developing the curriculum that its design should be away from the increasing trend of vocational training in college. President Hannah said, "Its advocates intend Oakland to be a liberal arts college of quality but one aimed at developing the abilities of good high school graduates, not a highly selected elite."[1] Dr. Thomas Hamilton, one of the original planners of the new institution, said at the Charter Class Convocation, "Here, if ever there is an opportunity for a fresh start--a chance to choose wisely from that which time and experience have proved valid and to clear away the rubbish of superficiality which certainly clings with at least the tenacity of ivy to many older universities."[2] In other words, it was decided that Michigan State University Oakland should be a university of the highest quality dedicated to the liberal arts ideal. It would be free to go its own way in search of better methods to do higher education's job.

These thoughts and ideals have been stated many times in many

[1]"This is Michigan State University Oakland," The Michigan State University Magazine, XX, No. 11, November 1959, p. 12.

[2]Michigan State University-Oakland, Convocation of Charter Class (Rochester, Michigan, September 17, 1959), p. 17.

different ways. Each new college or university feels the responsibility of setting the world right. Some have developed their curriculum to meet the immediate needs of their constituents, while others feel that their students will be best served if education is oriented to the past and approaches the future with theory at its base.

What is correct or best probably will never be discovered but man's eternal optimism will lead others to try. Michigan State University Oakland hoped that its approach to developing a curriculum would be the secret combination that all past colleges and universities have sought but failed to find.

Need for Research and Planning

The Board realized that before any new venture could become a reality there had to be extensive research and planning accomplished and coordinated. MSUO was no exception.

Among the things to be accomplished before the first students enrolled were: (1) study of the demographic information about the area the institution would serve; (2) a survey of the population to determine the attitude of the people toward the establishment of an institution and the educational aspirations these people have for themselves and their children; (3) the selection of interested and influential individuals who would lend their support and their names to promote this new enterprise; (4) the creation of a basic educational philosophy that would guide the institution; (5) the preparation of a curriculum appropriate to the philosophy; (6) the establishment of channels of communication which would make the idea grow in the minds of the people that the institution would serve; (7) the selection of the staff and faculty

which, during the early years of the institution, should be responsible for transforming the image into reality.

Of course, in all of this, the ingredients which are necessary to cement these parts into a whole are the personality, imagination, and resourcefulness of the individuals involved. In the history of higher education in the United States, the success or failure of an institution has depended upon the perseverance of the president and his associates. There are many examples of men (Thomas Jefferson, the University of Virginia; Eleazor Wheelock, Dartmouth College; Andrew D. White, Cornell University; and William R. Harper, University of Chicago) who breathed life into an idea and created an institution of higher learning.

The founding of Michigan State University Oakland was a rather unique situation in the history of higher education in Michigan in that it was assisted into being by a long established and successful university but was not relegated to a role of a branch. This institution was planned to be a four-year undergraduate college, free to plan its own curriculum, set its own internal procedures, select its own faculty, and to be free from departmental or divisional control of a parent institution. However, the Board of Trustees of Michigan State University retained its right and continued its responsibility to act as the legal body for ultimate decisions. In addition, the Board of Trustees charged President Hannah with the responsibility for the success of this new college but delegated authority to Vice President Durward B. Varner, first Chancellor of Michigan State University Oakland, to take the necessary action and to make the appropriate decisions to establish this new institution. The creation of new campuses in Michigan by other

colleges and universities was not new. In 1946, Northern Michigan College of Mining and Technology at Houghton, established a two-year branch (freshman and sophomore years) at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan. The University of Michigan created the Flint College of the University of Michigan (junior and senior years) in 1956, and the Dearborn Center (junior and senior years) in 1959. In each of these cases, the administrative control, the curriculum, and the faculty were determined and approved by the parent institutions.

As a first step in the planning of Michigan State University Oakland, the College of Education of Michigan State University was asked in January, 1957, to do a study of "selected population characteristics of Oakland and Macomb Counties, Michigan." The summary of this report indicated: (1) even by conservative estimates, the population of these two counties would nearly double between 1957 and 1970 (from approximately 750,000 to 1,445,000); (2) the birth rate and migration patterns predicted that the college-age population (18 to 24 years old) would likely increase at an even more rapid rate than the total population (from approximately 73,000 to 166,700); (3) the increases in population will have a resulting effect on the urbanization of the entire area; (4) the population of the area is largely native-born white with the exception of the urban centers where the Negro population is increasing; (5) the majority of workers for both counties are clerical, craftsmen, and operative occupations related to the automobile industry with a core of professional workers which was somewhat greater proportionately in Oakland County than in Macomb County.[1]

[1]Selected Population Characteristics of Oakland and Macomb Counties, Michigan (East Lansing: Michigan State University College of Education, January 1957).

Following the demographic study, the College of Education was then asked to study the "post-secondary education in Oakland-Macomb Counties." This study involved tallying answers on over 60,000 questionnaires. The group surveyed included parents of second, tenth, and twelfth grade students as well as tenth grade students and educational personnel in Oakland and Macomb Counties' schools

The conclusions of this sample revealed the following information about the attitudes of this area toward post-secondary education: (1) there would be an unmistakable and persistent demand for a post-secondary program (the number of people desiring programs was increasing at a rate greater than that of the population. The Michigan State University Oakland enrollment should be expected to increase at a rate almost three times that of the total population during the next fifteen years); (2) the number and percent of persons desiring non-degree programs ranged from two to three times greater than those presently preferring degree programs; (3) both degree and non-degree programs appealed to people of a variety of ages; (4) many individuals did not seem certain about their post-secondary school education goals, so it seemed prudent to provide programs for the potential as well as the initial degree students; (5) no one program seemed to meet the variety of education needs indicated by the respondents; (6) a need for a general education course seemed apparent; (7) the answers of the respondents indicated a compelling challenge for program development to meet the problems created by rapid urbanization.[1]

[1]Post-Secondary Education in Oakland-Macomb Counties (East Lansing: Michigan State University College of Education, 1957).

Questions Raised

These two studies raised several significant questions about the readiness of this community of two counties, to establish an institution of higher education in this part of the State. The potential growth in population and the impending urbanization would suggest that a college organized to meet the needs of the community should be assured success. However, in a population where a college education is not part of the family tradition, it would be necessary to know the educational aspirations of the parents for themselves and their children. What is the "college consciousness" of the population? What educational materials may be found in the homes of these families? What readiness is there on the part of the people? What is the possible enrollment? If the potential student has been deprived of educational opportunities, this factor could have a definite effect on the immediate and ultimate curriculum development of the institution. There would need to be a "continuous variation in experimentation with instructional methods and techniques."[1] In other words, what planning, organization, administration, and development of educational programs are needed to serve this community?

Michigan State University Oakland Foundation

The philosophy or goal of this institution, based on the results of the questionnaire described above, would seem appropriate to a comprehensive community college. But this is not what happened, because shortly after the survey was completed, a group of 50 citizens from Oakland and Macomb Counties were appointed by President Hannah as a

[1] Ibid., p. 15.

permanent advisory group to assist the Board of Trustees in a supporting role to develop the University. The Michigan State University Oakland Foundation, as this group was named, included educators, captains of industry, business leaders, labor leaders, government officials, and interested citizens. The Advisory Committee members initially took the stance that "the institution should not attempt to take care of the junior college needs of the area. The community or junior college function should be met by the development of local institutions."[1] The group leaned "toward a broad base of general education leading to specialization indicated by area needs."[2]

The establishment of this group and the subsequent working committees was an old continuing education and agricultural extention approach, used successfully by Michigan State University many times to involve people at the grass roots of a problem or a project. The foundation members soon added other community-minded individuals and each member was quickly assigned to one of the following working committees: program, continuing education, community relations, and finance. These committees did "a great deal of spade work and planning"[3] and took an active role in studying the direction and assisting in the creation of the image of this institution.

Original Curriculum Planning

MSU's Vice President Thomas Hamilton, subsequently president of

[1]Minutes of January 26, 1957, Oakland/Macomb County Advisory Committee to the Michigan State University, Rochester, Michigan (in the files of the Committee).

[2]Ibid.

This is Michigan State University Oakland, The Michigan State University Magazine, November 1959, p. 13.

the University of Hawaii, had prepared, on December 29, 1956, a proposal entitled, "The Matilda Wilson College of Michigan State University." This proposal was the original curriculum thinking for what was to become MSUO. However, as discussions increased and more information became available, some of Vice President Hamilton's basic ideas gave way to new concepts while others continued to permeate the thinking which is described below.

Chancellor Varner said in May, 1959, the development of the curriculum "is the product of four separate but related approaches to the problems."[1]

On June 18, 1957, a small group of Michigan State University faculty members were assembled by Vice President Hamilton, "to do some preliminary planning for the curriculum at the Oakland branch."[2] Dr. Hamilton had prepared a "list of assumptions stated in a doctrinnaire form"[3] to start the discussion.

ASSUMPTIONS ON WHICH CURRICULUM PLANNING FOR MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY AT OAKLAND MIGHT PROCEED.

1. The quarter system will be used.

2. All courses, regardless of the curriculum, will be five credit hours and a normal student load will be three of these at any one time.

3. One-third of each student's total program will be devoted to general and liberal studies. This third will not be confined to the first two years but extend through all four. Thus, each year a student will take throughout the year one five-hour course known as general and liberal studies. These need

[1]Curriculum (Rochester, Michigan: Michigan State University Oakland, May 22, 1959), p. 5.

[2]Letter from Thomas H. Hamilton, Vice President, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, June 17, 1957.

[3]Ibid.

not necessarily all be required integrated courses, although probably some should be. There may be merit in letting some of these general and liberal requirements be satisfied on an elective basis.

4. There will be no separate course in written and spoken communication but these skills will be taught as a part of the general and liberal studies. In short, students will write and speak and be graded on these skills but in relation to the content they pursue in the general and liberal studies.

5. In the general and liberal studies, natural science will be included, but rather than being a laboratory course it will be concerned primarily with the history and philosophy of natural science and will utilize demonstration laboratories. This seems justifiable since most students who go through this institution will have a laboratory science in any event.

6. For the present at least, there will be no military unit nor will physical education in its usual sense be required. However, some thinking might be done concerning the possibility of developing, on a non-credit basis during the first two years, a skill of some sport or physical activity which the student might carry on after graduation. At least in the beginning there will not be funds for an elaborate gymnasium or physical education facilities and the resources which exist on Meadow Brook Farms plus the resources of the community will need to be utilized.

7. In the beginning, curriculum planning should contemplate the following:
    a. The necessary courses in liberal and general studies.
    b. A concentration (approximately nine five-hour courses) in the field of business.
    c. A concentration, again defined as nine five-hour courses, in elementary education.
    d. The auxiliary work necessary for the preparation of secondary school teachers, contemplating, in the beginning, only a teaching major in mathematics, chemistry, and physics.
    e. A concentration in engineering science as non-specialized as relates to hardware as is feasible.
    f. The necessary supporting work in the arts and sciences for the above.

8. In planning this curriculum, the fact that these are five-hour courses should not mean necessarily that each course must have the student in class for five hours. Emphasis should be placed on the largest possible measure of responsibility being placed on the student. All planning should bear in mind that this institution will be faced with a shortage of college faculty just as others will be and are. In this connection, and also in terms of it being a sound educational practice, students who can demonstrate that they have mastered the content of a course should be given credit and moved along.

9. A normal teaching load will be defined as two five-hour courses.

10. Registration should occur only in the autumn.

11. No university-wide final examination period will be planned. It will be the responsibility of each faculty member to evaluate the work of his own students.

12. The grading system will be Honors, Pass and Fail.

13. Real attention in planning this institution should be given to the idea of simplicity as far as the inherent demands of the disciplines will permit. Knowledge is sufficiently complicated in its own right as to need no unnecessary compounding in either curriculum or adminstrative procedures.

14. Attached are some schematic presentations which might be helpful.

POSSIBLE ORGANIZATION OF MSUO

1. The Division of General and Liberal Arts and Sciences. (This would include not only such integrated and elective courses as might be needed but also the natural and behavioral sciences, mathematics and the humanities which would be needed as supporting and related studies.)

2. The Division of Engineering Science.

3. The Division of Business.

4. The Division for Coordinating Teacher Preparation (this would include both the courses for elementary teachers and those needed by secondary teachers).[1]

[1] Ibid., attachment, pp. 1-4.

TABLE I

POSSIBLE ALLOCATION OF TIME IN
THE MSUO CURRICULUM

	Autumn Quarter	Winter Quarter	Spring Quarter
Senior Year	Concentration Concentration General & Liberal Studies	Concentration Concentration General & Liberal Studies	Concentration Concentration General & Liberal Studies
Junior Year	Concentration Supporting & Related General & Liberal Studies	Concentration Supporting & Related General & Liberal Studies	Concentration Supporting & Related General & Liberal Studies
Sophomore Year	Supporting & Related Supporting & Related General & Liberal Studies	Supporting & Related Supporting & Related General & Liberal Studies	Supporting & Related Supporting & Related General & Liberal Studies
Freshman Year	Supporting & Related Supporting & Related General & Liberal Studies	Supporting & Related Supporting & Related General & Liberal Studies	Supporting & Related Supporting & Related General & Liberal Studies

Over the period of the next several months, each committee member, with the help of his colleagues, worked on this assignment with great dedication. In October 1957, Professor Edward Blackman was requested by Vice President Hamilton to assume the Chairmanship of this planning committee and as chairman he provided the direction and focus for the many discussions that took place that fall. Several position papers were prepared and the distillation of their content formed the basis for the final report presented to President Hannah in December of 1957.

Chancellor Varner wrote on January 8, 1958, lauding the members of the committee for the work they had done and stated that, "Certainly this is going to be an important guideline in getting this program launched on a successful note."[1] But he raised the question why the committee abandoned the idea of establishing three five-hour courses for each quarter. He stated,

> To me, there was a good deal of logic in this approach in that it would reduce the number of areas requiring attention from the students in a given quarter, it would greatly simplify the scheduling procedures, and finally, it would make possible the utilization of the Physical Plant to a much greater degree than would otherwise be so.
>
> I realize that your committee must have given a good deal of consideration to all these points plus others, but it did seem to me in the early stages that this was one of the innovations which had great promise for a variety of reasons. As I have looked over the general description of the subject matter content, it occurred to me that with but one minor modification the three-course system could be substituted without too much upheaval.[2]

Chairman Blackman answered Chancellor Varner, On January 9,

[1]Letter from Durward B. Varner, Vice President, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, January 8, 1958.

[2]Ibid.

1958 by writing,

> During its first few meetings under the chairmanship of Tom Hamilton, the MSUO Curriculum Committee discussed at length the alternatives of the three five-hour courses or the four four-hour courses. Both Tom and the members of the committee, with one exception, strongly favored the three-course system. The exception was Von Tersch, who felt that the four-course plan would facilitate the development of the two engineering curricula.
>
> When the committee resumed its work in the fall of 1957, it was instructed to proceed on the four-course plan. This was not a committee decision. I don't know who made the decision nor did I ask. I simply assumed that the problems in engineering produced the four-course decision.
>
> I am in complete agreement with the reasoning in your letter with respect to the desirability of offering a program of three five-hour courses. If the engineers can accommodate themselves to the change, I am sure that the other curricula could easily be modified to fit the new arrangement. Should you wish to reactivate the committee for the purpose of effecting the change, I shall be happy to participate in its work.[1]

This issue, although dropped at the time, was reopened in August 1959, when two MSUO faculty members (Messrs. Matthews and McKay) visited Dartmouth, Brandeis, and Hofstra to study their scheduling procedures and concluded that the four four-hour courses was best suited to MSUO.

Curriculum - Freshman English

A proposal made by Vice President Hamilton in his June 17, 1957 list of Assumptions, and included in the final report to President Hannah, suggested that freshman English, as traditionally taught should be eliminated, "but these skills will be taught as a part of the general and liberal studies. In short, students will write and speak and be graded on these skills, but in relation to the content that they pursue

[1]Letter from Dr. Edward Blackman, Professor of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, January 9, 1958.

in the general and liberal studies."[1]

This suggestion was not left unchallenged, because on May 5, 1958, 29 members of the Michigan State University English department sent the following letter to Vice President Hamilton:

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY - East Lansing

Department of English
May 5, 1958

Dr. Thomas H. Hamilton
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Michigan State University
305 Administration Building

Dear Dr. Hamilton:

We, the undersigned members of the Department of English protest with all the conviction and determination at our command the deliberate omission of freshman English as a required course in the proposed Meadowbrook curriculum.

To abolish freshman English as a separate subject and to entrust the responsibility for the teaching of the principles and practices of close reading and clear writing to those whose primary training will not have prepared them for these critical tasks and whose interests will naturally lie elsewhere must in the end defeat one of the fundamental purposes for which any institution of higher learning is established: to turn out persons who are able, among other skills, to read with discernment and taste and to express themselves in clear, cogent, and persuasive form.

We understand that there is a measure of disillusionment with certain so-called new techniques of teaching freshman English but to condemn freshman English as a discipline for this failure is mistakenly to confuse courses which differ altogether from each other in their aims and methods. That the Meadowbrook curriculum committee was unaware of this crucial difference is manifest by its failure to make any effort to consult with members of the department of English before reaching its decision to abolish freshman English. We should like to recall to you the fact that the Department of English had many years of experience with the teaching of freshman English before the course

[1]Letter from Thomas H. Hamilton, Vice President, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, June 17, 1957.

was taken from it.

If, as a result of the curriculum committee's refusal to permit the teaching of freshman English at Meadowbrook, graduates of that institution will be marked by the stigma of inadequate control over their own native tongue, it will not be the reputation of Meadowbrook alone which will suffer but that of Michigan State University itself.

We, therefore urgently request that this decision be reviewed and that the Department of English be given an opportunity to express itself on this most important question.

Respectfully yours,

Herbert Weisinger
W. B. Moffett
C. D. Mead
Bernard I. Duffey
William W. Heist
Branford P. Miller
K. C. Randall
James D. Rust
John A. Yunck
V. E. Leichty
C. C. Hamilton
Elwood F. Lawrence
Stanley Harrison
David W. D. Dickson
Jarold Baum
C. M. Newlin
Lawrence Babb
H. Kelly Crockett
H. R. Sturck
H. Grant Sampson
John Street
Claude Hunsberger
Harry R. Hoppe
George R. Price
Sam S. Baskett
John A. Waite
A. J. M. Smith
R. B. Nye
John W. Manion

Vice President Hamilton's reply was sent on May 14 to Dr. Russel B. Nye, Chairman of the English Department:

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Of Agriculture and Applied Science - East Lansing

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs May 14, 1958

Dr. Russell Nye
213 Morrill Hall
Campus

Dear Russ:

The letter signed by you and the other members of the department concerning the omission of freshman English from the MSUO curriculum I am forwarding to Mr. Varner who has the responsibility for this development.

While I am delighted that the members of the English Department are concerned about this curriculum, I think there is no good cause for alarm at this date. If I read the report of the Committee correctly, it certainly did not deprecate training in the writing of English, but rather suggested that there might be a way to do it in combination with certain other subject matter.

I think it should also be pointed out that no decision has been taken. This report is simply one designed to serve as a basis for discussion when a faculty at MSUO comes into being. Certainly no one would want to impose a curriculum on another faculty.

In any event, I am sure that Mr. Varner will see that the opinions which you and the other members of the English Department have expressed are given full consideration.

Cordially yours,

Thomas H. Hamilton
Vice President

je

cc. D. B. Varner

Dr. Nye did not give up easily and sent an informal letter on May 15, to Vice President Hamilton, attempting to caution further against the suggested plan.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY - East Lansing

Department of English

May 15, 1958

Vice President Thomas Hamilton
Campus
Administration Building

Dear Tom:

Thanks for sending on to Mr. Varner the communication from our department concerning the curriculum at MSUO. We recognize, of course, that the committee in charge of planning wishes to produce MSUO students who can write and read; there was no one on the committee, notably, who had ever tried to teach students to do this, which may account for their belief that it can be done in combination with something else.

Since we who have had experience in teaching composition had found that it is very difficult to teach students literacy by spending full time and using qualified personnel trained for the task, it was hard for us to see how part-time instruction by untrained, less qualified staff would do the job. Frankly, this has been tried before and it simply doesn't work. Even Michigan has tried it. Communication Skills is no happier than we are with the MSUO idea.

Yours,

Russel Nye

This matter was discussed many times during the next thirteen months. After July 1, 1959, Dr. Robert Hoopes, the new Dean of the Faculty, settled the matter when he established the curriculum for MSUO's freshman English course and entitled it "Rhetoric and Composition."

Dr. Nye found in Dr. Hoopes a fellow professor of English. (However, the story did not end there, because from the beginning, this course underwent continuous change until the fall of 1965 when the teaching of writing to freshmen was assigned to faculty teaching the University Courses which brought the University full circle back to the general philosophy stated earlier by the curriculum planning groups).

Curriculum - Meadow Brook Seminars

The second approach to the curriculum problem was completely independent of the Michigan State faculty committee. It was the work of the Program Committee of the MSUO Foundation, chaired by Mr. James C. Zeder, Vice President, Chrysler Motor Corporation, and also one of the vice presidents of the MSUO Foundation. This group sponsored the five Meadow Brook Seminars on Higher Learning--liberal arts, teacher preparation, business administration, engineering science, and continuing education.

"Some of America's most distinguished educators and citizens"[1] participated in these meetings. The Committee said to the Liberal Arts Seminar participants,

> with your experience and knowledge in the field of educational matters, and given a clean slate upon which to write, how would you go about developing a program which will insure that students at this new institution are, in fact, liberally educated regardless of the field of specialization?[2]

The Engineering Science, Teacher Preparation, and Business Administration

[1] Curriculum (Rochester, Michigan: Michigan State University-Oakland, May 22, 1959), p. 5.

[2] "Introductory Comments for the Meadow Brook Seminars on Higher Learning, The Liberal Arts," (Michigan State University-Oakland, December 13, 1958), p. 4. (Mimeographed).

Seminar participants were given the question,

> with your knowledge and experience in the field of _____ education, how would you organize a program in_____ at this new institution to train young people for the half century ahead of us?[1]

In each seminar the participants, "were invited to direct their thoughts to the opportunity of developing a total new curriculum in a situation where there are relatively few of the traditional limitations."[2] The challenge was met. The Seminars were very successful and formed another dimension in developing the curriculum. It was noted how much the thoughts of the Seminar participants agreed with the thoughts and report of the MSU Curriculum Committee. Each group, in many ways, reinforced the other. The liberal arts participants stated,

> there seems to be an agreement that a new institution of higher learning needs to break away from many of the restrictions which have grown up and those that have existed for some time. There should be a de-emphasis of such things as courses, credits, examinations, and formal teaching. A great deal more stress should be given to students learning. Thus, the library and the laboratory should replace the classroom as the center of the educational program. We have far too much emphasis on the student attending class for a given number of hours each week and listening to lectures. This has made the student's role in learning essentially a passive one.
>
> If a new approach is to succeed, of course, it becomes more important than ever that great attention be given to the total environment. Desirable intellectual outcomes can be expected only in an atmosphere consciously made propitious for intellectual activities. Many positive things can be done to assist, but there also are some things to be avoided such as intercollegiate athletics, sororities and fraternities, a course system, the lecture system, the proliferation of courses, grades and examinations, and rigid departmental organization.

[1]"Introductory Comments for the Meadow Brook Seminars on Higher Learning, Engineering Science, Teacher Preparation, Business Administration," (Michigan State University-Oakland, August 16, 1958, November 8, 1958, November 22, 1958), p. 4. (Mimeographed).

[2]Curriculum, 5.

> Above all, a proper university must, as one of its functions in the Liberal Arts, maintain an environment in which the quest for truth is recognized as primary. For just this quest for truth made of Athens, 'a mad miracle of a city--flashing out in all directions,' so in this quest is the hope for a free society.[1]

The Teacher Education participants said,

> Perhaps a sensible point of departure would be to make certain that it was thoroughly understood that the preparation of teachers is the responsibility of the total university and cannot with success, be delegated alone to any department or division or college. The reason for this stems from the fact that the preparation of teachers is neither a simple nor unitary task, but rather a complicated four-faceted responsibility which can only be borne by the total university. First, it should be observed that all teachers, regardless of level or specialty, must be provided a liberal or general education of excellence . . . . Second, each prospective teacher's learning experience must make certain that they have competence in the special field in which they are to be certified as teachers . . . . Third, the teacher must be prepared adequately in the knowledge of contemporary society and comprehend to the best of his ability the nature of the learning process and its implications for teacher methods . . . . Fourth, the teacher preparation program must help each student to truly understand the nature of the discipline which he aspires to teach.[2]

The Business Administration participants said,

> It has become increasingly clear that it is not the function of our undergraduate education to train a business man, but to produce a citizen and an educated human being. While it is true that the students should be provided with sufficient orientation toward his vocation so that entrance into it will be facilitated, it is truer still that any curriculum which attempts to provide at the undergraduate level all the skills and knowledge which the mature businessman has at his disposal is destined to failure from the outset. Such a curriculum not only overlooks the primary function of an undergraduate education, but it totally ignores the plurality of business methodology and the nature of change in a dynamic society.[3]

[1]Thomas H. Hamilton and Durward B. Varner, Meadow Brook Seminars on Higher Learning - The Liberal Arts, A Synthesis and Summary, Michigan State University-Oakland, (Rochester, Michigan: 1958), pp. 5-6.

[2]Ibid, pp. 2-4. [3]Ibid, p. 2.

The Engineering Science participants said,

> The engineer, at the head of a multi-billion dollar project, will find that he must have some knowledge of, and be able to communicate with, the practitioners of law, of finance, and of politics. Here, as many an engineer has learned to his considerable discomfort, blue prints and formulae prove unsatisfactory as media of communication. Thus, it becomes clear that the engineer of the future must not only be infinitely more skilled in his own discipline, but he must at least be an adequate generalist in the disciplines related scientifically to his own as well as those liberal disciplines which permit him to understand something about the nature of the physical and social world and the human beings and their works with which that world is populated.[1]

Curriculum - Michigan State's Deans and Faculty

The next approach to developing the curriculum involved Michigan State University Academic Deans and key members of their staffs. Their responsibility was to study and to work out a procedure for implementing the many recommendations from the original Curriculum Committee report and the Meadow Brook Seminars. However, this group recognized that the following questions had to be answered before much could be done to respond to their assignment.

> What are the basic concepts which each student should learn?
>
> What are the outer boundaries, if any, that the undergraduates can reach?
>
> What balance should be maintained between major general education and elective courses?
>
> In what sequence and in what quarter should courses be taught, and what should be the basic structure of the courses?
>
> On what basis should course materials be selected--primary sources or other materials?
>
> What should the qualifications of a faculty member be who is to teach the general education courses?

[1] Ibid.

As the work progressed, it soon became obvious that the time had now arrived when the details of a specific curriculum had to be spelled out. This assignment which was the fourth and final phase was made to a young and vigorous group of Michigan State University faculty. This working committee actually identified course objectives, content, credit, sequence of courses, requirements, and electives.

Curriculum - Michigan State's Honors College Students

Before submitting a final report, the decisions were tested by a select group of Michigan State University Honors College Students. The reactions of these students were: (1) if the number of courses offered each quarter should be three five-credit courses, then unusual care must be exercised in the selection of the faculty and only the ablest should teach; (2) a general reservation was expressed concerning the omission of the formal teaching of English composition; (3) the omission of R.O.T.C. was endorsed unanimously, but it was stated that there should be a provision at some point in the curriculum for teaching, as a part of the liberal studies, a block of material dealing with military affairs and military organization as it functions within the total governmental organization; (4) a concern was expressed that the engineering curriculum had no elective courses that could be used for additional fine arts study; (5) the student counseling should be handled entirely by faculty rather than by a paid staff of specialists in student problems; (6) a non-compulsory class attendance was favored and self-study should be promoted by each instructor; (7) a provision for small group discussions and free access to the faculty for all students were

encouraged.[1]

Curriculum-Planning Summary

The accumulated data from all groups was turned over to Chancellor Varner to be used by the first MSUO faculty when it arrived in the summer of 1959. How much of it was specifically used is hard to say, but the work of scores of people over a period of two and one-half years set the general guideline which did form much of the original curriculum. Chancellor Varner wrote in May 1959,

> It has been both interesting and gratifying to observe that certain major thoughts have had almost unanimous endorsement. Among these, we can identify the following:
>
> 1. MSUO will consider as its first objective the establishment of a first-class, undergraduate program. This does not bar the possibility of graduate work at a later date, but rather establishes a clear-cut priority of effort.
>
> 2. In order that this institution may convert to a twelve-month operational program at the earliest possible date, it has been decided that the quarter system will be adopted.
>
> 3. During the freshman year the normal student load will be four courses. In the sophomore, junior, and senior years, the load normally will be three five-credit courses, except for three additional three-credit courses which may be selected by the student during any three of the last nine quarters.
>
> 4. Physical education will not be required for any student, although physical education programs on an informal basis will be available and students will be encouraged to participate.
>
> 5. ROTC will not be offered.

[1]Summary of Comments from Honors College Group Concerning Tentative MSUO Curriculum, Michigan State University Oakland, Spring 1959 (in the files of the University).

6. There will not be a separate basic college but a substantial number of Liberal Studies courses will be expected of all students. These courses will constitute about half of the total curriculum and will be distributed over the entire four years, with a heavier concentration in the first two years.

7. The MSUO faculty will offer no course of sub-collegiate character. It will be assumed that only those students will be admitted who have demonstrated in their high school record that they have the proper training and ability to do college-level work.

   Nevertheless, some students inadequately trained in one or more of the basic tools of learning will inevitably appear in every freshman class. An effort will be made to identify such students as early as possible in their college career, and for them the MSUO administration will make available high school courses taught by high school teachers recruited for this purpose. Those who take such courses will be required to pay $15 per term per course. This fee should be adequate to defray the cost of instruction.

   The faculty will place strong emphasis on writing in all courses, and the quality of a student's writing will be the concern of the entire faculty.

8. The faculty will be encouraged to explore new arrangements for improving the learning process. Rather than prescribe new procedures to be followed, great freedom will be afforded the faculty with the hope that ways may be devised for improving the teacher-student relationship and for accelerating and enriching the educational program. For example, it is expected that less reliance will be placed on the formal lecture and more on small group discussions and personal consultation. Similarly, students will be encouraged to do as much independent study as is productive, with a corresponding reduction in the formal classroom situations.

9. In an effort to release dollars for faculty salaries, the use of technological devices will be encouraged where they offer promise of improving the efficiency of the program. For example, careful explorations will be made in the use of closed circuit television, tape recordings, records, film strips, and moving pictures.

Finally, it should be made clear that much of the content of the courses listed will of necessity be determined by the faculty of the institution, and that changes will occur with considerable

> frequency in an effort to maintain a fresh approach to the educational problems of the period.[1]

Thus, the newly established MSUO faculty ably guided by Robert Hoopes, Dean of the Faculty and George Matthews, Professor of History, devised during July and August 1959, a first year curriculum which met the program needs of the "Charter Class" students.

Foundation Committees

As stated previously, the MSUO Foundation had four standing committees. The important work of the Program Committee was described as part of the MSUO's curriculum development. However, to omit the work of the Continuing Education Committee, the Community Relations Committee and the Finance Committee would leave an unforgivable gap in the MSUO story.

Continuing Education Committee

The data from the Michigan State University College of Education Study on the aspirations of parents and students in Oakland and Macomb Counties was given many interpretations. Each group, analyzing these data, saw in it different information. The Continuing Education Committee, chaired by Elizabeth H. Gossett, was no exception for these data reinforced the urgent need for a meaningful program of adult education in Oakland and Macomb Counties. The implications drawn from the study by the Committee were: (1) a significant number of parents desire to resume their educational studies, (2) parents responding in the survey have a wide range of educational interest, (3) parents interested

[1]Curriculum, 8-10

in continuing their education represent a variety of different levels of past educational attainment, (4) opportunities are not now available to serve the post-secondary educational interests of the adult population in the two-county area, (5) there appears to be sufficient needs and interests to warrant the introduction of educational opportunities at Meadow Brook for adults on a part-time evening study basis, (6) adult interests include both degree and non-degree programs, and (7) in most of these desired areas of education, programs are currently provided at Michigan State University, therefore, development at Meadow Brook might proceed at an accelerated rate.[1]

The Committee established as their primary purpose to educate themselves on the far-reaching concepts of the whole theory of education for adults and to try to approach the problem constructively and with imagination in order to lay down a proper program for MSUO.[2] Dr. Lowell Eklund, Director of the Southeastern Michigan State University Continuing Education Program, as an ex-officio member of the Continuing Education Committee, guided the group through this educative process. His able leadership and deep knowledge of the subject helped the members of the Committee to understand the basic concepts and current thinking to which they were exposed. However, as a committee, they assisted little in the establishing of MSUO's division of Continuing Education, but it can be said that their support and contacts in the two-county community proved invaluable to the University during the formative period as well as later.

[1] Post-Secondary Education in Oakland-Macomb Counties (East Lansing: Michigan State University College of Education, 1957).

[2] Elizabeth H. Gossett, Annual Report of the MSUO Continuing Education Committee, (Rochester, Michigan: May 22, 1959), p. 1.

Following the lead of the undergraduate curriculum committees, the Continuing Education Committee also staged a Meadow Brook Seminar which was held on Saturday, April 18, 1959. The guest list included three eminent authorities in the field of adult education; Paul McGhee, New York University; Cyril Houle, University of Chicago; Robert Blakelee, Vice President of the Fund for Adult Education; and two well-known authors and psychologists, Dr. and Mrs. Harry Overstreet.

This was an important meeting for all participants and many worthwhile ideas in the field of adult education were presented which set the tone for the subsequent continuing education program at MSUO. Dr. Houle took this opportunity to enlarge upon his visionary concept of the "alumni university." He said,

> Sooner or later, some college or university will undertake in a systematic fashion to plan a lifetime program of education. It will give to young people those basic and structural elements which best set the patterns for their life later. It will then offer a program of continued study for its alumni, giving them an opportunity to extend, broaden, and modernize their education throughout life, as well as offering them a chance to learn the specific things which they need to know as they undertake new responsibilities . . . we may hope that the force of circumstances will eventually make its practice the rule rather than the exception, so that gradually American education will adopt a broader base of activity.[1]

Eklund's interpretation of Houle's idea was to organize a systematic program for post graduates which would provide guidance and counseling and sequential educational experiences for the Continuing Education student who would pursue refresher and advance courses--both credit and non-credit, technical and cultural--throughout his productive lifetime. It presumes the undergraduate experience as only the initial

[1]Lowell Eklund, "Some Thoughts and Recommendations Regarding the Role of Continuing Education at MSUO," Michigan State University-Oakland, Rochester, Michigan, April 18, 1959, pp. 4-5.

phase of one's education and a basic foundation upon which to build a continuing program for the individual's professional and intellectual enlargement. (This idea was subsequently implemented by the Continuing Education Division with a Kellogg Foundation grant).

Chairman Gossett wrote in her annual report dated May 22, 1959, commenting about the Seminar as follows:

> Although the information and advice we received was rather general instead of specific answers to our questions; it was nevertheless an inspiring challenging day, worthwhile in many respects, particularly from the point of public relations. I really believe our speakers took back with them to the cities of New York, Washington, and Chicago as much interest and excitement about us, as we received from them. This is all to the good. We are experimenters in a noble and new effort and never before has there been as much lay participation in this type of endeavor.[1]

Dr. Eklund wrote in his recommendations regarding the role of continuing education at MSUO:

> Among the most susceptible and appropriate areas for early study and formalization in any university is continuing education. Its status in universities varies greatly. Knowledge and understanding of its role, either actual or potential, is remarkably rare, even among the most dedicated of educators. The problem is further aggravated by the traditional opposition to this form of education. Immediate consideration should be given to the role of continuing education in our new institution and particularly to the measures required for the successful and enduring materialization of this role.[2]

He felt that the Continuing Education program should be integrated into the overall concept and operation of the University and its objectives, and that there should be a separate Continuing Education administrative unit to serve as a coordinating agency for interdisciplinary needs to facilitate the program.

[1]Gossett, pp. 1-2.

[2]Eklund, p. 3.

Community Relations Committee

Paul K. Cousino, Superintendent of Warren Consolidated Schools, accepted the chairmanship of the MSUO Community Relations Committee on July 9, 1958. "I look forward to this challenging opportunity in working with you (Varner) and other members of the group in bringing this wonderful institution into being."[1] This cooperative attitude was repeated again and again when the residents of Oakland and Macomb Counties were asked if they wanted to help in the launching of MSUO. Even though it was summer, the Committee had its first meeting July 30, on the campus in the then Michigan State University Continuing Education offices for southeastern Michigan. Chairman Cousino stated in his letter of invitation to the Committee members that the purpose of this meeting is "to obtain suggestions from this group as to how we can best achieve our objectives."[2]

The minutes of the first meeting proved the enthusiasm with which members of the Committee met the challenge. The suggestions range from a speakers bureau to meet with any interested groups to television coverage, house organs, newspaper feature articles, radio programs, tours, contests, et cetera. Once the brainstorming was done, it became obvious that a purpose, in writing, was needed in order to maintain continuity and direction for the Committee during its life. The annual report of the Committee, submitted June 30, 1959, to the Executive

[1]Letter from Paul K. Cousino, Superintendent, Warren Consolidated Schools, Warren, Michigan, July 9, 1958.

[2]Letter from Paul K. Cousino, Superintendent, Warren Consolidated Schools, Warren, Michigan, July 24, 1958.

Committee of the MSUO Foundation, contained this statement.

> The Community Relations Committee was established by the Michigan State University-Oakland Foundation for the purpose of informing the general public, particularly prospective college students and their parents, about the development and purpose of Michigan State University-Oakland. The Committee's entire program will be geared to fulfillment of this challenge. Beyond that, the Committee will work to achieve four specific objectives: 1) To assist in the establishment of MSUO's proper image in the public mind and to increase the public awareness of this image. 2) To help this institution to gain understanding, support and sympathy for its unique programs in all communities of the Oakland-Macomb Counties area. 3) To develop a strong bridge of pleasant and logical relationships between MSUO and the communities which comprise its support area. 4) To assist in the recruitment of good students who will be capable of achievement in high quality programs such as MSUO will offer.[1]

The Committee attempted to maintain two roles with regard to disseminating information to the public about MSUO. There was an on-going informational program which had implications for MSUO's first several years and there was planning for immediate kinds of programs which were executed before the fall of 1959. There were times when the group acted as a "committee of the whole" and other times it was broken into subcommittees, in order to achieve more specific objectives. The total committee served as a clearing house for ideas, programs, and publications.

The subcommittees were divided into the radio committee, the on-to-college committee, and the public relations committee. Each developed a program of its own to carry forward the general purposes and objectives.

The Committee designed and attempted through all practical means

[1]Paul K. Cousino, Annual Report of the Community Relations Committee, (Rochester, Michigan: June 30, 1959), p. 1.

of communication to develop a rather comprehensive public information program including the printed media, personal contact, and radio and television. The personal contact included discussions with legislators and a grass-root approach to inform the citizens of the two-county area. A specific program was aimed to meet the school personnel and students of the secondary schools through six "on-to-college nights." The press, radio and television people were given a thorough understanding of MSUO's hopes as well as the plan to implement these hopes.

After a year's work, Chairman Cousino reported at the annual meeting of the MSUO Foundation, held May 22, 1959, at the Elks Temple in Pontiac, Michigan, the following Committee recommendations and guidelines for the future:

> (1) The Committee proposes officially that a full-time professional public relations person be hired as soon as possible. . . . (2) The following emphasis will continue to guide this Committee in its efforts to satisfy public information objectives:
>
> - That MSUO is a sister institution to MSU at East Lansing thus <u>can</u> belong in the Oakland-Macomb Counties community.
>
> - That information which will be helpful to principals and counselors will continue to be one of the major concerns, since these people deal specifically with young people's choices for higher education.
>
> - That publications will be written in such a way as to be completely readable by all groups with which we must make intimate contact.
>
> - That a concentration of public information will continue to be made in Oakland and Macomb Counties.
>
> - That a deliberate public information plan will be devised and continually revised for the purpose of best informing individuals, agencies, and institutions in the two-county area, this plan to include all possible information media.
>
> - That the Charter concept involving this first freshman class will be continually kept before student bodies in the high schools in the two-county area.
>
> - That publicity regarding the curricular program will

emphasize its unique contribution to developing leadership for the generations ahead.

- That our public information program will continue to prepare documentary evidence for use by the newspaper and radio media.[1]

The work of this Committee, because of its intense interest and creative ideas was most effective in establishing the MSUO image which produced the Charter Class of 570 students in September 1959.

Finance Committee

The Foundation established this committee for the purpose of

> encouraging gifts and grants in support of additional buildings, land and other property, educational and research activities, scholarships, student loans, faculty housing, and such other purposes as may be designated by Michigan State University-Oakland Foundation Executive Committee.[2]

The first project of these influential men in the fields of finance and industry was to provide the University with scholarships and student loan funds for the "Charter Class." Their efforts produced a total of $17,045 which provided 54 scholarships for entering class of 495 full-time students. (The head count for fall was 570.) These funds were provided from individuals, banks, industry, service clubs, fraternal groups, commercial establishments, trust funds, veterans groups, school districts, et cetera. Much of the effort expended to solicit these initial funds was done on an individual basis. There was no project approach taken during this period. However, the cooperation received from the Community Relations Committee assisted the Finance

[1] Ibid., pp. 4-5.

[2] Minutes of July 16, 1958, MSUO Foundation Executive Committee, Rochester, Michigan, p. 2. (in the files of the Committee).

Committee in spreading the word and telling of the need.

Although the short-range needs were most pressing, longer-range planning and work was also being carried on by this Committee while the immediate needs were being met. It was obvious that in a year or two, student housing would be a necessity based on the student queries from in and out of state about MSUO, so the Committee explored means by which individuals could invest some of their funds to improve their net income, reduce their income tax, avoid the capital gains tax, reduce their inheritance tax, and invest in the future of this University through its resident hall construction. A brochure explaining this was prepared and sent to a selected mailing list. (Fitzgerald House, Pryale House, and Hill House were all financed by this means. The total netted nearly 1.25 million dollars). At the same time, negotiations were begun with the Kresge Foundation to provide funds for a library building which was built in 1962. Still another committee project was to work out financial arrangements with lending institutions for the establishment of a faculty subdivision.

Many Assisted

MSUO was fortunate in so many ways in the pre-opening period, but without the unselfish giving of time and dedication of effort of the Foundation's Executive Committee and the Foundation's standing committee members, the beginning would have been more difficult and in turn less effective. This statement is not to discount the heroic efforts of the MSU faculty and administration, the Board of Trustees, or the MSUO staff, but the support and effort of the members of the MSUO Foundation was that extra which helped to launch this new institution of higher

education with a dynamic and forward thrust.

Employing A Staff and Faculty

Even with the help of many people and organizations there was yet to be decided the specifics, the acquiring of a staff, and a quality faculty to put these ideals to work. The choosing of administrators for certain key functions of the University such as student services, admissions, registration and records, business affairs, physical plant, food services, and public relations proved rather easy when the resources of an institution like Michigan State University could be tapped. All up and down the line, there were available proven young men, trained and ready to aid in the founding of a new institution of higher education.

However, the selection of a quality faculty was another matter. It has been said that a faculty member should approximate at least some of the excellencies desired in the student. With this thought in mind, the criteria to be used in selecting a faculty would include personality, training, youth, and the hard-to-find gift of dynamism. Whether or not all these attributes could be found in an untried and unknown group was still to be discovered.

Chancellor Varner, in his dynamic and imaginative way, took this challenge and proceeded to gather on this new university campus a faculty of young scholars, dedicated to the idea of teaching at the undergraduate level. The approach taken to find these young men and women is worth the space to report it here because of its unusual style. Chancellor Varner did not make a frontal attack on this problem, but he approached it obliquely. Instead of seeking faculty from a department head who, under normal circumstances, resists any attempt of another

individual to recruit or pirate one of his staff members, the Chancellor turned to the quality graduate schools in the United States. The graduate deans were asked to identify the best young man or woman in a given discipline who had graduated from their school in the last ten years.

Under these circumstances, the dean was proud to recommend a promising individual without reservation. The acquisition of such a list of names with unqualified recommendations made it easy to communicate with the young faculty person desired, and, at the same time, eliminate the resistance of a protective department head. This approach further eliminated the interviewing of many self propelled applicants whose quality would normally be questionable. This method of recruitment had still one other advantage worth mentioning, and that was the attraction of still other outstanding young men and women with a desire to be associated with the faculty that was already employed.

Ingredients Were There

Michigan State University Oakland had many of the ingredients needed for success when it opened its doors in September 1959; an imaginative curriculum, an outstanding faculty of young scholars, the support of a major university, the support of a blue ribbon citizens group, a dynamic individual in the Chancellor's office, a group of young flexible-minded administrators, a selected group of good students, and an idea. With the new public attitude toward quality in education at all levels and the panic being generated about the necessity of expanded facilities in higher education, it appeared that the factors present would favor the establishing of a quality institution such as Michigan State University Oakland.

CHAPTER III

HOW OTHERS HAVE DONE IT

Wheresoe'er I turn my view,
All strange, yet nothing new;
Endless labour along,
Endless labour to be wrong;[1]
-Samuel Johnson

Following the shock waves of man's entry into the relatively unknown regions of space, the academic and lay worlds of the United States cried for upgrading the educational standards at all levels. This demand, in the late 1950's, was responding to Russia's Sputnik, to James Conant's and other reformers research and writing, to changes in the labor force, and to society's growth and affluence. In the period from 1957 to 1964, nearly 200 colleges and universities were established in the United States. The factors influencing this resurgence in the creation of new institutions of higher education included: a dissatisfaction with the direction or lack of direction of the older institutions, the spectacular growth in population, the educational aspirations of parents for their children and the children for themselves, a desire to keep colleges and universities small, the economic advantages of the local community when an institution is established in the area, the need for re-education caused by advances in technology,

[1]Johnsonian Miscellanies ed. G. B. Hill (1897), vol. 1., Anecdotes of Johnson by Mrs. Piozzi, p. 190, and The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations, Oxford University Press, Second Edition, Kingsport, Tennessee, 1955, p. 276.

and the opportunity for individuals and organizations to build their concept of the ideal institution.

State Surveys Reviewed

Because of these several factors and the potential enrollments, several states met the challenge by undertaking studies and surveys of their higher education facilities. Algo Henderson, in his Policies and Practices in Higher Education, said:

> The urgency of the problem for the states is shown by the numerous states and national surveys of higher education that have been undertaken in recent years and especially since the war. Among the national studies have been those of the President's Commission on Higher Education, the Commission on Financing Higher Education, the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training, and more recently the President's Committee on Education beyond high school. . . numerous of the states have recently made statewide surveys, among them California, New York, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Illinois, and Michigan; and nearly all of them have been concerned with the. . .problem of the overall planning and coordination of higher education.[1]

A review of these several surveys and their recommendations keenly pointed up the regional differences and the variant educational needs, but the surprising uniformity nationally of what was considered necessary for meeting the anticipated educational needs, at the post-secondary level, reinforced the results of these surveys. To better understand what some of these state surveys said to their state governments and to note the points of agreement and disagreement, a brief review of some of these studies will be reported.

California

California's 1955 Restudy, done by T. C. Holy, T. R. McConnell,

[1]Algo D. Henderson, Policies and Practices in Higher Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), P. 12.

and H. H. Semans began by projecting the potential enrollment in both public and private colleges and universities from 1954 to 1955, 1960, and 1965, as well as the facilities needed to handle the students. Its investigation covered all three types of state institutions and the independent institutions by taking into consideration the financing, the function, the organization, the progress, and the governing and administration of public education. The recommendations of the Restudy were: (a) no new state colleges should be established before 1965, (b) enrollment figures should be projected to 1970 and based on these estimates a re-evaluation of the need for additional institutions should be made, (c) no enrollment ceilings should be established for state institutions, (d) more junior colleges should be established.[1]

California's Master Plan, completed in 1960, reinforced by the 1955 Restudy stated: (a) that the junior college system should be expanded to handle the 50,000 FTIAC's (first time in any college) expected to seek admission in the fall of 1975 and, (b) that the four-year state colleges already approved should provide only upper division work.[2]

New York

The New York Study recommended the establishment of new four-year colleges at Troy and Albany and the expansion of the existing teacher colleges into liberal arts colleges.[3] This idea followed some-

[1]T. C. Holy, T. R. McConnell, and H. H. Semans, A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education, California State Department of Education (Sacramento: 1955).

[2]Master Plan Survey Team, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960 to 1975, California State Department of Education (Sacramento, California: 1960).

[3]Henry T. Heald, Chairman, Committee on Higher Education, Meeting the Increased Demand for Higher Education in New York, State Education Department (Albany, New York: 1960).

what the pattern of the regional teacher colleges in Michigan. However, in Michigan, this was not formally announced but just happened over a period of time. Of course, the teacher training aspect of both the New York and Michigan movement was continued as an integral part of the new image.

Florida

Florida's survey (1956) directed attention to these higher education needs: (a) public colleges and universities must prepare for tripling their present student bodies in the future based on 1955 enrollments, (b) more diversification of curricular offerings were recommended, (c) the state must provide adequate financial resources to permit enrollment increases and program improvement but the institutions were cautioned to keep realism in their requests, (d) the community college system must receive prime attention for early development, (e) additional four-year institutions should be established as needed, and (f) immediate attention should be given to creating a new institution in the Tampa Bay area and the lower east coast.[1]

Illinois

The Illinois study (1961), authorized by The Joint Council on Higher Education in Illinois, concluded that, (a) the state has a recognized responsibility to provide resources to educate the college-bound young person, (b) the state will have to provide support for the junior college systems, (c) the junior colleges should provide terminal and transfer programs, thereby allowing the senior colleges to handle upper

[1]A. J. Brumbaugh and Myron R. Blee, Higher Education and Florida's Future, Volume 1, Recommendations and General Staff Report, University of Florida Press (Gainesville: 1956).

division quality programs, (d) the junior college development must receive immediate attention, (e) the existing curricula and functions at all levels of higher education should be expanded, (f) the principal facilities of the present institution should be increased, and (g) the state should consider creating several new four-year institutions in the immediate future.[1]

Minnesota

Minnesota approached its study quite differently from the other states by appointing staff members from their own educational institutions to conduct it. Although there was concern for the objectivity of the results, the evaluation of the data showed minimum bias. The recommendations followed basically those of Illinois--(a) a need for experimentation with the curricula, (b) a need for expansion of junior college systems, and (c) a need to utilize present four-year institutions more effectively before creating new ones. In addition, the Minnesota Commission expressed concern for the low amount of financial assistance to college students.[2]

Points of Agreement

The points of agreement between the studies was encouraging as it concerned the identification of the major issues--(a) the expansion of the college system, (b) the diversification of programs, (c) the limiting of the establishment of new four-year institutions until the

[1]Gilbert Y. Steiner and Romayne R. Ponleithner, Public Higher Education in Illinois, Staff Report to the Committee to Recommend a State Plan for Public Higher Education (Springfield, Illinois: 1961).

[2]The Minnesota Commission on Education, Higher Education in Minnesota, University of Minnesota Press (Minneapolis, Minnesota: 1950).

present colleges and universities are fully used, and (d) to provide adequate financial resources. However, there seemed to be a lack of common approach regarding how new four-year institutions should fit in the existing systems. In a way, the problem appeared different for each state because of the method of control or approval.

Approaches to Institutional Control Differ

In Michigan, in 1957, control of the public four-year institutions was divided between the State Board of Education, the Boards established with constitutional authority to control the funds and expenditures of their respective institution, and the Boards appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the Senate.[1] Most of the other states had a form of centralized control which made Michigan different. But even in this state, Michigan State University and the University of Michigan with their constitutional authority deemed it wise to gain legislative approval when MSUO and the University of Michigan's Flint and Dearborn branches were established. In contrast to Michigan, Florida, with its centralized control, established both the University of South Florida and Florida Atlantic University as free standing institutions. This pattern of creating new institutions followed John Dale Russell's recommendation to Michigan not to create branches. California, on the other hand, proceeded to continue its

[1]The State Board of Education provided control for Eastern Michigan College, Central Michigan College, Northern Michigan College, and Western Michigan College. Michigan State University and the University Michigan had separate Boards with constitutional authority. Ferris Institute, Michigan College of Mining and Technology, and Wayne State University had separate Boards appointed by the Governor. Wayne State University was in a transition period moving from a municipally operated institution to a state-controlled institution which permitted some Board members to be other than Governor appointees.

system of branches while Minnesota flirted with the idea of branches.

MSUO's Relationship to Michigan State University

MSUO was established by the Board of Trustees as an affiliate or sister institution to Michigan State University, which in the main has been difficult for people in both the academic and lay worlds to understand. The fact that both schools are served by the same Board has been a major factor in the continuing confusion. The affiliate status enjoyed by MSUO, provided it with several unique advantages over other new four-year institutions such as: immediate accreditation, prestigious name, experienced advice, a tried cadre of administrators, and a free hand to develop a new institution different from the "so called" parent institution. The latter point is one of the significant differences between the branch and an affiliate. Another major difference between a branch and an affiliate is the lack of counterparts on the original campus who decide policy or make decisions in one location and expect it to be followed by other individuals usually on a distant campus. The Board of Trustees and President Hannah shrewdly recognized that MSUO should not be dependent upon MSU in the sense of a branch but should be guided to create an individuality of its own by allowing curriculum development, faculty recruitment, admission requirements, student recruitment, architectural design, academic organization and structure, student activities, and financial management to be handled locally. The Board proffered the help of MSU with its vast array of talent, but, at the same time, stated that MSUO would be left alone to organize and develop itself within the broad policies of the Board of Trustees just as MSU had been left alone.

Quantity Versus Quality

A review of the literature including college catalogs describing the establishment of new four-year colleges and universities, reinforces Samuel Johnson's musing in the eighteenth century, when he pointed out that man recognizes that others have passed the same way before and yet man will spend his own time and energy repeating the same processes. Sometimes these processes lead to new insights and other times to mistakes made previously. In 1871, James B. Angell noted: "The public mind is now in a plastic, impressionable state, and every vigorous college, nay, every capable worker, may help to shape its decisions upon education."[1] Today, more than ever it is believed that education is the means to greater economic rewards and upward social mobility. Higher education is finding itself where elementary and secondary education was 40 to 50 years ago-- on the threshold of universal attendance. However, it should be quickly pointed out that while quantity will increase it does not necessarily follow that there will be uniformity in quality. In fact, even though post-secondary education will become more common, the level of abilities of high school graduates will continue to differ from the very low to the very high. In 1947, President Truman's Commission on Higher Education reported its thoughts regarding the functions of colleges and universities:

> American colleges and universities must envision a much larger role for higher education in the national life. They can no longer consider themselves merely the instrument for producing an intellectual elite; they must become the means by which every citizen, youth, and adult is enabled and encouraged to carry out his education, formal

[1]Rudolph, 243.

and informal, as far as his native capacities permit.[1]

There is a basic issue involved here. The issue of whether higher education can recognize and meet the needs of society at large while still maintaining quality programs. There is a need by the average man not to confuse the President's Commission statement by assuming that every man has a right to attend a Dartmouth, a Michigan, or a California, but that every man has a right to expect that there will be an opportunity for post-secondary education commensurate with his ability. However, there must be institutions that perform the task of taking the gifted individual out of a crowd and setting him up in an environment in which his greatest potentials can be achieved. Society must have these schools if society is to be preserved and improved. "A broadly conceived public policy for higher education, based on the concept of both individual and social development, is new."[2] Yet, if the states are going to implement the recommendations of their studies and surveys, it would seem that as new institutions are created, they must meet the current needs of society and then assist that society to extend its horizons.

New College Starts

As mentioned previously, the period 1957 to 1964 was an active one for creating new four-year institutions. This was a period of activity but not necessarily innovation. Among these new starts were Hofstra's New College, Wayne State University's Monteith College, Florida

[1]Michael Brick, The Need for Higher Education Facilities in Mohawk Valley, A Report to the State University of New York (New York: 1965), p. 36.

[2]Ibid.

Presbyterian College, the University of South Florida, St. Andrew's Presbyterian College North Carolina, the University of the Pacific's Raymond and Covell Colleges, Chicago Teacher College-North, University of California-Santa Cruz, Grand Valley State College, Florida Atlantic University, New College-Sarasota, Florida, and Michigan State University-Oakland.

These institutions did not happen without planning. In the case of Michigan State University Oakland, as related in Chapter I, there were many individuals involved in charting its course. Specialists generalists, and pragmatists gave hours of their time determining this new institution's role.

For MSUO, it was decided not to repeat the regional college concept or to identify with the local area, in the community college sense, but to establish an institution as Donald O'Dowd said about Wesleyan,

> to provide its students with a foundation in the basic modes of thought and techniques of analysis. The graduate should be equipped to achieve insights and realize intellectual rewards which are traditionally reserved for the professionally trained scholar. . . .to prepare students to make a personal commitment to purposes and institutions.[1]

A review of the news releases, periodicals, promotional materials of the new institutions listed above would certainly lead the reader to believe that a new era had arrived and that higher education was going to take a great leap forward. The facts are that the catalogs reveal little actually new in objectives, attitudes, or curricula. To illustrate this point, several of the "new ideas" or basic concepts will be discussed in

[1]Seymour E. Harris, (ed.), Higher Education in the United States the Economic Problems (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 163.

light of the period under discussion. Those things to be reviewed will include (1) general education or liberal studies, (2) independent study, (3) calendar, (4) curriculum, and (5) student selection.

Historical Review

In 1869, Charles William Eliot laid the foundation for the general education movement in the twentieth century when he created the elective system at Harvard and caused the prescribed classical curriculum to tumble from its previously unchallenged position in American higher education. Of course, the principles which underlie general education extend centuries before Eliot but in this country he heralded the approach of a new movement. The exact date is unknown, but Alexander Meiklejohn, in his inaugural address at Amherst in 1912, outlined some of the "essential parts of many contemporary institutional statements of general education purposes."[1]

President Meiklejohn said:

> I should like to indicate certain parts of human knowledge which seem to me so essential that no principle of election should ever be allowed to drive them out of the course of any college student.
>
> First, a student should become acquainted with the fundamental motives and purposes and beliefs which, clearly or unclearly recognized, underlie all human experience and bind it together. He must perceive the moral strivings, the intellectual endeavors, the aesthetic experiences of his race, and closely linked with these, determining and determined by them, the beliefs about the world which have appeared in our systems of religion. . . . Secondly, as in human living, our motives, purposes, and beliefs have found expression in institutions,--those concerted modes of procedure by which we work together,--a student should be made acquainted with these. He should see and appreciate what is intended, what accomplished, and what left undone

[1]Thomas H. Hamilton and Edward Blackman, (ed.), The Basic College of Michigan State, (East Lansing, Michigan: The Michigan State College Press, 1955), p. 2.

> by such institutions as property, the courts, the family, the church, the mill. . . . Thirdly, in order to understand the motives and the institutions of human life one must know the conditions which surround it, the stage on which the game is played. To give this information is the business of astronomy, geology, physics, chemistry, biology and the other descriptive sciences. These a boy must know so far as they are significant and relevant to his purpose. Fourthly, as all three of these factors, the motives, the institutions, the natural processes have sprung from the past and have come to be what they are by change upon change in the process of time, the student of human life must try to learn the sequence of events from which the present has come. . . . And in addition to these four studies which render human experience in terms of abstract ideas, a liberal education must take account of those concrete representations of life which are given in the arts, and especially in the art of literature. It is well that a boy should be acquainted with his world not simply as expressed by the principles of knowledge but also as depicted by the artist with all the vividness and definiteness which are possible in the portrayal of individual beings in individual relationships. These five elements, then a young man must take from a college of liberal training, the contributions of philosophy, of humanistic science, of natural science, of history, and of literature. So far as knowledge is concerned, these at least he should have, welded together in some kind of interpretation of his own experience and of the world in which he lives.[1]

In the words of Thomas Hamilton,

> This essence seems in all instances to involve the assumption that there is some kind of educational experience which should properly be provided by a university for all its students regardless of their eventual occupational destination.[2]

Other institutions which made contributions to this curricular reform during the period from 1919-1944 must include: Columbia University, the University of Chicago, Stephens College, the University of Minnesota, the University of Wisconsin, Colgate University, the University of Florida, St. John's College, and Michigan State College.[3] Harvard University report published in 1945, General Education in a Free Society, "added the prestige of that distinguished institution to

[1] Ibid., pp. 2-3. [2] Ibid., p. 1. [3] Ibid., p. 4.

this development;"[1] as it raised "that most ancient question: what ought an educated man to know?"[2]

General Education

Today, there is hardly a four-year college or university in the country that does not have some form of general education. Some have taken rather direct approaches to this basic information which forms the foundation for the "educated" graduate while others have made subtle changes in their curriculum to accomplish the same results.

Except for Florida Atlantic University, all of the new institutions listed above were advocating, and in most cases prescribing, a vigorous program in general education or liberal studies. The aim of these colleges and universities is to graduate an individual who, in addition to having a speciality where appropriate, is liberally educated in the fine arts, the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. This liberal arts foundation is not to be a superficial one but one well grounded in the history of man's accomplishments. For many, the approach is to extend this experience through all four years, not to be just a freshman-sophomore survey in general education. In the main, these colleges and universities organized their liberal studies programs to foster in each student a curiosity to delve independently or jointly into the ideas, literatures, institutions, and the languages of peoples past and present. The faculty was given freedom to order appropriate subject matter which he deemed pertinent to himself and his students. The two together were encouraged to attack man's accumulated knowledge with vigor and determination, to force a breakthrough into the boundless

[1] Ibid., p. 5. [2] Rudolph, 474.

region of thoughts and ideas.

Thoughts from Brubacher, Mills, Van Doren and Newman

John S. Brubacher states that,

> On the whole, theories of general education fall into two main categories. First are those which stem essentially from the nature of man, particularly his rational nature, and second are those which stem from his moral nature, especially as it is sensitized to the demands of society.[1]

John Stewart Mills said, "Men are men, before they are merchants, captains of industry, or members of learned professions."[2] Mark Van Doren, in his book, Liberal Education, makes this statement, "Liberal, that is, general, education as making a person competent not merely "to do" but primarily "to be."[3] Consequently, its prime occupation is with the "skill of being."[4] History tells us that the Trivium and the Quadrivium provide modern man with the base for the liberal arts which forms the foundation for general education or liberal studies. "The Trivium--composed of grammar, logic, and rhetoric--were regarded as the liberal arts par excellence, because they were peculiarly arts of functions of the mind."[5] The Quadrivium included arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. Except for music, the Quadrivium furnished man with the basis for his interest and development of the natural and physical sciences which has led him to the threshold of space. Music has provided man with

[1]John A. Brubacher, Bases for Policy in Higher Education (New York: Center for the study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965), p. 22.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Mark Van Doren, Liberal Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Windstron, Inc., 1943), p. 73.

[4]Ibid. [5]Brubacher, 26.

a means to relax and to express himself in ways other than calculations, writing, or speaking. John Cardinal Newman, "reasoned that the more any education fails to reach out toward general ideas but exhausts itself on the particular, the less it deals with knowledge at all."[1] Brubacher said, "To remain truly liberal, the spirit of intellectual excellence must. . . .cultivate the detached mind."[2] It appears that the philosophers and educationalists are in reasonable agreement with Brubacher's first theory about general education, but there is less agreement on his second theory which asks whether general education should be concerned with man's moral development. Some feel that higher education should deal with the intellect and studies related to intellectual excellence. In other words, dealing with the matter of morals in an intellectual or academic sense.

> Still others see our colleges and universities as social microcosms themselves. They are centers where individual and social interest clash. . . .general education must necessarily be concerned with habituation in moral conduct as well as with its theoretical analysis. It must educate the whole man, his appetitive as well as his rational nature.[3]

Current Examples

A look at the catalogs of several new institutions demonstrates in man's nature a general recognition by the faculties that both theories exist. Hofstra's New College describes its approach to general education this way:

> in the first year the subject matter, nature, and technique of various disciplines are presented. In the second year, human experience is examined by means of these or related disciplines so as to show how man has historically organized his experience rationally and imaginatively. In

[1]Brubacher, 29. [2]Brubacher, 31. [3]Brubacher, 36.

> the third year, the forms in which man casts his experience and the systems of value implicit in certain organizations of experience are examined critically.[1]

Florida Presbyterian College described its Core Courses as follows:

> In these, students pursue with the group and on their own a critical understanding of the major attempts of man to interpret his purpose and to organize his experience through the analytic and historic study of works and institutions.[2]

The College of Basic Studies of the University of South Florida states its objectives in the following manner:

> One of the functions of this college is to provide that part of each student's education which seeks to improve his general intellectual skills and provide an understanding of the principal areas of human achievement--in the arts and humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences, and mathematics. These are the skills and the areas of broad knowledge which should be held in common by all educated people wherever their fields of specialization may be; they form our common cultural heritage.[3]

The University of California, Santa Cruz, outlines their general education requirements with this statement:

> . . . to transmit knowledge, and with it understanding of the significance, methods, and interrelations of our various ways of looking at the universe, including broadly,
>
> The humanities and the arts
>
> The social sciences
>
> The natural sciences and mathematics
>
> . . . to ignite curiosity, and the urge to read, lest exposure to knowledge be a fruitless exercise.

[1]Hofstra University General Bulletin, Hofstra University 28:1 (Hempstead, Long Island, New York: March, 1966), p. 126.

[2]Florida Presbyterian College Bulletin, Florida Presbyterian College (St. Petersburg, Florida: 1966), p. 9.

[3]Bulletin of the University of South Florida, University of South Florida 1:1 (Tampa, Florida: 1959), p. 60.

> . . .to cultivate the skills involved in inquiry, expression and the handling of ideas.
>
> . . .to teach habits of intellectual honesty, accuracy, sensitivity, and independence.
>
> . . .by enlarging his understanding on his own and other cultures to develop the student's ability to stand outside himself, to understand as a consequence his location and opportunities.
>
> . . .in the academic area by encouraging some expertness, to foster a sense of competence.[1]

One of the most interesting colleges founded in the 1950's was Harvey Mudd College, the fifth of the Claremont Colleges. Its purpose is to specifically educate engineers for leadership roles in society as well as in engineering. The curriculum is so organized that one-third of all course work is in humanities and the social sciences. Harvey Mudd wants their graduates to understand the importance of engineering and the importance of engineering on the rest of society. This approach is unique in that the general education courses were organized to meet the criticism of most science-minded students that these courses have little or no application to their major. In this case, the students are shown the broader role of their career field and its place in society.[2]

Michigan State University Oakland's University Courses

Michigan State University Oakland subscribed to many of the same basic principals, as described in the several illustrations above, in its University Course structure which at the outset prescribed approximately 60 percent of all course work to be taken by its students. Unlike many institutions, this Course work was to be distributed throughout the

[1] University of California, Santa Cruz Undergraduate Program, University of California (Santa Cruz, California: 1965), p. 7.

[2] Harvey Mudd College Bulletin, Harvey Mudd College XI: Special Issue. California: September, 1958), pp. 34-35.

four-year undergraduate program and to be the direct and continuous concern and responsibility of the entire faculty. The Freshman courses were Rhetoric and Literature (3 quarters) and Western Institutions and Social Ideas (3 quarters). The Freshman-Sophomore courses were Foreign Language (6 quarters), Social Sciences (any 3 one-quarter courses from introductory courses in Economics, Political Science, Psychology or Sociology) and The Arts (3 quarter courses divided on the basis of students' choice of art and music--each student required to take a minimum of one course from each area). The Junior course was Area Studies--a study of Indian and Chinese culture. (Like the Arts, the student was required to take three quarters but must take a minimum of one course in each culture). The Junior-Senior course was Science and Mathematics (3 quarter courses but one quarter minimum required in each area). This requirement was designed to reveal the creative and deductive nature of an advancing field of knowledge. The Senior Colloquium was a one quarter requirement. This course was to be the wrap-up course for each student. Problem oriented, it would be organized to relate man's accumulated knowledge to the present day. In addition, each student would produce an in-depth paper on a subject in which he was particularly interested--a junior size thesis.

Independent Study

Many of the newly formed colleges and universities have been quite preoccupied with the "independent study" plan. This method of learning among the oldest experienced by man has been going through a new period of popular appeal and has been included with other methods as a way to improve instruction. Albert Einstein once said, "It is nothing short of a

miracle that modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiosity of inquiry." Most institutions of higher education recognize that independent study is not something that every student is capable of handling, nor an instructional panacea but an opportunity for those individuals who have proved their ability and interest to enrich their educational experience. However, "in recent years a number of colleges and universities, including both public and private institutions, have sought to employ this concept of independent study so as to include a wide range of students at all levels of ability."[1] This is being done even in light of the hard fact that most students entering college from high school have limited experience with anything approximating independent study.

R. H. Bonthius and his colleagues and the Fund for the Advancement of Education have produced evidence that average or below average students have found independent study an exciting way to learn. It has put meaning into their education. They are no longer a container receiving a quantity of facts but a living part of the educative process. The major advantage of independent study to the marginal student is the freedom that he has "to proceed at a pace consistent with his own needs and capacities"[2] while giving him a chance to "gain confidence and mastery in dealing with materials that otherwise might defeat him."[3] But it must be pointed out again that one method of instruction is not the answer for all people. An instructional method must be judged on the basis of the goals and objectives to be achieved and matched with the students' motivation and attitude. W. J. McKeachie states that independ-

[1]Samuel Baskin, (ed.), Higher Education: Some Newer Developments (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1965), p. 44.

[2]Ibid., p. 55. [3]Ibid.

ent study helps to improve the student's insight and problem-solving capacities and his attitude toward change but independent study has not been found to produce any significant differences in student achievement in the long run over that acquired from conventionally taught classes.[1]

Evidence on the success of independent study is quite inadequate at the present but Samuel Baskin of Antioch and his associates have a research project in progress to determine the feasibility of independent study for all students and the development of an instrument for measuring the student's capacity to study on his own.[2] The interest in teaching methods in higher education and the current interest in independent study will make it a favorite topic of researchers during the next several years.

The several factors which have made independent study a topic for discussion in most committees on instruction and stirred the imagination of the planners for new colleges and universities are: (1) the potential for instructing average students, (2) the recognition that man cannot keep up with the multiplying rate of knowledge, (3) the acknowledgement that the learning process is active, not passive, and (4) the broader interpretation of what constitutes the independent study process.[3]

This method of instruction has taken many forms and in some institutions it has little relationship to the actual conditions while in

[1]Nevitt Sanford, (ed.), The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962), chap. 8, pp. 312-364.

[2]Samuel Baskin, Quest for Quality, New Deminsions in Higher Education (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, No. 7, 1960).

[3]Baskin, (ed.), Higher Education: . . ., 52-53.

others an organized effort is made to assure this educational method as a part of every student's experience. Wayne State's Monteith formalized independent study by its freshman research project Science of Society 0133. Their aim is to incorporate in their basic courses, "A number of independent study features which are designed to appeal to the student's initiative and to help him develop capacity to think critically and creatively."[1] Still another approach at Monteith is their tutorial studies which permits a student the opportunity to study in depth a particular interest under the guidance of a faculty member.

Florida Presbyterian College sets aside its winter term, the month of January, for independent study and research. During this period each year, every student, under the guidance of a faculty member, must engage in a project where, "he chooses and limits his subject, gathers material, organizes it and presents it as a paper, as a short, story, a painting, or a piece of laboratory apparatus.[2] This experience is, "designed to develop the qualities of self discipline in pursuits requiring the student to be the prime explorer . . .)[3] In addition to this, Florida Presbyterian encourages their students to accelerate their education through independent study to achieve advance standing in an area that they can present proficiency.

California's Santa Cruz says it this way, "Much instruction will take place in seminars and tutorial: mature students will study independently with guidance from faculty."[4]

[1]Wayne State University Bulletin Monteith College, Wayne State University 43:7 (Detroit: May 1963), p. 27.

[2]Florida Presbyterian College, 11. [3]Ibid.

[4]University of California, Santa Cruz, 11.

Brandeis makes no special statement about "independent study," however, there is no mistake about its intentions to provide each student with opportunities to maximize his educational goal in the liberal arts and in the manner best suited to him.

The University of South Florida promotes and "encourages qualified students to do part of their work independently."[1]

Grand Valley State College makes only the slightest reference to independent study and then only in an off-handed way.

> The work and progress of each student receives the personal attention of the faculty in all courses. Many courses include individual projects designed to suit a student's particular needs and interests. Some are based entirely on individual study and research.[2]

Florida Atlantic University, an upper division state university, has five colleges where it could be assumed that independent study would be a significant part of the curriculum. However, only in the College of Business and Public Administration and the College of Science is there any reference to it and then only slightly. The former lumps it together with other instructional methods as follows: "The course of study will incorporate concepts, techniques, theory, and practice through the interaction of independent study, classroom teaching, laboratory participation, field work and academic research."[3] "The College of Science programs of instruction are designed to make use of the extensive facilities of the University for independent study."[4]

[1]Bulletin of the University of South Florida, 37.

[2]Grand Valley State College Catalog, Grand Valley State College (Allendale, Michigan: June, 1967), p. 29.

[3]Florida Atlantic University Bulletin, Florida Atlantic University, 2:1 (Boca Raton: April, 1966), p. 37.

[4]Ibid., p. 119.

New College, in Sarasota, Florida, quite different in many ways from the traditional liberal arts college, formalizes their independent study program requiring each student to "complete four independent study projects before beginning his final year. The normal independent study project is expected to represent about one month of intensive work."[1] The projects can be completed during the period between the end of the first quarter (approximately November 25) and Christmas vacation (approximately December 20), during the summer, or for the four-year student, during one of his non-residence terms. In the fourth year, each student must prepare and defend a senior thesis which takes about one quarter of the student's time.[2]

The key words that stand out in any presentation or discussion of "independent study" are qualified, mature, and prepared.

Institutions like the Florida Presbyterian College, New College, and Wayne State University's Monteith, who deliberately work a period of independent study into their curriculum should be applauded. However, unless they and other institutions experimenting with independent study programs are willing to spend large sums of money for advising and evaluation, many of the student projects may turn out to be rather superficial.

Michigan State University Oakland, in several of its early news releases, touted "independent study" but actually little took place during the first four years. First, the promotion of "independent study" was pretty much the idea of one individual; second, the support was limited in a financial way; third, not many of the faculty were willing to guide "independent study;" and, fourth the MSUO student body was not

[1] Bulletin of New College, New College, 3:3 (Sarasota, Florida: September, 1967), p. 64.

[2] Ibid., pp. 64-66

mature, qualified, or ready for this experience. This student group was intellectually unsophisticated, and for many they were the first of their family to enroll in college. This is not to say that some of the "Charter Class" students were not able to handle an independent study program, but to say that in general these students' backgrounds ill-prepared them for this experience.

College Calendar

Of the many different proposals for change in colleges and universities structures or programs, the subject of the calendar is occupying an unusually large amount of time throughout the country. With the pressure both immediate and future on the institutions to take more and more students, the Boards, the administrators, and the faculty are being forced to study the pros and cons of a year-round academic calendar as a possible solution to the handling of these impending large numbers. In addition to space, the year-round calendar discussions include the concern for managing the rapid rate of knowledge expansion, the desire of youth to accelerate their education when their goals include graduate or professional education, the seriousness of purpose of all people toward education since "Sputnik," and the recognition that more and more man must have both a liberal as well as a specialized education. Former Chancellor Edward Litchfield, of the University of Pittsburgh, said:

> We believe that such a (year-round) calendar makes possible a more complete education, provides a more flexible means of coping with the expansion of knowledge, and encourages the entry of people into professional life at an earlier and more productive age.[1]

[1]Edward Harold Litchfield, "Trimester: Education of Superior Quality in A Shorter Length of Time," College and University, Vol. 31 (Summer, 1955), 25.

Year-round education is not a new idea but first instituted during World War I and repeated during World War II to meet the emergency of training men for specialized assignments or for the officer corps. A good definition of the year-round academic calendar is difficult to find but the simplest, although far from complete, lists two criteria. They are: (1) forty or more weeks of classes per year, and (2) the opportunity for a student to earn a baccalaureate degree in three calendar years with no more than a normal full-time course load. Probably the most familiar year-round program is the quarter system that has added the fourth quarter to the school year. The newest type is the trimester which added another full semester to the existing two-semester year thereby expanding the year to 45 or 48 weeks. There are other combinations of semesters and quarters and semesters and half-semesters which fall under the rubric of year-round programs which are designed to lengthen the school year for more efficient use of the facilities and the many other claims purported to it. In Michigan, we have samples of all three groups--Michigan State University, Wayne State University, and Ferris State College on four quarters; Michigan State University Oakland on the trimester; and the University of Michigan and Western Michigan University on two semesters and a half-semester.

It is very doubtful that the institutions of higher education in Michigan would ever make their calendars uniform as the State Universities of Florida (trimester) have done. Michigan institutions with their authority are most reluctant to give up any of their power. However, if they did the advantage would be considered nominal and certainly the character of educational independence in this state would be changed which most educators would consider unfavorable.

W. Hugh Stickler outlines the optimum conditions for operating a year-round academic calendar as follows:

> (a) the terms should be of equal length, character, and status, (b) there should be equal numbers of admissions every term and equal numbers of enrollments every term, (c) course and curricular offerings should be equalized, (d) the faculty should be equitably paid and equitably utilized, (e) physical plant utilization should be equalized throughout the year, and (f) the year-round program of the college or university should be integrated and unified.[1]

MSUO's Commitment to Year-Around Operation

To get all of these items working together let alone most of them would be most unlikely. A good example of an operating program is MSUO. The commitment of moving to a year-round operation as soon as possible was announced by the Chancellor early in the planning of this institution. However, from the fall of 1959 through the summer of 1961, MSUO was on a quarter system. The students were held to a maximum of four courses a quarter with each course being valued at four credits. During the winter and spring of 1961, the decision was made to move from the quarter system to the trimester system. At the time, there was only one operating example of the trimester system and that was at the University of Pittsburgh. Chancellor Varner, Dean of the Faculty Robert Hoopes, Director of Admissions and Registrar Herbert Stoutenburg, Director of Business Robert Swanson, and Professor Donald O'Dowd comprised the committee to study the program at the University of Pittsburgh and the available literature. Messrs. O'Dowd and Stoutenburg attended a seminar at Pittsburgh in the spring and from this and the committee's deliberations, the trimester was launched in the fall of 1961. When

[1]Baskin, (ed.), Higher Education: . . ., 231-232.

President Hannah was consulted by Chancellor Varner regarding the wisdom of making the change, President Hannah stated that "the quarter system was the only practical and effective system for year-round education but MSUO was free to make its own decision." The implication was obvious but left unsaid.

The original reaction of the public to MSUO's decision was positive. The program provided the students with the flexibility of graduating in the traditional four years or in two and two-thirds if they wished to accelerate; the students had the advantage of the quarter system because the first semester ended before Christmas thereby eliminating the "lame duck" period normally related to a semester system; the students who wished to work in the summer instead of enrolling in the third semester had four and one-half months and were first in line for summer employment because the winter semester was over by April 22; the students also were favored by the in-depth opportunity the 15 weeks semester afforded them in courses they were taking; the faculty's salary was increased 45% annually for those who taught in the third semester; the faculty member found employment easier to obtain; and the faculty member was advantaged to have longer periods of time off for research, study, or travel. The school years 1961-62 and 1962-63 were considered successful. Approximately 70% of those students eligible to enroll enrolled in the third semester, and the University's financial picture was bright based on the more favorable use of its facilities. The two major drawbacks were the pressures put on the Physical Plant operation because there was no time for maintenance and other similar work, and the Administrative staff found no time to do the special projects normally handled during the summer months.

Based on the experience through August 1963, it would appear that the trimester system had a reasonable chance of continuing a while longer.

Curriculum Planning

It was less than 100 years ago that the influence of the German universities was truly felt in higher education in the United States. But with it came a demand for changes in the curricula and the programs in our colleges and universities. Virtually none were safe, and a fluidity previously unknown in our system was instituted which has had very far reaching and lasting effects. In fact, the major differences in our approach to higher education from those of Europe are a combination of the German influence and our advances in technology. Higher education became a vehicle for career preparation and upward mobility. The greatest effort in curriculum development in recent years has been to re-establish the importance of liberal education regardless of specialization and to find means for coping with the explosive expansion of knowledge. To do the latter, Dressel says, "The curriculum can no longer be regarded as a fixed set of courses. It must be regarded, rather, as defined by a set of principles which constitute a means of structuring the association of the teacher and the student to the end of educating the student."[1] The former, as discussed earlier in this chapter, has been accomplished by the general education movement. However, it should be pointed out that most new four-year colleges and universities have almost made a fetish out of the amount of liberal arts requirements

[1]Paul L. Dressel, The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education (Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963), pp. 98-99.

included in the curriculum. For example, a list of representative schools with their credit requirement for all undergraduate students illustrates the point: The University of South Florida 48 quarter credits; Harvey Mudd College, 42 semester credits; The University of California, Santa Cruz, 16 courses out of 36 required for graduation; St. Andrew's Presbyterian College, 59 semester credits; and MSUO, 68 to 100 quarter credits. In addition to the required credits, it was possible for students to take their elective in humanities, fine arts, and social science courses. In fact, some departments recommended this action.

A problem of some magnitude facing curriculum planners today is the great diversification found in the course offerings and majors of large complex universities but not limited to this group entirely. This "57 variety" approach has been caused by the wide range of student academic ability and the specialization for vocational opportunities present in today's business and industrial worlds and social agencies. To the liberal arts trained faculty member, this approach is recognized as a diluting of the true meaning of education. In fact, it has been one of the major causes for the large quantities of required "liberalizing" courses found in the curriculum of new institutions established in recent years. Another factor responsible for this pressure which has received little attention has been the size of the humanities faculty in these institutions. English departments are large because of the freshman English requirement. The modern language departments are large because of the popularity in foreign languages caused by the general public's recognition of rapid communication and travel, and by the faculty as a broadening and accepted mark of the educated man. Adding to these

faculties, the members of other humanities departments and those individuals in non-humanities departments sympathetic to the need for liberalizing courses, it quickly provides a substantial voting block which can control the curriculum rather effectively. Using MSUO as an example, ten out of the seventeen general education courses required of all students could easily be categorized in the humanities, four in the social sciences, two in science, and one either in humanities or social science depending upon one's point of view. The changes made by the Committee on Instruction and approved by the Senate during the first four years continued the same balance just described even though efforts were made in some quarters of the faculty to increase the elective opportunities opened to the students.

In addition to the faculty posture, it must be pointed out that much of the liberalizing approach at MSUO and other recently established insitutions was set by the mood of the nation following "Sputnik" and by the attitude in educational training of the experts who were involved in suggesting the curriculum direction of the new colleges and universities. For some, like the University of South Florida and Harvey Mudd, there was an attempt to blend the general with the specific while at Santa Cruz, St. Andrew's Presbyterian, and MSUO, there was a certain purism maintained to keep course work in the theoretical rather than recognizing the specialization aspect of some majors. As questioned by McGrath and Meeth,

> Do colleges have a responsibility to provide a general education that, like its precursory, the traditional liberal arts curriculum, prepare graduates for an intelligent private and civic life, or are they to become in fact professional schools concerned primarily with vocations preparation for the world of scholarship,

business, and industry, or the other professions?[1]

They answered,

> It would seem to be in the best interest of our culture at large to have institutions provide both a broad base of knowledge in the major areas of learning and enough specialization to accustom the student to intellectual work of a higher order within a narrow branch of scholarship or to prepare him in the specialized activities of the practice of a profession such as law, medicine, or engineering. The achievement of both these purposes affords an extraordinary challenge to faculties to design appropriate programs of studies.[2]

Curriculum Concerns

Other areas of curriculum concern to both new and old institutions are course proliferation, use of new instructional media, improvement of course content, field study, and less provincialism in the attitude of students. Each of these subjects has had volumes written about the pros and cons in the developments of each area, therefore, not much space will be allotted here. However, a sentence or two on each is worthwhile.

The dangers of course proliferation are several and can have a very deleterious effect for most institutions but particularly the new ones. Two rather common problem areas, but not very often recognized, are the expansion in the language department and faculty recruitment. In the former, some of the new schools have instituted several of the romance languages all at once, thereby necessitating many faculty members just to handle the required courses. The number of language majors produced in the new schools is few, but the university, by providing

[1] Baskin, (ed.), Higher Education: . . ., 34

[2] Ibid., 34-35

elementary work, is obligated to teach a variety of courses in several languages with very, very, small enrollments at the upper level. This subject area must be viewed as a whole and care should be taken not to let the publicity which goes with the establishment of a new institution outrun the abilities of the department or budget. In the case of faculty recruitment, here lies a sleeping giant. When a young institution is trying to interest good young people to join with others in the establishment of a new college or university, the president, the provost, or the department head will promise the person being recruited an opportunity to teach, in addition to the basic courses in his discipline, his speciality. This offer is most appealing to many young people, because in a more established institution whether large or small, the upper level courses are taught by the senior faculty, leaving the more arduous and the less challenging courses to the newest man or woman. As most catalogs will reveal, the fragmentation trend is quite noticeable and one which must be recognized and controlled.

Man's search for instant education continues unabated today with a growing interest even among some of the humanists in the miracle of electronic devices for education. The more common pieces of equipment such as television, teaching machines, and computers when used with imagination can aid the curriculum, but William Trow makes a good point in his study when he says: "The millennium for education will not be ushered in by the purchase of a truckload of teaching machines and another of television equipment."[1] Florida Atlantic University, which has spent millions in electronic gear, is in deep trouble and has caused

[1]William Clark Trow, Teacher and Technology: New Designs for Learning (Des Moines: Meredith Publishing Co., 1963), p. 180.

great concern in the Florida Legislature. The apparent mistake is the amount of reliance placed on the machine rather than the development of an integrated program where the equipment is an aid and a device for enriching the curriculum. It is expected and hoped that the trend at Florida Atlantic can be slowed down and the direction changed in time to prevent a catastrophe.

Federal and foundation money is being offered in large amounts to all levels of education to find a better way to teach our citizens. The impact of these monies has initiated curriculum studies beyond any previous concerns in this area. The National Science Foundation opened up a complete new means of cooperation between government and higher education. The new Humanities Endowment for the Arts is a late but welcome entry into the curriculum field of the arts. New groups are being formed all over this country such as the Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten, The Great Lakes College Association, and The Social Science Education Consortium of Midwest Universities. What will come of all this effort will not be known for many years, but the important thing today is the recognition at the national, regional, and local levels that educational methods can be no more static than the rest of society. Means must be found to cope with the explosion of knowledge and to educate people to recognize education as a lifelong process.

Related quite closely to this interest in learning about learning is the number of schools establishing a form of work experience. This is not a new idea. Antioch, Reed, and Berea have been in this business for years, but the greater mobility and sophistication of our college students have made the idea more popular as a means of expanding

the students' horizons and reducing their provincialism. In 1959, the University of Michigan-Dearborn Center was the first to institute such a program in Michigan. Later Kalamazoo College reorganized their curriculum and inserted a requirement of off-campus work in addition to the quarter abroad option. Since these two starts, several of the other Michigan institutions have included a work experience option in their curriculum. Out of state Beloit, Earlham, Augustana, and New College at Sarasota are examples of this trend.

The concern by most colleges to assist their students to recognize the existence of other cultures than the western culture has been very real since World War II. Area study programs have been developing momentum since the middle '50's. There is hardly a new four-year institution born today that does not have a program in China, India, or African studies. In addition to formal course work, these schools are offering quarters, semesters, or junior year-abroad programs in various countries to broaden the recognition of other peoples and their cultures. The participants of the Meadow Brook Seminars were unanimous in their recommendation to include non-western area studies in the MSUO curriculum. This recommendation was followed with the requirement for graduation of a year-long program in the culture, political, economic, and social history of China or India. The recognition of this past deficiency in the curriculum, regardless of the educational level, makes two major contributions in correcting the attitude of the American people. First, we are no longer isolated by two oceans and we cannot deny our role and responsibility in the world community, and second, we must learn to accept Wilkie's "One World" by learning to live together in peace.

As stated previously, curriculum development must keep pace with the dynamic society in which we live, and if colleges and universities are going to continue to influence this society then they must prepare and perceive their role as the instigator of change rather than the reporter of change.

Student Selection

Student selection is a process that must be called an art rather than a science, a matching process of institution to student and student to institution. How this matching occurs is more a matter of chance than logical planning. For every student that knows exactly why he chooses a specific college or university, there are hundreds who select an institution for some less than logical reason.

Admissions requirements, as they appear in college catalogs, fall into three basic patterns. Pattern 1 details the requirements in a specific manner and leaves little doubt as to who will be admitted and who will not be admitted. Often the institution using this approach places few limitations, if any, on the prospective student. An example of this model is the University of South Florida. However, it should be pointed out that there are exceptions to the above statement such as the University of California and the University of Michigan.

Pattern 2 used by the eastern and far west private institutions says very little in a specific way about their requirements which makes it most difficult for a refused candidate to question the decision.

Pattern 3 continues the vagueness of Pattern 2, but the phrasing is carefully worded so that the prospective student can read the requirements and believe the institution is specifically designed to meet his personal abilities. These requirements imply that only the more able

student is admitted but under certain special conditions others may be given an opportunity. Institutions choosing this approach are seeking the more able student but recognize that to meet their predicted head count they must be flexible enough to take some students with lesser ability. Two examples illustrating this point are Hofstra University and MSUO.

HOFSTRA

> The basic requirement is graduation from an approved secondary school and the completion of the scholastic aptitude test. Scholastic aptitude, the previous record, and personal qualities are important factors in evaluating the applicant. Every program of study presupposes adequate ability in various disciplines. At the same time concerned more with the individual student than with abstractions, Hofstra recognizes that an inflexible standard may not accommodate all desirable applicants.[1]

MSUO

> The University considers the best preparation for its work a program of studies at the high school level which consists chiefly of those fields that are fundamental to the liberal arts: English, mathematics, foreign languages, social studies, and science. Students admitted to MSUO are chosen on a selective basis, with consideration given to the candidate's high school academic achievement, recommendations, aptitude test scores, leadership qualities, interests, and educational goals.
>
> In doubtful cases, a candidate may be asked to the campus to take a qualifying examination, the results of which will become one of the criteria for determining admissibility.[2]

During the late 1950's and early 1960's, newly formed colleges and universities who sought to establish a reputation for academic excellence followed Pattern 3. Attention was given by the college

[1] Hofstra University General Bulletin, 11.

[2] Oakland University Catalog, Oakland University VII:1 (Rochester: September, 1966), p. 37.

admissions officer to the identification and selection of the more able student and the young scholar was desired as much as the star athlete or the non-white student. High schools supporting honors programs, advanced placement, and independent study became the happy hunting grounds of every admissions officer in the region.

The admissions procedure, as stated above, is a matching of institution to student and student to institution and whether a student succeeds or fails in college depends to a great extent on this matching process. Some schools find their educative role to be "applied" in form while others direct their curriculum more to the "theoretical" approach. A student must choose, he must recognize his own strength and weaknesses and fit himself to the school and the curriculum. There is a point where external advice stops and the decision-making process must be the results of the student's internalization of the information he has acquired. The able student may find that an independent study program, a good library, a bright young dynamic faculty, or a trimester calendar the factor for his choice. While the less able student may find the security of individual attention or small group living attractive to him. Selection is a two-way street. The admissions officer is looking for the bright students but fills in with others. The student is looking for that certain thing that appeals to his Libido.

The selection process is a serious matter deserving more attention from institutions than it is getting. A perfect match is not expected and most schools will discover that its student body is a heterogeneous group. Reports about student-ability studies tell us that the reason colleges seek at least some of the more able students is to provide the less able students with models and the more able with an

adequate number of his peers for stimulation.

Finally, one of the little talked about methods of student selection but used more often than suspected is that of self-selection. The procedure can work to the disadvantage as well as the advantage of colleges. Self-selection often occurs when a timid or self-effacing student eliminates himself by not applying to an institution whose reputation intimidates him when in reality he could handle the academic program with reasonable assurance. When this happens, the student and the institution where he should have attended lose. However, it should be noted that there are times when the self-selection process redirects the thinking of a student toward an institution better equipped to meet his specific ability and everyone wins.

Institutions of higher education have much to learn in identifying and selecting students, but the greatest help to reduce the confusion and to assist the matching process would be for the catalog to clearly and succinctly tell the colleges' total story. Murray G. Ross, President, York University, put it this way: "It is important for students before beginning their university careers to discover the ethos, the distinctive character, of their university so that their days as students may be more pleasant and fruitful than might otherwise be the case."[1]

New Versus Repackaging

Applying the thought of Samuel Johnson once again to the present situation, one must agree that it is difficult to detect anything new in the educational purposes and goals of the new institutions created in recent years. The many excerpts and quotes from college catalogs

[1]Jacob Bronowski, Henry Steele Commager, Gordon W. Allport, Paul H. Buck, Imagination and the University (Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1964), p. 86.

reported above would seem to support this position. Even the most enthusiastic supporter for a new four-year college or university would be hard pressed to argue that his institution is truly innovative. What has happened is a reshuffling and a repackaging of recognized and proved educational purposes and goals. However, it should be acknowledged that to rearrange or modify old patterns sometimes can be creative and have a lasting effect on the short- or long-range operation of an organization.

Faculty Recruiting

The discussion in this chapter to this point has been concerned with the structure and the subject matter content thought to be necessary in creating a new college or university. At this time, it seems appropriate that a few lines should be allowed to discuss faculty recruitment and attitudes in the establishing of a new institution.

Why are faculty members attracted to new institutions in preference to staying at or accepting employment in well established colleges or universities, and who are these faculty people? In the case of MSUO, which appears rather typical, it was found that there were four reasons given by individuals for seeking employment with this new institution. They were: (a) the challenge of building a new program, (b) the opportunity for young faculty members to teach their speciality immediately, (c) the pressure of "publish or perish" was minimized, and (d) security. The first three reasons were usually given by young men or women in their early forties who saw the chance to do something that the traditions of their present department would stifle or block. The last reason included individuals who thought the prestige they had gained elsewhere would give them an unchallenged status and would permit them

to teach and research those things which they considered important without necessarily becoming involved in the new institution's problems. Under (b) above, there was a sub-group which saw an appointment at MSUO as a stopover on the way to a more prestigeous position. The advantages for this group included academic ranks higher than they had and would likely get for a while at a more established school, a chance to teach upper level courses in addition to elementary courses, and an opportunity to become a part of the decision-making process. One indivdual saw the challenge of building a new program as an opportunity to identify again with a college after having spent three or four years in an education-related organization. This is not to say this person would have found it difficult to re-enter college teaching, but he used this means to do it.

Joseph Gusfield and David Reisman reported in "Sociology of Education" their research on Michigan State University Oakland and Wayne State University's Monteith College identified in the study as, Harlow University at Barth, and Lawrence University's Tilak College respectively. Using the analogy that the faculties were "like pioneers to the old west,"[1] the authors called the three groups "pioneer settlers," "pioneer adventurers," and "job holders." They defined the "pioneer settler" as a faculty member who had come to find a permanent home; the pioneer adventurer" as one who saw his appointment as an interlude which he might capitalize on or move along to the next town; and the "job holder" as a faculty member who is looking for personal satisfactions which were likely outside his teaching or research. As Gusfield and

[1] Joseph Gusfield and David Reisman, "Faculty Culture and Academic Careers: Some Sources of Innovation in Higher Education," Sociology of Education, Vol. 37 (Summer, 1964), 288.

Reisman pointed out, the "job holder" was of such minor significance to both schools that the category was not referred to again in their paper.

H.U.B. found that its new faculty were men primarily interested in being in on the ground floor and willing to expend their energy to help this new institution succeed but knew that if it did not no one would hold them responsible and they could move on to another college or university without damaging their reputation. T.C. on the other hand found the largest percentage of their faculty interested in the innovative opportunities open to them in this new setting. According to Gusfield and Reisman, this group appeared less committed to a professional career than H.U.B. settlers, and this attitude was interpreted to be a mechanism to rationalize their feelings of not truly belonging to the profession and wondering why it had rejected them.[1]

This study not only pointed up the difference why the two faculties sought employment at their respective institutions but drew attention to the difference in attitude brought about by the organizational structure of the two operations. MSUO, for all practical purposes an independent institution, offered a total challenge to the faculty member. He could participate and grow to the extent he wished to become involved while at Monteith College the shadow of Wayne State University was ever present. Even though an attempt was made to provide a separate image, the fact remained that it was difficult for the faculty and staff not to look upon the college as a department or a division.

Caplow and McGee in "The Academic Market Place" states, "that an institution's attractiveness to a candidate is determined by what it can

[1]Ibid., pp. 281-305.

offer him in the way of prestige, security, or authority."[1] Although Caplow's and McGee's study dealt with major universities, it is interesting to note the similarity between the new small and the large old institutions' attractiveness to candidates. However, the new institutions do have several factors working for them in recruiting new faculty which the older institutions do not have. The first is the recruiter himself. This job, for the first three or four years, is generally handled by the president or chancellor who usually is an individual of great energy, drive, dedication, vision, charm, and salesmanship. This personalized treatment by the chief administrative officer of an institution has certain advantages that are appealing to any faculty of staff candidate. A second factor is the uniformity and the age of the faculty group. Most of these individuals have similar points of educational reference and have lived through a similar socio-economic period. Because of this, the channels of communication are more readily established creating a quick camaradarie. The third advantage considered helpful is the opportunity that the faculty candidate has to try new techniques, teach a particular interest area, or develop something new, or do all three. Finally, the differential in pay, particularly in public institutions, is so minimal, if not equal to other potential openings, the candidate rarely considers money a problem.

Faculty recruitment is one of the key functions in any institution and it is particularly true for a new one. A school's reputation and general attractiveness to students and to other faculty people depends greatly upon the effort, time, and selective criteria used in

[1]Theodore Caplow and Reese J. McGee, The Academic Market Place (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958), p. 147.

employing a faculty member. Good faculty members can and do attract others of equal or better quality, but a poor faculty member is like a cancer. The only way to get rid of him is to cut.

With approximately 70 percent of an institution's budget going for salaries of faculty members, the matter of recruitment must be allocated adequate time and funds to do the job properly. No institution, new or old, can afford to take this matter lightly.

Summary

The various subjects described in this chapter were obviously the thinking and educational philosophy of many men. They were the accumulated knowledge of the past, organized and reshaped by the thinking of many, to accomplish certain prescribed goals. The people involved organized carefully what should be included and in what unit it should be taught to provide an education for today's society and world of work. MSUO with its own faculty and administrators, the several citizens' committees, the Meadow Brook Seminars, and the MSUO staff, fashioned a program not too different in content from other institutions, but packaged it in a different manner. It required the coordinating, coaxing, focusing, amalgamating, and consolidating of interested people to establish a curriculum for this brand new school. It required faith on the part of many people and a sensitivity to the vested interests of others. The give and take of negotiations, the thrust and parry of political pressures, the balancing and weighing of judgment, the relevance and reliability of data, and the spontaniety and originality of ideas all had their place in the step-by-step process of decision making.

If enrollment projections for the future are correct, and there

is reason to believe they will be, what Hofstra, the University of California, Santa Cruz, Monteith College, Grand Valley, MSUO, and others have experienced will be repeated again and again. Some may do it better because they are working from a broader up-to-date base, but it can be predicted that there will be recognized threads to the present and the more distant past.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHARTER CLASS

The challenges given the Charter Class during the first few days of its coming together in the fall of 1959 were many. Among those presenting these challenges for this group to contemplate was President John A. Hannah; Dr. Thomas H. Hamilton, then President, State University of New York; and Dr. Robert Hoopes, Dean of the Faculty at MSUO. President Hannah said on September 17 at the Convocation of the Charter Class,

> I would remind you students that because you are the first of the thousands who will follow, you will set standards, establish precedents, originate traditions--in short, help to set the tone of Michigan State University Oakland. Because you are in this unique position, it seems fair to call upon you for effort commensurate with the importance of the circumstances in which you find yourselves. If you choose, you can establish a standard for true excellence: nothing less would be worthy of those who have made this institution possible, those who will be working with you as your instructors, and those who hold such high hopes for this college of which one day you will be the first alumni.[1]

Dr. Hamilton, one of the early contributors to the educational stance of MSUO, said,

> . . . I would here first emphasize that you must recognize that nothing of significance in the last analysis was ever taught by anyone but only learned. . . .Learning is a positive, active, exciting enterprise in which the teacher can, at the very most, provide the best possible conditions for the student to learn. Should you assume that (your approach to learning) is a passive and and not an active role, almost all that has gone into the building of this institution will be for naught.[2]

[1]Michigan State University-Oakland, Convocation of Charter Class, (Rochester: September 17, 1959), p. 13.

[2]Ibid., p. 19

Dr. Hoopes, meeting with the class for the first time, said,

> so far as the members of this, the Charter Class, are concerned, each or most of you must be struggling with certain questions. What is life? What is success? What is happiness? What is good? What am I? What do I want? Where am I going? Those questions you must ask, somehow, sometime; and the answers you discover will determine largely what you will become and what you will go on to find. Primarily, you are in college to seek answers to those questions, and the first thing you will discover is that there are no pat answers. If anyone tells you there are, he's a fool. And yet you must ask the questions that need to be asked. You will receive guidance from countless great historical voices that have asked the same questions, and, it will probably seem to you, come up with as many different answers as there have been voices. Out of the welter and confusion you will--hopefully--begin to develop a receptiveness to new ideas, freedom from prejudice and emotional bias, the habit of insisting upon verification and demonstration of everything present as truth, and ability to distinguish between appearance and reality, a refusal to accept authority or tradition as final, and a permanent skepticism of all those fads, propagandas, and panaceas that may be called the patent medicines of the mind.[1]

To these new college students these statements were both a nudge and a threat. They were neither too idealistic to be impractical nor too realistic to lack challenge. The challenge was presented. The acceptance of that challenge is the Charter Class story. How each individual in this group would react was unknown, but no freshman class was more eager to meet the challenge. Some sought vocational preparation. Some wanted social acceptance. Some looked for freedom from tradition. Some desired confrontation with ideas. Some wished for refuge from inclement weather.

Lynn Elaine Anderson, Student No. 00001, a 1959 Pontiac Central

[1] Ibid., p. 23.

High School June graduate and the recipient of the Roslyn Wyman Scholarship, was Michigan State University Oakland's first student. In many ways, she was typical of the Charter Class students--commuter, resident of Oakland County, 18 years old, single, upper quarter of her high school class, daughter of a small businessman, major and career undecided, one of several children, unsophisticated, active in school and youth groups, and hopeful. Joining Miss Anderson in filing an application for admission to this distinctive group were 894 other people. Of this group 674 were admitted and 570 enrolled in the fall of 1959. At the date of graduation on April 20, 1963, only 102 had been able to succeed in the first four years. Since that date through April 1968, the number of the original group to graduate from Oakland University (MSUO) has increased by 65 for a grand total of 167. In other words, 17.9 percent of the Charter Class has graduated from Oakland University which is decidedly under the national average of approximately 50 percent. However, it should be pointed out that some of the beginning class transferred and many have graduated from another college or university.

General and Specific Characteristics

Who were the members of the Charter Class and what were the general characteristics of this group? In order to gain an insight into this class's background, a review of the University records and the student applications for admission were studied. Tables 2, 3, and 4 tell the story.

A composite of the Charter Class based on Tables 2, 3, and 4 revealed that there were more men than women; that the married women

TABLE 2

ENROLLMENT STATISTICS

Item	Men	Women	Total
Total Applications for Admission	528	367	895
Total Students admitted	390	286	676
Total Students enrolled	353	217	570
Part-time students	57	36	93
Married students	36	34	70
Veterans (World War II & Korean)	50	1	51
First time in any college	326	200	526
Transfer students	27	17	44
Enrollment by curriculum:			
Business Administration	61	9	70
Engineering Science	135	4	139
Liberal Arts	97	63	160
Teacher Education	60	141	201
Geographic Distribution:			
Macomb County	71	34	105
Oakland County	265	176	441
Wayne County	6	3	9
Balance of State	8	3	11
Out of State	3	1	4

TABLE 3

GENERAL STATISTICS
BY PERCENTAGES

Categories	Men	Women	Father	Mother	Total Percentage
Sex:					
Male	...	...	...	...	62
Female	...	...	...	...	38
Marital Status:					
Single	...	...	...	...	88
Married	...	...	...	...	12
Number of Children in Family:					
One	...	...	...	...	10
Two	...	...	...	...	27
Three	...	...	...	...	29
Four or more	...	...	...	...	34
Employment of Father:					
Professional or semi-professional	...	...	...	...	18
Managerial or own business	...	...	...	...	15
Clerical, Sales and Service	...	...	...	...	7
Skilled labor	...	...	...	...	28
Semi-skilled or unskilled labor	...	...	...	...	32

TABLE 3--Continued

Categories	Men	Women	Father	Mother	Total Percentage
Quarter Rank in High School Class:					
First	23	30	...	...	53
Second	25	12	...	...	37
Third	9	0	...	...	9
Fourth	1	0	...	...	1
Education Financed by:					
Parents only	...	...	...	...	23
Students only	...	...	...	...	31
Parents and students	...	...	...	...	31
Scholarship	...	...	...	...	12
Loan	...	...	...	...	3
Factors in Choice:					
Liberal education	...	...	...	...	41
Close to home	...	...	...	...	29
Intellectually stimulating	...	...	...	...	20
High academic standards	...	...	...	...	10
Small size	...	...	...	...	0
Intend to Major in:					
Business Administration	...	...	...	...	11
Engineering Science	...	...	...	...	23
Liberal Arts	...	...	...	...	29
Teacher Education	...	...	...	...	37

TABLE 3--Continued

Categories	Men	Women	Father	Mother	Total Percentage
Definiteness of Future Plans:					
Certain or nearly certain	...	...	...	...	61
Somewhat doubtful	...	...	...	...	25
Fairly or very uncertain	...	...	...	...	14
Employment Plans by Student:					
Not intending to work	...	...	...	...	53
One to ten hours per week	...	...	...	...	28
Eleven to twenty hours per week	...	...	...	...	18
21 or more hours per week	...	...	...	...	1
Education of Parents:					
Less than high school	...	...	32	21	...
High school graduate	...	...	38	56	...
Some college or other education beyond high school	...	...	20	12	...
College graduate	...	...	8	10	...
Graduate study	...	...	2	1	...

TABLE 4

GENERAL STATISTICS IN PERCENTAGES
BY QUARTER RANK IN HIGH SCHOOL
BY INTENDED MAJOR

Quarter Rank	Business Administration	Engineering Science	Liberal Arts	Teacher Education
First	28	55	39	65
Second	41	31	52	30
Third	28	11	8	5
Fourth	3	3	1	0

were either new to college or returning after an absence of 10 to 15 years; and that the married men were almost exclusively part-time evening students; that two-thirds of the students had two or more brothers and/or sisters; that one student in ten was an only child; that the class was found academically "very similar to the 1958 freshman class in East Lansing;"[1] that ten percent of the class took the entrance examination; that one father in three was vocationally classified as semi-skilled or unskilled; and that thirty-two percent of the fathers and twenty-one percent of the mothers had less than a high school education while ten percent of the parents held a bachelor or higher degree. In addition, the several factors which influenced choosing MSUO were: liberal education, close to home, intellectually stimulating, and high academic standards; teacher education was the most popular curriculum

[1]Arvo E. Juola, Some Evaluations of the Freshman Population Based on Placement Testing, Evaluation Services Department, Michigan State University, (East Lansing: Fall, 1959), p. 1.

choice followed by liberal arts, engineering science and business administration; sixty-one percent of the class indicated, on their applications, they knew what they would do vocationally after graduation; and finally, over half the class stated they did not plan to work but three-quarters of the group said they would not depend on financing from their parents.

Adding to the information above, the studies Michigan State University's College of Education completed in 1957, "Selected Population Characteristics for Oakland and Macomb Counties" and "Post-Secondary Education in Oakland-Macomb Counties" as referred to in Chapter I tells a little more about the area, the family, and the home backgrounds of these students in this part of the state. The first study revealed the following facts: (a) Oakland-Macomb Counties are in a rapid growth cycle which is expected to continue for 20 to 30 years, (b) the majority of workers are in clerical, skilled, and unskilled occupations related to the automobile industry, (c) the parents with children in school have a positive attitude toward college, (d) the recruitment of students should not be difficult, (e) the educational needs at the post-secondary level recommends both a community college and a MSUO, and (f) the number of non-degree programs would be two to three times that of the degree programs.[1]

Those who answered the questions in the second study represented a cross-section of the general population in these two counties and their answers compared reasonably close to the figures reported in Table 3 above. For example, the educational achievement of the parents

[1]Selected Population Characteristics of Oakland and Macomb Counties, Michigan (East Lansing: Michigan State University College of Education, January, 1957).

indicated mothers as having a slight edge over the fathers but each having approximately two-thirds of their total with a high school diploma or a college degree. Heads of households were identified with the skilled, clerical, and unskilled occupation. Professional and managerial positions accounted for about 40 percent of the jobs held by the fathers. Teaching and engineering were listed most often as the desired majors in college with business administration rating third. It should be noted that the questionnaire was so worded as not to include areas normally conceived as liberal arts; therefore, this major was not easily identified.[1]

This class, as stated earlier, was found to be "very similar in ability to the 1958 MSU freshman class."[2] The admission requirements were the same used by Michigan State University in the fall of 1959. Basically, the student was required to be a graduate from an approved high school with a satisfactory record, have the recommendation of his high school counselor or principal, indicate some participation in extra curricular activities, and have completed a minimum of ten units in the following areas: English (a minimum of 3), foreign language, mathematics, science, and social studies. Table 3 revealed that 90 percent of those who enrolled were in the upper half of their class with 53 percent in the upper quarter.

Dr. Arvo E. Juola, of the Michigan State University's Evaluation Services, did a study[3] using the College Qualification Tests to analyze the MSUO freshman class by comparing percentile norms established

[1] Post-Secondary Education in Oakland-Macomb Counties (East Lansing: Michigan State University College of Education, 1957).

[2] Juola, 1. [3] Juola, 1-14.

at Michigan State University with national norms for freshmen at state universities. The College Qualification Test was administered to provide a measure of scholastic aptitude. This test is divided into three parts, verbal comprehension (V), general information (I), and numerical ability (N) with each part being scored separately and also added together for a total score. The V score measures linguistic ability and checks the verbal factor needed in certain curricula. The I score indicates the general information accumulated by the student with no relation to a specific curricula but has served at MSU as a good predictor of academic success. The N score measures quantitative ability and identifies students with ability to succeed in scientific or technical curricula.

The analysis of the CQT, when compared to the national norms, indicated that MSUO freshmen were a much more homogeneous group of students than found on a national basis. This was not surprising, because the MSUO student came from a limited geographic area with almost comparable educational backgrounds and school systems. A look at the mean scores in the verbal comprehension, general information, and total score revealed that the MSUO male achieved above the average score for freshmen on a national basis. An examination and comparison of the MSUO men's percentile scores indicated a concentration around the 50th to 75th percentile. However, there was only a small group of men in the top ten percent and fewer below the 35th percentile. The MSUO women did not compare as well on a national basis. The freshmen women only scored above the national average in the general information test. In the numerical ability subtest, both men and women fell below the mean on the national norm. The women students also scored below the average in the

verbal comprehension subtest. In fact, the women's percentile ranking placed the majority between the 20th and 30th percentile. A few women scored at the 95th to 99th percentile level while a few scored below the 20th percentile. On the total score, the women concentrated about the 35th to 45th percentile range which placed them appreciably lower than the national norm for freshmen women.

Analyzing only the MSUO freshmen men's results on the three subtests by curriculum, those students electing the engineering curriculum tested the highest. The liberal arts major placed second with business administration majors third and teacher education majors fourth. Looking at each subtest and comparing the men's scores to the women's scores, it was obvious that the men in the Charter Class had a greater potential and aptitude for college work than the women.

On the Michigan State University Reading Test, the liberal arts major scored the highest, teacher education majors were second followed by business administration and engineering science respectively. However, noting that both engineering and business administration majors were predominately men, the reading test scores for the four majors favor the engineers when only scores for men are compared. The others in order were liberal arts, teacher education, and business administration.

Quality of Student Unknown

When classes began on September 21, 1959, little was actually known about this class. The statistical information described above had not been studied and the orientation test information was not available to the faculty. In fact, the results were not known for several weeks into the fall quarter. The students were handicapped and so were the

faculty because they did not know their raw material.

Although the local and national publicity that accompanied the opening of Michigan State University Oakland stated clearly that this student body was not an elite group but "an extremely good one--able, serious minded, (and) aware of the purpose for which (MSUO was) established,"[1] still the curriculum and the academic expectations of the faculty were very demanding. The first hint that the students had not been matched properly to the curriculum or vice versa was when the high school counselors began calling the Director of Admissions asking what was happening at MSUO. They had had many visits from their former students complaining bitterly about the work load and pointing an accusing finger at the high school for not properly preparing them for college. These visits to the high school represented a good cross-section of the class.

In November, the following memo was written by Herbert Stoutenburg, Director of Admissions and Registrar, suggesting to Chancellor Varner agenda items for an upcoming faculty and staff meeting. Mr. Stoutenburg thought that if these items were discussed openly the faculty would have a better understanding of the student body which would result in a more realistic approach to the level of academic expectations and in turn work to reduce some of the frustrations and anxieties of the students.

1. A question that I think should be discussed and one that I am sure will be raised is the caliber of MSUO students. (Our students earned their right to attend MSUO. True, their selection was not based on an application ratio of four or five to the one granted admission, but they came from good high schools with

[1] Michigan State University Oakland, Convocation of Charter Class, (Rochester: September 17, 1959), p. 22.

good formal academic backgrounds or the equivalent.)

2. I would like to see a point made that good teaching inspires and one of the greatest satisfactions of teaching comes from seeing students grow. (At the moment, based on the reaction of students, I have the feeling that certain members of the faculty have pegged their course material at a given level and are unwilling to adjust. This may be because they lack imagination, have not had adequate teaching experience or are not willing to back down from a previous position.)

3. A final item for review is the advisor role of the faculty member. (Possibly some clarification is necessary as to what is expected. At times it would appear that some faculty members are punching a clock as regarding office hours.)[1]

By mid-term time, the problem was better defined, but little was done and blind faith prevailed. Everyone wanted to believe that this group was more capable than it was, and because they did, many of the courses were geared above the freshman level. Demands were great and so was the later carnage. However, Dr. Paul Tomboulian, head of the Chemistry Department, and Dr. James McKay, head of the Mathematics Department, selected a cross section of courses using 7th week grades to determine the success of the Charter Class to this date in the first quarter.

Seventh Week Grades Sampled

Dr. Tomboulian studied the academic achievement in Chemistry I for the 177 students enrolled. Nearly two-thirds of the students had less than a C grade at mid-term time. More than a third of these students were from the top quarter of their graduating class while 25 percent of the failures were accumulated by this group. However, this same group earned approximately four-fifths of the passing grades.

[1]Memorandum from Herbert N. Stoutenburg, Jr., Director of Admissions and Registrar, Michigan State University Oakland, Rochester, Michigan, November 20, 1959.

TABLE 5[1]

SEVENTH WEEK GRADES FOR CHEMISTRY I STUDENTS AS RELATED TO HIGH SCHOOL STANDING

Grade	Top Quarter of H.S. Class		Remainder of H.S. Class		Total	
	% Receiving Grade	No.	% Receiving Grade	No.	% Receiving Grade	No.
A	7	6	1	1	4	7
B	18	16	2	2	10	18
C	32	28	14	12	23	40
D	26	23	34	30	30	53
F	17	15	49	44	33	59
Total	100%	88	100%	89	100%	177

Mathematics I students (Table 6) fared little better in percentage than the Chemistry I students for grades below a C, but in grades of F, they received even more than Chemistry I students. The Mathematics students, in the top ten percent of the graduating class, like the Chemistry students, were better able to handle the course work. Over 70 percent of the C grades and above were given these students.

A random sample of the 13 sections of Western Institutions I (Table 7) classes by Dr. McKay revealed better general preparation for this subject matter. This, of course, is assuming that the quality of instruction and demands of the instructors are similar to the Chemistry and Mathematics classes. In total, more than 50 percent of the grades were C and above with only 26 percent receiving failing grades.

[1]Paul Tomboulian, "Seventh Week Grades for Chemistry I Students as Related to High School Standing," Michigan State University Oakland, Rochester, Michigan, November 1959, p. 1. (Mimeographed).

TABLE 6[1]

SEVENTH WEEK GRADES FOR MATHEMATICS I STUDENTS
AS RELATED TO HIGH SCHOOL STANDING

Grade	Top Quarter of H.S. Class		Remainder of H.S. Class		Total	
	% Receiving Grade	No.	% Receiving Grade	No.	% Receiving Grade	No.
A	12	9	3	2	8	11
B	17	12	11	7	14	19
C	32	23	7	4	20	27
D	18	13	20	13	19	26
F	21	15	59	38	39	53
Total	100%	72	100%	64	100%	136

TABLE 7[2]

SEVENTH WEEK GRADES FOR WESTERN INSTITUTIONS I
(Section 1B, 9A, 10A) STUDENTS
AS RELATED TO HIGH SCHOOL STANDING

Grade	Top Quarter of H.S. Class		Remainder of H.S. Class		Total	
	% Receiving Grade	No.	% Receiving Grade	No.	% Receiving Grade	No.
A	2	1	9	4	5	5
B	24	13	10	5	17	18
C	40	22	30	14	35	36
D	18	10	15	7	17	17
F	16	9	36	17	26	26
Total	100%	55	100%	47	100%	102

[1]J. H. McKay, "Grades for Mathematic Students in Mathematics Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 as Related to High School Standing," Michigan State University Oakland, Rochester, Michigan, November, 1959, pp. 1-2. (Mimeographed.

[2]J. H. McKay, "Mid-Term Grades for Western Institutions (Sections 1B, 9A, 10A) as Related to High School Standing," Michigan State University Oakland, Rochester, Michigan, November 1959, p. 1. (Mimeographed).

Mid-Term and First Quarter Grades Compared

The mid-term grades in Chemistry and Mathematics held true through the final grades. The Chemistry Department gave 99 grades below a C, 76 of them F's. This accounted for 55 percent of the chemistry grades given. The Mathematics Department gave 70 grades below a C, 44 of them F's, which also accounted for 55 percent of the grades given. The Western Institutions faculty gave 114 grades below a C, 43 of them F's, which accounted for 21 percent of the grades given. During the fall term, 1,960 separate grades were assigned by the faculty which when reviewed in total did not present a too unreasonable picture except in grades of F. The grade distribution was, A's, seven percent; B's, 21 percent; C's, 35 percent; D's, 12 percent; F's, 17 percent; Incompletes, one percent; and No Grades, six percent. With most of the MSUO F's being given in Chemistry, Mathematics, and Economics, it substantiates Dr. Juola's interpretation of the C.Q.T. (N) score. He said, "Both the male and female students at MSU-O fall below the mean on the national norms in the numerical ability subtest on the C.Q.T."

A comparison with MSU's entering freshmen with the Charter Class for fall, 1959, would have been most interesting, but the closest information available from MSU[1] was the grade distribution of 100 and 200 level courses for undergraduate students. The grade distribution for this group was: A's, 13 percent; B's 29 percent; C's, 30 percent; D's 13 percent; F's, five percent; Incompletes, one percent; and No Grades, one percent. These percentages were based on 51,479 grades and included

[1]Distribution of Grades Fall 1959 (East Lansing: Office of the Registrar, Michigan State University, January, 1960).

students from all four undergraduate classes and a much broader selection of courses. Allowing for the effect of upperclass students who may have caused the percentages of A's, B's, and C's, to run higher and reduced the percentage of failures, the difference was not too great except in F's

The grades received by the Charter Class students may not have shocked many, but for a group, 90 percent of whom had met the minimum requirements for admission, the experience was most damaging to their ego and accounted for the very high attrition which was to follow.

Attrition A Problem

By December 31, 1960, or four quarters after the Charter Class started, 250 of the class had withdrawn.

TABLE 8[1]

ATTRITION FIGURES BY GPA AND LAST QUARTER IN ATTENDANCE FOR THE CHARTER CLASS

Grade Point Average	Fall 1959	Winter 1960	Spring or Summer 1960	Fall 1960	Total
0.0 to 0.99	48	27	14	5	94
1.0 to 1.99	4	22	40	40	106
2.0 to 4.0	9	7	21	13	50
Total	61	56	75	58	250

A review of the official record card for these students indicates that 71 asked for transcripts to be sent to other four-year degree

[1]J. H. McKay, "Some Data on Drop-Outs," Michigan State University Oakland, Rochester, Michigan, June 6, 1961, p. 1. (Mimeographed).

granting institutions and community colleges. No record was kept of the remaining 179.

Action for Change Taken

The grade situation in the fall of 1959 called for drastic administrative and faculty action in order to salvage the spirits of the student and maintain a reasonable enrollment. The administration and faculty agreed on two points but not without some of the faculty condemning any practice which would compromise the original policy. The first decision was to permit all students to continue to the end of the spring quarter before taking any academic action for dismissal. The second decision was to reverse the policy, that all courses attempted would be included in computing the grade point average. In its place, the decision was made to allow the last grade for any repeated F to stand. In other words, a student repeating an F grade would not have the two grades averaged, but the last grade would be the only grade counted when calculating his grade point average. This was a decision to apply only to the first quarter's grades, however, there was no time limit for repeating any of the first quarter's F's. Some students repeated the courses in the winter quarter of 1960, but many of the F's were repeated several terms later. The fall 1959 grades were a rather severe trauma for the Charter Class which only the strongest or most persistent survived.

Curriculum Design and Revisions

Although many well known and not so well known people had a hand in shaping the broad concepts of the MSUO curriculum, it took the newly

acquired faculty to give it substance. As might be expected in a new situation, the courses were little more than outlines two months before classes began. The subject matter content for each course had a modicum of coordination. Each faculty member was free to develop and organize his course within the broad guidelines set forth by the divisional chairmen.

Even though the development of the curriculum and subject matter for the Charter Class was never more than a quarter or a semester ahead, the objectives and purposes were clear. These had been set forth by the lay committee and the first year's faculty. Dr. Robert Hoopes, Dean of the Faculty, asked, "What do we ask of our students?" He answered, Simply this:

> That they raise and confront fundamental questions; that they develop the ability to state those questions in intelligible terms; that they press forward in conversation with their teachers irrespective of the consequences involved; that they commit themselves, in short, to the belief that only the truth, as we see it, shall make us free and that service to anything else is bondage.[1]

Using this statement, the faculty was provided with an excellent bench mark from which to organize the curriculum. The nature of which was to create a challenge that could not be ignored and satisfied only when one had expended a total effort.

Curriculum is a thing that is always in constant flux and is never resolved. Faculty members and administrators spend many hours developing the content and organizing the relationship of the subject matter to the institution's goals. The student gives the impression of being unaware of the deliberations and seems willing to trust that the

[1]"Oakland University," Oakland University Publication, 1960, back cover.

right thing will be done in the end. MSUO's Charter Class was no exception, as illustrated by two of its first graduates.

Donald Mann recalled that he and his fellow students were too busy and excited about their day-to-day educational experience to be concerned about the next semester's courses. Comparing his high school mathematics course to his college mathematics course, he said, "For the first time this subject was enjoyable--the end was no longer a mere calculation, but a way of thinking through an approach to a problem. Learning was meaningful and fun."[1]

James Morrison said,

> being only 18 years old and the first in my family to go to college, I had no preconceived idea of what to expect. My only disappointment with the curriculum was the failure of MSUO to have a major in biology. I was very much impressed with all my professors from the first day to the last day, and I guess I trusted them to develop a proper course of study to fit my ultimate major, elementary education. I do not remember much in the way of conversation or concern about the curriculum development among my friends.[2]

A review of copies of the Oakland Observer, the University's weekly paper, revealed only a reporting interest in curriculum development. In the first four years there were fewer than a dozen articles and no editorials or letters to the editor criticizing any aspect of the curriculum.

But this lack of direct involvement or apparent interest by the students was not the case with the faculty. The highly prescribed university course requirement and general requirements for graduation

[1]Interview with Donald Mann, Charter Class member, November 12, 1967.

[2]Interview with James Morrison, Charter Class member, November 12, 1967.

were under constant review by the faculty. The several concerns that affected the Charter Class and subsequent classes were: (1) the number of free electives, (2) the required number of courses for graduation, and (3) the distribution of the subject areas within the University Course structure.

The free elective problem, as explained in Chapter II, required compromise and soul-searching by the faculty because the highly prescribed nature of the MSUO curriculum in both its general education and department major requirements left little room for students to pursue any area of special interest. Some departments felt that electives should not be free, but recommended courses in collateral areas so as to strengthen a major. However, after hours of debate, it was agreed that each student would be guaranteed a minimum of two courses of his own choosing. In some majors this number was expanded to five. Once decided, this policy was not changed.

Course Requirement

How many courses constituted an appropriate number for graduation was not an easy problem to solve, or at least the MSUO faculty found it difficult to handle. One group proposed a minimum of 35 courses which, on the basis of an earlier decision, would have required nine semesters to complete a bachelor's degree. Another group argued for 32 courses which would have required the student to enroll in and pass 4 courses each of eight semesters. Finally, the problem was resolved by requiring 31 four credit courses. The student was to complete the University Course requirements, the nine courses in his subject matter major, as specified by his advisor and agreed to by the student, the needed collateral courses and what other courses needed to satisfy the minimum. The rationale used

for the 31 course minimum was the feeling by the majority of the faculty that a student should be permitted to have one semester of less than a full-credit load, or, in the case of a failure, the student should not be penalized by having to spend an extra semester for one course. In order to accommodate the teacher education students, because they were required to take 30 semester credits of education courses and because of the minimum two-course free elective, the subject matter major was established at 8 courses as compared to the 9 courses in other majors.

University Courses

The above decision placed certain limits on the University Course prescription and caused the faculty to reassess their previous thinking about MSUO's general education requirements. For example, it was learned by the end of the second year that the foreign language requirement was unrealistic when applied to all students. Some students were incapable of learning a language using an oral-aural system. Questions were asked by the Business and Engineering faculties why a requirement of this nature should be applied to students whose strengths, interests, and needs were so different from liberal arts students. Ultimately, this requirement was reduced in quantity and changed in approach for several categories of students. Only in a few cases where students had postponed taking a foreign language did the Charter Class students benefit by the change in the requirement.

The Senior Colloquium, a course which was to be the capstone of the general education experience at MSUO to capitalize on the accumulated attitudinal changes and apply them to a significant problem of today, was reluctantly dropped from the University Course requirement to accommodate the major specifications, election policy, and the minimum

number of courses for graduation. This decision was the easiest of several that could have been made, because no one had staked a claim nor was a vested interest being infringed upon. Although the Senior Colloquium was given up without too much concern, the idea of reinstating the course was discussed many times. But until some other course can be dropped, a policy change takes place, or a very real-felt need exists, it probably will not find its way back into the curriculum. According to Miss Patricia Sadowski, a Charter Class graduate, some students felt that they were being cheated, but most students felt relief when this decision to drop the Senior Colloquium was announced.

The Introduction to Art (UC 047) and the Introduction to Music (UC 049) in the University Course structure repeatedly received major attention when there was any suggestion of reducing the number of general education required courses. The usual approach was to allow students a choice of one or the other, and to make it a one semester requirement. Each time this matter was discussed in the Academic Senate, the two departments were able to rally support, and the requirement remained unchanged.

However, freshman English was substantially changed on February 25, 1961. The English faculty recommended that the two-semester requirement be changed to three semesters. This decision, generally not affecting the Charter Class, redirected the emphasis of the freshman English requirement from one of writing and reading to a semester of intensive "instruction and practice in expository writing . . . and critical analysis of expository prose,"[1] and two semesters of a course

[1] Michigan State University Oakland Bulletin, Michigan State University Oakland, (Rochester: Summer, 1961), p. 33.

> designed to help the student study critically the literary traditions, forms, and conventions of the west, from the Greeks to the present, in the hope he will acquire a foundation for taste and an understanding of the functions of literature as an art for the conveying of ideas, emotions, and values.[1]

Effect on Students and Relationship to Faculty

The experience of and the pressures on the Charter Class provided the impetus for many of the curriculum changes and new policies instituted during the first four years. In few cases did the Charter Class benefit directly from the adjustments and revisions. According to several members of the class, this was what established the "esprit de corps" in the group. They were pioneers, and they recognized their role. In fact, they were proud of it, and were not resentful of subsequent classes, but felt a little pity for them for having everything easier.

The students trusted a few with a lot, but in turn, the excitement of an adventure provided an unusual opportunity for the MSUO student and the faculty to enter into an academic partnership which was to prove profitable for both throughout their four years together. Contrary to this experience at MSUO, Philip E. Jacob said in 1957, "An accumulating body of evidence indicates that the person of the instructor is on the way out as an educational factor at many institutions."[2] But, he also said that,

> There are still colleges where the teacher counts with his students. High instructional impact is more likely to be found at a place where (a) contact between faculty and students in the curriculum is

[1] Ibid., pp. 33-34

[2] Philip E. Jacob, Changing Values in College (New York: Harper and Brothers Publisher 1957), p. 78.

> intimate, (b) the faculty is "student centered," and teachers derive a real sense of satisfaction and value from teaching their particular students (regardless of their intellectual level, social background, or outlook), (c) faculty (and perhaps students) have a relatively large amount of responsibility for the educational program of the institution, (d) the institution, including its administrators, is self-conscious and purposeful about its educational mission, and (e) there is wide diversity in the background, personality, and value of the students.[1]

This statement of Jacobs characterized the conditions and the situation at Michigan State University Oakland. As stated previously, the students felt an academic partnership with the faculty and perceived themselves as involved with university decisions in the many facets of administration and curriculum. This sense of involvement was encouraged by the Chancellor's democratic attitude and approach, the Dean of Students' willingness to work with students, the Registrar's student-centered operation, and the faculty's interest in personal contact with the students outside of class as well as in class. Interviewed Charter Class members looked back at their relationship with the faculty and said:

> I appreciated the faculty's efforts to get closer to the student. (James Morrison)

> I was surprised at the forthright manner in which the Chancellor talked about University matters with the students, but it made me feel like I was a partner with the faculty and administration in establishing MSUO. (Kristin Ulseth)

> When I was working on my masters at Ohio State, I realized for the first time how fortunate I was to have attended Oakland where the undergraduate experience is a joint effort involving student and faculty. (Larry Warner)

> We were a motely group willing to try anything new because we trusted the faculty. (Ronald Miller)

[1] Ibid., p. 78-89.

Late in the junior year and early in the senior year, those members of the Charter Class who were liberal arts majors in the humanities and the social sciences experienced a sense of panic when all of a sudden they realized that their undergraduate days were running out and they were not prepared for a specific vocation. The Placement Bureau was deluged with questions, and it became a rather popular haunt because of an awakening concern for the job market. The result was an administrative decision to hold several orientation programs describing the functions of the Placement Bureau, the responsibilities of the student, the opportunities available for the different kinds of majors, the use of the vocational reference library, and the procedure of being interviewed. Several liberal arts faculty members and the Dean of the School of Humanities discussed the career opportunities for the liberal arts major, and emphasized the interest of industry, business, and graduate schools in students who had not placed a restriction on their education by specializing. Of course, this latter argument was not as valid at MSUO as it might have been at another institution where fewer university-like courses (general education) were required. On April 20, 1963, except for those students who did not plan to work, all graduates of the Charter Class were placed either in a job or graduate school. Less than a third of this group found employment outside of Michigan and over half located within 35 miles of MSUO. Several administrators and faculty members encouraged the Class to be more adventuresome and break for a while with the known security of family and things familiar. Some did, but the unsophisticated background of these individuals made it difficult for them to change their attitudes.

Loyalty to the Class

A characteristic of the Charter Class was its pride in trying to live up to the MSUO image of a no-nonsense school (no fraternities, sororities, ROTC, or intercollegiate athletics) and an institution not bound by tradition. The Class displayed a deep concern for those wayward brethern who lost sight of the prime purpose for being at MSUO. In the March 11, 1960 copy of the Oakland Observer, the following editorial appeared:

To Be An Egghead Or Not To Be

> If Michigan State University Oakland turns out many 'eggheads,' it will be a miracle. For the most part, the students give little regard to their studies, and who would with all the other things to do?
>
> All spare time is spent in the Student Center, with the exception of a few students who prefer to gossip in the library. In other college and university libraries, the sound of a pin being dropped on the floor can be heard by all. This is not so at MSUO. An exploding bomb would probably be heard by relatively few. The library in this institution has provided a shelter for a stray dog, a meeting place for a few 'beats' and their bongo drums, facilities for an experiment to find out if formica will burn, a place to do modern dancing, and last, and least, a place to study.
>
> The perspective 'eggheads' of MSUO also congregate in the Student Center. Many students cut classes to check their opponent in chess, play out their sensational pinochle hand, even the score in pingpong, play 'kissey face' in the lounge, or to hear one more song by the Kingston Trio.
>
> Some students have their fingers in every extra curricular activity. There are relatively few clubs, but must one belong to all of them? It is well enough to belong to a few non-academic organizations, but one's studies should come first. If a person is a ski enthusiast, works on the student newspaper, explores student government, and lifts weights, little time is left for the problems of economics and conjugating verbs in French.
>
> We agree with the saying, 'all work and no play makes Jack

> a dull boy,' but next year when the 'Charter Class of MSUO' is slinging hash in the greasy spoon, it will be too late to correct these mistakes. It is not too late now to realize the importance of studying, but the question is, will the students realize, or will they stumble on out the back door?[1]

This concern of the class for its members was carried over to the matter of appearance and proper decorum. As illustrated by the following headlines from copies of the Oakland Observer, "Student Behavior,"[2] "Is There a Right To Be Immature,"[3] and "Conduct Unbecoming To MSUO."[4] After the arrival of the new freshman class in September, 1960, the Charter Class was less willing to speak to the school as a total. The loyalty was to the class as an identifiable group. After November, 1960, no other articles or editorials appeared in the Oakland Observer on these subjects.

Lack of Class Interest to Govern Self

Many of the administrative decisions made during the first four years should have been made by students, but because of the on and off nature of a student government or other representative body with a total University view, the administration acted. Such areas as student handbook, student publications, judiciary decisions, social code, leadership training, intramural athletics, honors system, insurance program, freshman orientation program, commencement planning and chartering student

[1] Oakland Observer, (Rochester, Michigan), March 11, 1960, p. 3.

[2] Ibid., November 3, 1959, p. 2.

[3] Ibid., October 7, 1960, p. 2.

[4] Ibid., November 18, 1960, p. 2.

interest groups were available and open to students for policy-making decisions, but the Charter Class did not take full advantage of the opportunity. The first effort at establishing a student government was in October, 1959, when an exploratory committee was elected to draft a proposed form of government and a procedure for electing officers.

The Exploratory Committee did their homework diligently by visiting with student governments on other college and university campuses, preparing a constitution, and holding an election. On October 24, 1960, Paul Allen was elected MSUO's first Student Government president along with 17 Senators. The first year, the government spent organizing, appointing committees, and sponsoring some minor projects, but by the spring election in 1961 when only 17 candidates ran for the 22 senator positions, some disenchantment was noticeable primarily because of the lack of real purpose in goals of the Student Government. At the beginning of the second year, the Student Government attempted to adopt the Student Center Council and found a resentment among the Student Center Board of Governors for what appeared to them to be an attempt at a take-over by the Student Government. The Student Center Council was organized in January 1960, to manage, plan and coordinate activity programs in the Student Center.

In the fall of 1961, Howard Hinkel was elected the second president of the Student Government and there was a general hope by students, faculty and administration that the group would succeed, but by February, 1962, the breakup and failure were evident. Accusations were being made by different groups, some with validity and some without. The Dean of Students, Duncan Sells, the third one in as many years, was quoted in the February 9 edition of the Oakland Observer as follows:

> I'm not sure MSUO is old enough to support a Student Government, and by old enough, I don't mean age, I mean the maturity with which the Senate is facing its problems . . . the situation developed here is unhealthy, . . . at the present time you are not accomplishing anything. If you have enough respect for each other you will decide whether or not you are capable of working together.[1]

On February 16, the Senate announced their sponsorship of a blood drive, and on March 9, voted to suspend the Student Government's operation and announced an indefinite moratorium. For some unexplainable reason the student body in general and the student government specifically never quite recognized "the obvious fact that the college is a cooperative enterprise and that the students are a part of the college with a valuable and necessary contribution to make to the effective functioning of the institution."[2]

This story describing the short life of the Student Government was told to show another side of the individuals who made up the Charter Class. The establishment of a government seemed to the students, the administration, and some faculty, as the thing to do. It was started with sincerity and enthusiasm; but soon ran into trouble because there was no upper class to turn to for advice nor tradition upon which to base a decision. The group's experience was limited to what they had had in high school. The moratorium was most disturbing to the administration and least disturbing to the students. The administration wanted a means of communicating with the student body, but because of the independent nature of the Charter Class member, he willingly

[1] Ibid., February 9, 1962, p. 1.

[2] Frances E. Falvey, Student Participation in College Administration (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher College, Columbia University, 1952), p. 13.

accepted the responsibility to represent himself. He found little need to band with others because his reaction was sought from time to time by the administration to the many changes and alterations within the program which gave him a feeling of being at the center of the University community. Because of this general attitude by the students, the administration had a free hand to make policy and decisions which the Charter Class should have made. For example, many students were very upset about noise and the conduct of their fellow students in the library. Some attempted to generate support to solve the situation by identifying the problem publicly and pointing out alternatives. An article supporting this approach was published in the first edition of the Oakland Observer entitled "Quiet Please." The last two paragraphs of the article are as follows:

> What is to happen to our library? The answer is up to us. If we can't solve the problem, we know what will happen. Librarians will become disciplinarians, and we shall lose privileges in the library because we show we cannot accept responsibility there, and we might lose privileges elsewhere. Also, if the librarian must devote time to policing the library, there will be that much less time to order needed books and get them on the shelves.
>
> Again, the solution is up to us. We are supposed to be a hand-picked student body. The library must be a place for study. To serve this function it must be quiet.[1]

However, instead of the students dealing with the problem themselves through an organized structure, they wrote letters to the editor and complained to the librarian. This problem like others later was solved by administrative action. Much too often, the students looked to the administration to handle such things as the preparation of a student

[1] Oakland Observer, (Rochester, Michigan), October 23, 1959, p. 6.

handbook, of judiciary decisions, of social code, of cultural programs, of college calendar, of freshman orientation, of commencement planning, of leadership training et cetera. Some would say that this forfeiting of rights and responsibilities by the students should have made the administration of MSUO easier, and in some ways it did. But the lack of student participation in the policy-making activity and the failure of the student government caused problems for classes that followed.

The Charter Class did organize from time to time, for short periods, to create a group to handle a special project, but a recognized student government in any form has never been established since the moratorium. This group left little in a way of tradition in terms of the discussion except for the tradition not to organize or be organized. This has proved to be a handicap to subsequent classes. The administration, and to a lesser degree the faculty, still persist that some formal channel of communication should exist between them and the student body for healthy relations.

Woodrow Wilson, when president of Princeton University said,

> A college is not only a body of studies but a mode of association. . . . it must become a community of scholars and pupils--a free community but a very real one, in which democracy may work its reasonable triumphs of accommodation, its vital processes of union.[1]

By the lack of interest in a student government and an inability to work together, the Charter Class denied itself an important educational experience. The administration lost in turn an excellent opportunity to teach the interested and capable young men and women leaders who could have salvaged part of the organizational structure that existed even

[1] Woodrow Wilson, "The Spirit of Learning," Address before Phi Beta Kappa Chapter in Cambridge, July 1, 1909, Public Papers, (ed.), Satannard Baker and William E. Dodd II (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1925), p. 118.

though it might have been reduced in scope. Reviewing the events which led to the collapse of the government and noting the lack of unity before and after the moratorium, it is obvious that the experience Woodrow Wilson spoke of, "in which democracy may work its reasonable triumphs of accommodation," was never realized in fact or thought by the Charter Class student. Woodrow Wilson's statement has a disturbing quality which haunts a person or a group that permits a situation to deteriorate and collapse. The University made a great mistake when it shrugged its collective shoulders and let the student government fail. This decision, or lack of one, put the students' responsibilities on the administration which placed the students in a more subordinate role than usual at a time when they should have been questioning and challenging.

The administrative staff, as described earlier, had been carefully selected and they brought to MSUO a great deal of technical know-how. However, each was to learn that decision and policy-making at the top level of administration is different from implementing decisions and policies at the middle-management level. They learned that student problems require more attention than office and procedural problems. This newly organized administration, by being sensitive to the needs of the student, discovered the rich and rewarding experience of working with intelligent young people at the time in their lives when they are accepting and rejecting ideas and values at an incredible rate. Because the administration had to make decisions and set policies, its recognition of the students' point of view was significantly expanded. This was a tremendous training experience for the administration and helped the administrator to see the University in its many inter-

connecting roles.

Special Events

The first social event at MSUO was a tea hosted by Mr. and Mrs. Wilson in their Meadow Brook Hall, an experience never to be forgotten by the students. The thought of being entertained in a home of such great beauty and tradition was unbelievable to many of the students. Surrounded by a noteworthy collection of paintings, including originals by Rembrandt, Van Gogh, Reynolds, Stuart, Gainsborough, Renoir, Cezanne, and Rubens, and viewing such diverse things as thick oriental carpets, silk wall coverings, detailed wood carvings depicting highlights of Mr. Wilson's life, and last but not least, gold-plated bathroom fixtures made a lasting impression on this group.

The last social event for the Charter Class, like the first, was a party at Meadow Brook Hall. However, Mr. Wilson was not there to enjoy with Mrs. Wilson the deep satisfaction of seeing a dream come true. This event was characterized by gaiety as well as deep emotion and true sentiment toward Mrs. Wilson. Many of the students, including Judy Brooks, Robert Furness, and Richard Stier thanked Mrs. Wilson, with a quiver in their voices, for the opportunity to go to college which would not have been their lot if the Wilson gift had not been made.

In areas of special interest, the Charter Class was able to organize from time to time, for short periods, to create a group to handle a project or an event. But participation depended on the event. For most of the first year, a large portion of students were more likely to return to their high school for entertainment than to drive ten or more miles to the University for a dance or a movie. The familiar

surroundings of the high school and the acceptability of old friends gave them security which they did not feel at MSUO. But, as the year drew to a close, the participation in activities on campus became less of a problem. The Student Center Council provided much of the leadership for the special events, but the intramural sports were planned by the Athletic Department, the concert and lecture series by the Dean of Students Office, the faculty readings by the English Department, the collateral program in the humanities by the Western Institutions faculty, religious groups or clubs by the area churches. Dean of Students, Roy Alexander, in his annual report for 1959-60, made these two statements:

> The organization of this group (Student Center Council) provided much more consistancy and order in planning, as well as a more business-like concern for expenditures . . . the club program, which has been continuously increasing in scope, has been successful in a large measure because of the cooperation of various faculty members.[1]

The first year, 19 clubs were organized and chartered, and seven of them lasted through the four years (choir, drama guild, inter-varsity council, science, skiing, Wesley Foundation, Young Democrats, and Young Republicans).

Student Involvement in Extra-Curricular Programs

The first charges of apathy were heard on the campus in the fall of 1961, and erupted openly in the winter semester when the Oakland Observer ran the following editorial,

RAH RAH!

> People say there's no school spirit at MSUO.
>
> They say there's no common sentiment unifying students on this campus.

We disagree.

There is too a common sentiment. There's lots of spirit here. It's MSUO's brand of Rah-Rah.

Apathy.

It shows up all over the place. In our student organizations, where active members--or any members for that matter--are at a premium. There's a small band of die-hards in each organization with no school spirit at all. They do all the work.

There's the foreign film series. Maybe you're a member of the Drama Arts Study Group, the organization that sponsors the films. You paid your $3 so that the series would be possible. But you've never shown up at a movie. A couple of people have, but they're 'out of it.' Any kid with any apathy at all goes to a basketball game at his old high school or plays hockey with the guys down the block.

Then there's the Letters to the Editor column in the Observer, an obvious example of our school spirit. Maybe you didn't know there was a letters column. No wonder--we get an average of one letter a month. Usually from some kid who just hasn't gotten the idea. At MSUO, if you've got any school spirit at all, you're apathetic. That means you keep your ears and eyes closed and your mouth shut. Nobody with school spirit writes letters to the newspaper.

If you want to be 'in' on the campus--that is, if you want to demonstrate your apathy--you don't accept responsibility. Just a few weeks ago a group who really wanted to prove their spirit signed up for a talent show sponsored by the Student Government Foreign Student Committee. Then, no one showed up for rehearsals. The show fell through but the would-be contestants boosted school spirit.

Most MSUO students, however, don't go to such extremes to demonstrate their apathy.

An easier way is to study.

All the time.

Students with the most spirit say they don't have any spare time. But once in a while they're seen playing pool or sitting around in the grill. Those who make posters for dances or chair committees for Culture Internationale haven't caught on. They're to be pitied.

> No, when it comes to unifying sentiment, MSUO has no problem school spirit--to Oakland variety--grown with every social event and every club meeting on campus.
>
> Apathy abounds.
>
> Rah, Rah.[1]

The replies to the editorial were many, but Miss Lynne Humphrey's letter to the editor seemed to summarize the general attitude of those responding.

> I want to express my feelings toward your editorial on apathy in the February 2 issue. I am not apathetic towards it but am bored with the whole subject 'lack of school spirit.'
>
> The first thing to consider is: Why are we here at MSUO? I answer for myself, 'to earn a teacher's certificate and to meet new people; to become a more enlightened and useful person through new ideas and experiences. These can be accomplished without joining clubs or activities planning committees.
>
> I approach with caution additional responsibilities which any activity must eventually include, and I won't get involved until I feel that I can spend the time profitably and without serious harm to my grades. I am fully satisfied with four-semester courses, a job, and the TEA.
>
> Please don't tell us again that we students should be ashamed to be apathetic if it only means 'inactive,' which I believe it does in most cases. Perhaps you could give us instead the busy person's secret of how to do much and still keep grades at MSUO high.[2]

The challenge thrown to the student body was met with candor and with recognition that there was a lack of participation, but they excused the charge of non-involvement by placing higher values on study, need to work, responsibilities at home, and freedom of choice. This outburst was short-lived, and disappeared from the public discussion in

[1] Oakland Observer, (Rochester, Michigan), February 2, 1962, p. 2.

[2] Ibid., February 16, 1962, p. 2.

less than four weeks. Nothing appeared to be gained or lost by the brief recognition of the situation. The mood at MSUO was not different from that found on other campuses with much longer histories.

Marlon Hellerich, Dean of Albright College, Reading, Pennsylvania, blamed the lack of student involvement across the nation on two factors. The first was the "general societal conditions" and the second was the "misconception and misuse of student government by administrators, faculty, and the student leaders."[1] He stated further that

> students are today largely concerned with living private lives. They look upon student government as but one of many extra curricular organizations, all of which are demanding their time and energies. And today, they show little inclination to give much of themselves to extra-curricular concerns, particularly those which demand sustained involvement.[2]

Hellerich explained that the students had grown up in a period when there was considerable emphasis on organization, and to protect themselves from more organization, they refused to become involved and to participate only at a minimum. They were willing to "pay the college and university organization its due in terms of meeting the demands of its regulations for campus living, but they will surrender as little as possible of themselves to the demands of extracurricular organization."[3]

Rokens and Hansmeier asked the question, "Should not the students be commended rather than censored for their apathy toward activities which until recently, were paramount in their minds?"[4]

[1]Mahlon H. Hellerick, "The Vital Relationship Between Student Government and Campus Community," College and University, Vol. 35 (Spring, 1960), 270.

[2]Ibid. [3]Ibid.

[4]Roland W. Roskens and Thomas W. Hansmeier, "For Student Personnel Work: Our Desideratum," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XXXII (October, 1961), 404-5.

Lest this emphasis on student activity be misinterpreted as a complaint that too much time was spent in study at MSUO, let it be said that the University considered itself fortunate to have a student body that put its academic work first. There were many other schools that found the reverse true. For example, Dean Hourtoule, of Lafayette College, writes,

> The problem of motivating today's students in our colleges and universities is becoming of increasing concern to faculties and administration alike. Hundreds of thousands of apparently intelligent and eager young people invade the college campus each fall, and each fall the hope is renewed that this year will be better than the preceeding--that these youngsters want and will be stimulated to seek an education. All too frequently the hopes and intentions of all involved in the college community are forgotten; the exigencies and expediencies of the moment take precedence. The fraternity or sorority, the football stadium, and the party weekend rather than English Lit, Western Civ, or Engineering orientation seizes the active interest of the student.[1]

Before proceeding, it should be noted that extremes either way are damaging to the total educational process. "Student involvement in extracurricular life should be aimed to promote scholastic success rather than endanger it. Activities should act to conduct rather than insulate, strengthen rather than act as a substitute."[2]

The freshman class of 1962, full of energy and sensing a stability about MSUO not felt by the first three classes, soon became disenchanted with the spartan attitude toward extracurricular activities they found when they arrived. This fourth class wanted to organize and be identified. The class met for the first time September 28, 1962.

[1]Gilbert O. Hourtoule, "Student Apathy: A National Epidemic," College and University, Vol. 37 (Fall, 1961), 45.

[2]Hall T. Sprague, "Academic vs. Non-Academic Activities," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XXXII (October, 1961), 407.

By November 16, the freshman council's discussion had generated such interest that the Oakland Observer made it their lead story for that edition. It was reported that the Council considered their major goals to be

> student representation and communication with the faculty and administration . . . Council Chairman Roger Bailey (Manchester, New Hampshire) was asked by the Observer reporter for his opinion of the possibility of the Council's success in view of the history of student organizations at MSUO.[1]

He answered, "Chances are good for organization of the freshman class if the group takes a realistic approach, has a mature realization of needs, and comes up with a simple, sensible program."[2] Also appearing in the same edition was a letter to the editor from a freshman who was unhappy with the slowness of the freshman council to organize and act and his criticism was summed up in his first sentence: "Freshmen of the University, you have nothing to gain but your identity."[3] Other frustrations of the freshman class included decisions, affecting students present and future, being made by the seniors (Charter Class) without consulting the total student community. The decision which came under greatest criticism was choosing the University ring. The freshmen were not cowed by the seniors, and they wrote and spoke openly about their unhappiness. The seniors smarted under this challenge, and one answered the criticism with this letter to the editor,

> The senior class is special and don't you ever forget it! The senior class--especially the members of the Charter group--has experienced changes and reversals, the likes of which you will never know. In the past three years we have smoothed out many a rough path so that you will not stumble and fall.

[1] Oakland Observer, (Rochester, Michigan), November 16, 1962, p. 1.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

> Let us watch dear freshmen, whose meetings we call 'stupid.' You and your fellow freshmen have much work to do before you become united seniors a few years hence. Lot's of luck, ten-week old freshmen."[1]

The work of the freshmen council continued until the end of the winter semester 1963, but also collapsed as interest waned and internal friction became disruptive of the efforts of a sincere few. The council was another example of the inability of MSUO students to organize and sustain the organization. Where did the fault lie for these repeated failures? The answer has many facets, but the major items which contributed to the failures were: (1) the original philosophy and concept of a no-nonsense program, (2) the rigorous academic demands put on the students by the faculty, (3) the national attitude regarding the undeclared educational competition with Russia, (4) the negative posture of many of the faculty toward extracurricular activities, (5) the lack of a qualified staff and positive approach in the Dean of Students office, (6) a student body representing the attitude of the times, that of non-involvement, and (7) the individual student's sense of the urgency of the times.

Student Reaction

The Charter Class members interviewed recently, looking back at the class's participation in non-academic activities commented thusly:

> The student government filled no need that was not filled better by special groups. We may not have appeared organized, but I remember a feeling of unity through our participation in special interest groups and our classroom experience. I think the Charter Class was a unique group who established a tradition of working together on projects, but not willing to formalize a structure into a fixed organization. Each project was considered special, and, therefore, the membership changed to meet the requirements necessary to accomplish a job. (Mike Deller)

[1] Ibid., p. 2.

> I don't understand why people thought we were not organized. We were involved in most of the major and many of the minor events or activities on and off campus, and the leadership was found in the Charter Class. (William Kath)

> As one of the two Student Government presidents, I must admit I felt a personal failure when the moratorium was declared, but now as I look back I realize that only a few individuals wanted a government. There was no universal support. The few interested were talking to each other, and in the process convinced themselves that everyone felt as they did. I believe if we had had a 30 percent resident student population instead of all commuters, there might have been more need which I think would have spawned more interest. (Howard Hinkel

> My lack of interest in the Student Government was not apathy but a feeling the administrators knew better how to run the University, so I was willing to let them. As far as activities were concerned, I belonged to the Science Club and attended the large once-a-year functions that were well advertised. (Don Mann)

The Charter Class was a unique group that was capable of uniting for one thing and being poles apart on another. Those projects in which it was interested, it handled, but at the same time willingly let the faculty and administration do those other things in which it had little interest. The message was clear enough that a new generation of students were entering and attending college. The attempt by the administrators and some of the faculty to promote traditions from other institutions were rejected. Who was right or who was wrong is not the question because only time will show the advantages and disadvantages of both systems as the system changes again.

Placement of First Graduates
A Measurement of Success

A university's success is measured in many ways, but for a new

institution the only one readily available to it is the ease with which its graduates are placed in industry, the professional world, or graduate school. Oakland's record with the Charter Class was excellent. By the fall of 1963 every student seeking placement was placed. Eighteen of those graduating were admitted to graduate schools on a full-time basis, five received fellowships or assistantships (University of Washington, University of Detroit, Purdue University, Michigan State University, and Bucknell). Forty-six graduates were employed in school systems or education-related jobs in colleges and universities, twenty-three chose positions in business and industry, four entered the armed forces in Officer Candidate or training programs, five were hired by the Federal government, two chose careers with private social agencies, and five became full-time homemakers. This record, for a first class, is a good one, and the University staff feels a certain satisfaction in it. Again, the Charter Class led the way and their employment and advanced education record has been such that Oakland University's graduates are sought after by many firms, school systems, and graduate schools.

Summary

To end this chapter on the crass subject of job placement would be to dishonor the principles and ideals on which MSUO was founded, to make a mockery of the efforts of the many people who worked to establish MSUO, to disregard the effort of those who taught the students, and to depreciate the value the students received from their education. MSUO attempted to provide the Charter Class members with a curriculum to liberalize their thinking, to create a proper attitude for establishing

values, to recognize meaningful concepts, to think critically, and to achieve a recognition of self-realization. It is safe to assume that all members of the class did not achieve these goals but the dedication and seriousness with which they approached their education was evidence of their acceptance of the goals set forth by the faculty. For an institution to have developed an attitude of inquiry in its students is a credit to those who taught them. Using these goals as a foundation for life-long learning, it is reasonable to presume that someday others may also achieve the educational objectives outlined. If this becomes true the energy and time expended by so many to develop, at MSUO, a meaningful institution will have been worthwhile.

The Charter Class graduates for all of their shortcomings were a courageous group, highly motivated with great faith in themselves, and a pioneering spirit. History will recognize that this class set the pace for the many classes yet to enroll at Oakland.

CHAPTER V

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

Historical Event

On the cool and cloudy afternoon of May 2, 1958 a most unusual sight was visible to the passers-by on Walton Boulevard and Squirrel Road, in Pontiac Township, as they saw approximately 150 well-dressed people standing in the middle of a horse pasture at Meadow Brook Farms. Most of the travelers were unaware that history was being made as the first shovel of dirt was turned for North and South Foundation Halls to officially start construction on the new Michigan State University Oakland campus. Among the many distinguished guests and dignitaries were Mr. and Mrs. Alfred G. Wilson, President John A. Hannah, Vice President Durward B. Varner, State Senator Harvey Lodge of Oakland County, State Senator George C. Steeh of Macomb County, Mr. Harold Fitzgerald, Publisher of the Pontiac Press, Dr. Sarah Van Hooesen Jones, resident of Avon Township and former Michigan State University Board of Trustees member, Mr. George Karas, Director of the Physical Plant, and Board of Trustees members Dr. Connor Smith, Chairman, Mr. Clark Brody, Mr. Arthur Rouse, Mr. C. Allen Harlan, Mr. Don Stevens, and Mr. Jan Vanderploeg.

The Master of Ceremonies for this occasion was Mr. Fitzgerald, who later became the president of the MSUO Foundation. Mrs. Wilson and President Hannah spoke to the assembled group. Mrs. Wilson, in her high-pitched voice, spoke of the pride she and Mr. Wilson took in the

products of their estate and said, "Now we shall see a new product--educated men and women of high ideals who will render service to all mankind."[1] President Hannah reminded the onlookers that they were witnessing "an historical occasion,"[2] and said that "MSUO was not designed as a 'transplant' of Michigan State University but would be shaped by local people to meet the needs of Oakland and Macomb Counties . . . . We hope to make it more than just a place that educates young people; but like all public universities a place that works with the community for its betterment."[3] Finally, he said, "The Wilsons have done their part through their extremely generous gift, and it is now up to MSU, the Legislature, and the peoples of the two counties to make MSUO what they want it to be."[4]

First Assignments

The administrative action required to make this ground breaking possible was taken on March 15, 1957 when the Board of Trustees approved "an agreement with Swanson Associates of Bloomfield Hills, Michigan for the developmental work (campus plan) at Meadow Brook . . . . Mr. Swanson is also hired as architect for the first building . . . ."[5] This was J. Robert F. Swanson, Chairman of the Oakland County Planning Commission, who several months before had presented the idea to Mr. and Mrs. Wilson to give their estate for an educational institution. Mr. Swanson was eminently qualified to perform this architectural service, and because

[1] Pontiac Press, May 3, 1958, p. 1.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid.

[5] Minutes of the Michigan State University Board of Trustees Meeting, March 15, 1957, East Lansing, Michigan, (in the files of the University).

of his involvement and commitment to the total project, the assignment became one of great personal interest.

Michigan State University Vice President Durward B. Varner was given overall responsibility for Michigan State University-Oakland by the Board of Trustees on January 15, 1958. These duties were added to his responsibilities at MSU for off-campus education. As the months passed, the MSUO demands grew as community relations, faculty selection, student recruitment, and curriculum development required more and more time. To ignore one of these areas in favor of another would have been administratively and politically unwise, as well as self defeating in the long run. Priorities needed to be established and a schedule planned in order to handle first things first. Certain jobs could go on concurrently but ranking and dovetailing had to be thought through so that all pieces of the assignment would come together at the required time. Curriculum development received the earliest attention of the planners and consumed the greatest amount of energy and time. This planning started early in 1957 and because each new academic year required the curriculum to be set and the courses to be developed no later than the preceding summer, the planning continued throughout the four years. Community relations received the second priority, with student recruitment next, and faculty selection last. Although it is obvious, it needs to be said that--curriculum development, community relations, student recruitment, and faculty selection are a continuous process and have no end.

Community Involvement

Vice President Varner realized immediately that to sell a new

product requires the support of many people who will act as agents in representing the product. Anyone familiar with salesmanship knows that the key to success is a good product, belief and enthusiasm in that product, appropriate advertising, and an abundance of energy. Harold Fitzgerald, a loyal supporter of the University of Michigan and the publisher of the Pontiac Press, took one look at MSUO and what it meant to Oakland County, particularly to the Pontiac area, and was sold. With the support of this community-minded individual who had an entree into nearly every home in the community, the first major step to establish contact with the customer was accomplished. His enthusiasm and influence in the community encouraged other leaders to join in this great new undertaking. The power structure in the area had been tapped and with this resource at Mr. Varner's disposal new doors were opened into Macomb and Wayne counties. The membership of the MSUO Foundation reached into all of the important segments of industry, business, labor, government, and education. The role that the Foundation played in assisting Michigan State University Oakland was explained in Chapter I. No more will be said here.

College's Role

A university is many things to its several publics. Falvey states, "The College . . . arose in response to a felt need to preserve and propogate the accumulated culture of educated man."[1] College can mean a place where young men and women go beyond high school to continue their education, a place where knowledge is extended through research, a place where the participants isolate themselves from the "real world"

[1]Falvey, 4.

problems, a place where liberalism is fostered, etc.[1] Falvey states further,

> American people generally take a bifocal view of the college. The popular picture of the absent-minded professor and the irresponsible student is supplemented by the idealistic concept of the college as the most perfect expression of an unbounded faith in education, the patent medicine to be prescribed for every personal and social ill. Such confidence and hope, pitifully blind and simple as they may be, are the factors which have made education in America big business.[2]

Response to A Cause

The college as an active and contributing organization of contemporary society has a certain mystic quality which gives it a special place in that society. It cannot ignore its responsibility to the community it serves. It is looked upon as a prestigious as well as an economic asset to the community, and people willingly serve it because of a desire to be a part of a growing and vital organization.

Mr. Varner recognized the value of Mary Follett's statement that "power over people derives basically from sharing power with them."[3] From the beginning, the responsibility for MSUO was shared with many people who were not directly in higher education but who had expertise in the many areas needed to establish a new institution--finance, curriculum, publicity, teaching and philosophy. This involvement by so many was not accidental, it was subtly planned to happen. In the crassest terms it could be called an administrative technique or in a more genteel phrase it can be identified as recognition of a human

[1] Ibid., p. 3. [2] Ibid.

[3] Ordway Tead, The Art of Administration (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1951), p. 130.

characteristic. A characteristic which makes people willing to subordinate themselves to a cause, the reward for which is a satisfying experience and fulfillment through the realization of participation. These were men and women vitally interested in worthwhile projects and did things in the community. Many people who had experience in making decisions through sound judgment which had produced good outcomes.[1] Some were worker-volunteers who sought self-fulfillment by offering to help where they were needed. Others were willing to direct their resources of time, money, and know-how to the advantage of the University. Their presence was felt and their "we--ness" centered its energies on object oriented projects that served to further relate the University to the community while producting practical results in the way of money, public relations, gifts and loyal support.

They were not looking for honorific positions. They wanted to work. This reservoir of talent was nurtured by the University and proved helpful in many ways.

Scholarship Committee

The single largest group of workers was the Scholarship Committee, which included approximately 500 women in Oakland and Macomb counties. These women through their several money-raising projects such as, The World Report Lecture Series, The Meadow Brook Ball, and the Bloomfield Hills Hunt Club Fair furnished over 70 percent of all the scholarship money distributed by Michigan State University Oakland for the first three years. In 1961 the Committee raised $61,186 and in 1962 a total of $80,391. The balance came from business, industry, labor,

[1] Ibid., p. 129.

individuals, and community organizations. No state appropriated funds were involved until the fourth year, and then only in a token amount. The Scholarship Committee served to bring people in direct contact with the University and to make them feel a part of it as it developed. Each person became another outlet for taking the message to the community. The only disadvantage to this group, as an unofficial agent of the institution, was the narrowness of the socio-economic community contacted. Primarily these women represented the upper middle and upper class of Oakland and Macomb counties, however, it should be noted that most of the funds collected provided grants-in-aid and loans to the lower economic segment of the area.

These lay groups assisted in interpreting the University to the community, in identifying the needs of the community to the University, and in stimulating support for the University from the community. Mr. Varner openly shared the weaknesses and needs of MSUO along with its strengths and accomplishments. This honest and frank approach cemented the tie with the volunteers because they were made to feel that the University was their concern along with the students, faculty, and administrators.

Faculty Attitude

In general, the faculty position during the early years was less than enthusiastic in their recognition of the community and any participation in public relations activities was entered into as a duty to be performed, not something to be enjoyed.

Most faculty members recognize public relations as a normal function of the organization when used to disseminate information,

promote an event or arrange a public appearance for one of the college or university staff; but the legitimacy is challenged when public relations is used to solicit public support. The internal community of scholars, teachers, and academicians as pointed out by John Watson, is repulsed by "anything that is redolent of salesmanship."[1] The faculty thinks of public relations in terms of the intrinsic purposes as these benefit the educational program. On the other hand, "the administrator faces the dilemma of professionalism and advertising. Certainly he will be concerned about integrity, honesty and good taste, but he will also be concerned about effectiveness."[2]

Public Relations

Michigan State University Oakland's non-credit Continuing Education Division was the only unit which reached out to the community-at-large to determine the needs and then serve them. This effort by Dean Lowell Eklund and his staff was eagerly accepted, and the enrollments in the Continuing Education courses were proof of the need. The public relations value of this program was immeasurable because it identified the University with the community and focused the attention of the community on it.

While the Continuing Education program was serving the public and creating an image of service, the paramount effort of the University was directed to attracting attention to the undergraduate program. The news releases were written to emphasize MSUO's newness, excellence,

[1]John Watson, Administration and Policy-Making in Education (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1959), p. 123.

[2]Ibid., p. 135.

innovativeness, spartan simplicity, and dynamism. However, the text was not written for local consumption only but also for national audiences. The result was that more often than not people hundreds of miles from Rochester, Michigan knew more about the University's programs than did the people in the local area. In this respect the objective of attracting attention to Michigan State University Oakland was unsatisfactory. Faculty members and administrators believed that by announcing and projecting an image of quality and excitement, students would knock down the gates clamoring for admission. This was not the case. However, the University, because of the national press coverage, had out-of-state students from the beginning, interest having been evoked in this new operation of Michigan State University.

Much of the public relations effort locally was carried by Chancellor Varner through his involvement in the community, by the administrators who spoke as often as their schedules would allow, and by the Admissions' staff. The schedule for these few was rigorous but they believed in their product and knew the intrinsic value of that product for the community.

Student Recruitment

The first students who applied for admission were a result of the efforts of the Foundation's Community Relations Committee. Their information program involving newspapers, radio, television, College Nights, and speaking engagements created the first interest. This momentum was carried forward during the fall of 1958 by Roy Alexander, Director of Student Affairs, and, after January 1, 1959 by Herbert Stoutenburg, Director of Admissions and Registrar. Although the

welcome sign was out at the area high schools, there were varying degrees of contact allowed with the students. In some cases, such as Bloomfield Hills High School, the interview began and ended with the principal. Permission to discuss the University's program with the counselors, faculty, or students was denied. However, at most other schools such as Pontiac Central, Pontiac Northern, Rochester, Oak Park, Romeo, Birmingham, Centerline, et cetera, the cooperation and relations were cordial and helpful. Student recruitment for the Charter Class was aided by MSUO's newness, its image of quality, its relatively low cost and its availability to a number of students who might otherwise not have planned to attend college.

The MSUO faculty was lulled by its own enthusiasm for the stated goals and purposes into an unwarranted complacency by assuming that students would flock to this new, dynamic, and creative institution. This self-delusion was short-lived after classes started in September, 1959. The reports of the academic standards, the students' achievement and the time required for preparing class assignments changed the attitude of many area high school students toward applying to Michigan State University Oakland. Further, high school counselors quickly became cautious about suggesting MSUO to any but their best students. During the school year, the image of academic quality was reinforced by the low grading and heavy attrition of the Charter Class. The University was forced to make a decision--lower the academic standards or raise the admissions requirements. To do the former would be to break faith with the planners and lose the faculty. To do the latter would probably mean reducing the size of the entering classes. Of the two choices the second one appeared to offer the most flexibility. It was recognized, however,

that this could not be done more than once or twice without affecting the thrust of the institution. By spring, 1960, the Admissions staff found that they were spending half of their time, on high school visits, explaining the first quarter grading. Also, it was noted that the high school counselors took a more protective position toward their students and limited the number and caliber of students permitted to be interviewed. The high school staffs commented that MSUO appeared to be designed for an academic elite, a "little Harvard," and this was unrealistic for the area. Gerald Lawerence, Counselor at Madison Heights Lincoln High School, said, "Unless this image is changed by your actions, our kids will not go there." Mr. Lawerence's statement was heard many times in different schools during the second, third, and fourth years.

This reaction was a dangerous development for the University. So in order to break down the resistance and change the image, selected groups of high school principals, counselors, and superintendents were invited to the campus for lunch by Chancellor Varner and the Director of Admissions. These meetings were organized to report MSUO's progress, and to discuss what avenues could be used to increase the high school students' interest in this new institution. These luncheons were pleasant affairs, but rather unproductive. The minds of the high school faculty and administration were not to be changed easily. The 30 percent of the Charter group who did not return for the fall quarter in 1960 were their product and the student's withdrawal reflected on their high schools. Besides, there were other colleges where students from the 1959 class had enrolled and had been successful. When registration for fall 1960 was completed, the total enrollment had been increased by approximately 60 percent, to 908 students, as compared to 570 for the fall 1959. However,

the new student enrollment was down 12.6 percent to 508. Although there was some concern that the new student enrollment had decreased, less concern was shown for the 30 percent who did not return. When the enrollment statistics for the fall 1960 quarter had been analyzed, spirits were lifted. The report showed that the new students who had graduated in the upper quarter of their class had increased by 10 percent.

As the Admissions staff made their first high school visits in September 1960, it was soon discovered that the student recruitment for fall, 1961 was under the long shadow cast by the first year's grading. To make matters worse, the requirements for admissions were increased from the upper-half of the student's graduating class to the upper-quarter. Entrance examinations were continued for those below the upper quarter; but the "cutting score," based on the records of years one and two, were also raised to get a student who would be better matched to the MSUO program. The high schools reacted negatively to the change in admissions standards because they recognized that this action reduced, by one more, the colleges where they could send their average or high-average students. This situation caused the high school principals and counselors to again be more selective of the student they recommended for admission. Added to this was a noticeable process of self-selection by the students which was felt as the period for filing applications started. Many students who were admissible were not willing to take the chance. These students who had to commute, applied to Wayne State University, South Macomb Community College, Henry Ford Community College, Detroit Institute of Technology, Lawrence Institute of Technology, Port Huron Junior College, and Flint Community Junior College

instead of Michigan State University Oakland. Also, at this time MSUO was identified by the Negro students as a place not to go. They were asking why go to MSUO and stand a chance of failing, when there were places to go where Negro students had succeeded. This problem plagued the University during its first four years.

Fall, 1961, registration again showed a growth overall, but the new class size decreased again by another 3 percent. The new student enrollment accounted for 493 of the total 1,069. These figures were a disappointment in light of the enrollment projected. The total was to be 1510 students, of which 700 were to be freshmen. These estimates were based on the assumption that 80 percent of the 1960 freshman class would return, and 90 percent of the sophomore class would return. This meant that the enrollment would be comprised of 700 freshmen, 400 sophomores, and 410 juniors. The fact is that the enrollment by class was 609 freshmen, 285 sophomores, and 175 juniors. Because each group was smaller than anticipated, the administration realized that drastic action was needed to reverse a trend that was unsatisfactory to all concerned. At the October 30, 1961 Administrative Group meeting, Chancellor Varner re-emphasized that "new student recruitment is a first priority with the University this year." Of the many suggestions made to marshall the University's resources to increase the percentage of June high school graduates who would attend MSUO, the one resource needed most was ignored--additional professional staff in the admissions office. The staff of two men, in the fall 1961, were sharing three major responsibilities--admissions (recruiting, application processing, and correspondence), and registration and records. It took another year and another decline in new student enrollment (1959--570, 1960--508,

1961--493, and 1962--471), the University studiously ignored the fact that as of the end of registration (fall, 1961) 49.1 percent of the students admitted to MSUO in 1959 and 1960 were no longer enrolled. (See Table 9 below). This heavy attrition was caused by failures, transfers, and withdrawals for sundry reasons. A hidden but significant factor in all three of the above causes was easily traced to an inadequate academic advising system. Fortunately, this weakness was recognized by the Dean of the University and he instituted corrective measures during the 1961-1962 school year by charging the Dean of Students office with the specific responsiblilty of following the scholastic progress of each student. This program established a special faculty review committee that worked closely with the student's instructors and his academic advisor. Concern for the first time was as great for the in-school student as it was for the recruitment of new students. This action was not felt immediately in the high schools; but was a major step in subsequent years to the re-opening of the high school doors.

With the increase in the admissions staff in the fall of 1962, attention was directed to creating a better image of MSUO to the high school staff and students, and Glen Brown, the new Associate Director of Admissions and Director of Scholarships, headed this task force. In a special memo to Chancellor Varner, he said,

> Experienced admission administrators know that student enrollment is the direct result of the number of contacts made, and that to be sure of capacity enrollment it is necessary to cultivate large numbers of key people over a period of time. They also know that a low percentage of any senior high school class will matriculate to any given institution. For these reasons, it is paramount that the admissions office find the shortest approach to the

TABLE 9[1]

ENROLLMENT BY TERM OF FALL ENTERING GROUP
FALL 1959 THROUGH WINTER 1963

	NUMBER ENROLLED BY TERM OF ENTERING GROUP										
Term of Entry	Fall 1959	Winter 1960	Spring 1960	Fall 1960	Winter 1961	Spring 1961	Fall 1961	Winter 1962	Spring 1962	Fall 1962	Winter 1963
F-1959	570	497	...	370	316	...	249	232	a	199	195
F-1960	...	...	...	511	448	...	275	245	a	210	189
F-1961	...	...	...	...	...	...	493	413	259	293	258
F-1962	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	475	369

[1]New admissions for Winter 1960 (38), Winter 1961 (49), Winter 1962 (86), and Winter 1963 (54) that enrolled are not shown because of their small number.

[a]In Fall 1961 MSUO changed from a quarter system to a trimester system. Enrollment by term of entry was meaningful only for the entering group of Fall 1961 so the enrollment figures for the Fall 1959 and Fall 1960 groups were omitted from this table.

> largest number of academically qualified high school seniors.[1]

To accomplish this task he reorganized the approach to the high school visitation and college day and night programs, enlarged the scope of faculty and staff participation in the on-campus evening programs for high school students, faculty, and counselors, (Science Night, University Night, and Social Science Night), revamped the printed material designed to promote MSUO, established home interviews, increased the campus tour opportunities, held luncheons and dinners for key high school administrators in selected cities, and promoted the Junior On-Campus Advising Day in the spring.

Brown said he wished to reverse the "inverted funnel" effect at Michigan State University Oakland. He planned to bring the students in through the small end of the funnel by using appropriate selection criteria, and hope that all would graduate by coming out the big end, instead of admitting many students not matched to the MSUO program and having only a few graduate through the small end of the funnel. He, like most admissions officers, believed that prospective students should be told in clearly defined terms what the college is, what it takes to get through, and what it costs to attend. If these three things are understood, then the students will not arrive expecting one thing but receiving something different.

In an attempt to determine what changes could be made to improve the MSUO image, the one thing that received the most support was to change its name. The admissions office experienced again and again the

[1]Memorandum from Glen Brown, Associate Director of Admissions, Michigan State University Oakland, Rochester, Michigan, September 5, 1962.

situation where students and parents stopped listening to the "MSUO Story" after they heard the words "Michigan State University." The last word of the name, "Oakland," did not register. The admissions officer became aware of this problem when a student or parent asked an irrelevant question or the admissions officer observed a quizzical look on the face of his listener following a statement he had just made. Recognizing the confusion caused by the name, the admissions officers took extra pains to preface their remarks about MSUO by explaining the relationship between Michigan State University and Michigan State University-Oakland. It proved difficult to substitute the "sister institution" or "affiliate" concept for the "branch" connotation which had been so well established in many of the early news reports. Even Michigan State University's admissions office did not understand the relationship, as shown by the following letter to Mr. H. A. Fick, dated May 27, 1960.

> MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY East Lansing
> Office of Admissions and Scholarships
>
> Dear Mr. Fick:
>
> President Hannah has asked me to respond to your letter of May 24 to him.
>
> The fact is that the admissions standards of Michigan State University are higher than those of our Oakland branch--MSU-O.
>
> The stated requirement by MSU-O is that the student be in the top half of the high school graduating class. As you will see by the enclosed statement, Michigan State University requires that a student be in both the top one-third of the high school graduating class and also score in the top one-third in ability test scores.
>
> In addition, Michigan State University requires that out-of-state residents take the Scholastic Aptitude Test of the College Entrance Examination Boards as a

condition for applying for admission.

I am sending you a copy of our Information for Prospective Students from Michigan State University, and asking that similar material be sent to you from MSU-O. If there is anything I can do to facilitate the admission of your friend to Michigan State University, please let me help.

Most sincerely,

Office of Admissions and Scholarships

May 27, 1960

P.S. You understand, of course, that our Oakland branch is a commuters' school--it has no dormitories and all students must find their own housing in private residences in communities from five to ten miles from the campus. Michigan State University, of course, has a fine system of residence halls and student services right on campus.[1]

Mr. H. A. Fick
7169 Hazelwood Drive, R. No. 1
Richland, Michigan

The name change was discussed with the Board of Trustees from time to time during the first three years. Finally, at the February 19, 1963 Board Meeting, Mr. Brodie moved, and Mr. Nesbitt seconded, "to change the name from Michigan State University-Oakland to Oakland University (Affiliated with Michigan State University)."[2] The motion was passed by an unanimous vote. This action was of great significance to Michigan State University-Oakland. It now had its own identity. The news of the name change was greeted with enthusiasm by the students, faculty, and staff. Using hind-sight, most individuals involved in

[1]Letter from Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, May 27, 1960. * The name of the sender of this letter has been withheld, since the individual is still an employee of Michigan State University.

[2]Minutes of the Michigan State University Board of Trustees Meeting, February 19, 1963, East Lansing, Michigan. (in the files of the University.

naming the institution originally have indicated that they would not do the same thing again, especially since MSUO was given autonomy to develop its own program. The name change did not eliminate the "branch" concept immediately, and for some probably never, but the public and the high school faculties found the change easy to accept.

Although the enrollment decreased in numbers each fall, the quality of the student increased, as described by MSUO's Psychological Service research with total score and student percentile rankings on the College Qualification Test. The statistical tabulation indicated the following:

TABLE 10[1]

TOTAL SCORE AND STUDENT PERCENTILE RANKINGS ON THE COLLEGE QUALIFICATION TEST

Percentile Ranking		Raw Score Totals			
		1959	1960	1961	1962
	10%	92	100	107	109
Lower	25%	106	113	121	121
	50%	121	132	138	139
Upper	25%	138	149	152	160
	90%	154	163	166	176

By the fall of 1961, the students' College Qualification Test total score at the lower 25 percentile was equal to the 50 percentile in

[1]"College Qualification Test (Total Score) Percentile Ranking for Each Year - 1959, 60, 61, 62 Showing Percentage of Students Scoring at or Below any Particular Raw Score Interval in Each Year" (Office of Psychological Services, Oakland University, May, 1963). (Mimeographed).

fall, 1959, thereby eliminating from the third entering group the equivalent of the lower 25 percentile of the Charter Class. Even though the total raw score increased in all-percentile ranks each of the four years, there was a stabilization of scores in 1961 and 1962 in the lower 50 percentile groups. The upper quartile spread showed a narrowing in raw score in 1960 and 1961; but in 1962 moved substantially upward again, indicating a general increase in ability at the upper level as well as at the lower level.

With this information available, the admissions staff and some faculty were very much surprised to discover the grading continued to be consistently low. On February 13, 1963, the Director of Admissions wrote Chancellor Varner deploring the wastefulness of human resources by the University's "tough" policy. He said,

> To me, this is an appalling figure (loss of 50.4 percent of the students enrolled) and a very real condemnation of our program. The remainder of the story is that it continues to affect our relationship with the secondary schools . . . I am sure you realize that I am not stating that our slow growth is all caused by our unusually high attrition, but when it is coupled with recruitment it has a multiplying effect, which I would like to see eliminated.[1]

When the Charter Class graduated on April 20, 1963, much had been accomplished in the four years, and Oakland University had a bright future ahead of it. The admissions problem was not solved; but the increase in the admissions' staff, the increase in the admissions' budget, the melting attitude of the high school counselors, the strengthened advising program, and the new interest by students were all positive signs of a solution in the foreseeable future.

[1]Memorandum from H. N. Stoutenburg, Jr., Director of Admissions and Registrar, Michigan State University Oakland, Rochester, Michigan, February 13, 1963.

Curricular Programs

Even though Michigan State University Oakland had identified itself as a liberal arts college, the original Michigan State University planning committee gave the impetus to develop programs in Education, Business Administration, and Engineering Science. The Meadow Brook Seminars in turn were divided to explore curriculum ideas in these three areas as well as Liberal Arts. In the fall of 1959 the curriculum choices offered the entering students included Education--Elementary or Secondary, Business Administration, Engineering Science, and Liberal Arts--non-science and science.

Teacher Education

The consultants for the Seminar on Teacher Education made it abundantly clear that to prepare teachers for the future, in light of the high level of education generally considered to exist in this country, the total University had to assume the responsibility. It was stated that teacher preparation is not a discrete function of a department or division or college; but "must always be viewed as interrelated, supplementary, and complementary."[1]

The "total university" concept was enthusiastically endorsed by the faculty and administration, and safeguards were established to protect against any dilution of this idea. MSUO did not want to fall prey to the negative image borne by many colleges of education so it studiously developed a program which would be above reproach by those

[1]Thomas H. Hamilton and Durward B. Varner, The Meadow Brook Seminars on Higher Learning--Teacher Education, A Synthesis and Summary, Michigan State University-Oakland, (Rochester: 1958), p. 2.

who taught in the liberal arts. During the first year of the education program (1960-1961) every effort was made to build the image that the "professional education courses" were respectable and equally as demanding as any other courses in the University. At the end of the fall quarter, 1960, the grade distribution in Education 241--Social and Philosphic Issues in Education was: A's - 4.7%, B's - 17.3%, C's - 39.4%, D's - 22.8%, and F's - 15.7%. Professor Laszlo Hetenyi, the first teacher appointee and planner of the MSUO Teacher Education Program, said,

> It is my fond hope that in the years to come the figures in the last two categories can be reduced, but each reduction will have to come about through an improvement of student performance. Until this takes place, the course serves the valuable function of weeding out those whom this institution would not wish to sponsor as teachers in the nation's schools.[1]

The students fared better in the next two courses, Education 242: Student, School and Community; and Education 243: Psychology of Learning and Development. It was assumed that the "weeding out" process, Education 241, left only the better students in Education 242 and 243, and the grade distribution showed improvements over the first quarter. Michigan State University Oakland wanted to dispel any notion that the teacher education program would be considered an easy avenue to a degree.

Professor Hetenyi, when asked what he considered the most important thing for the future teacher to know, answered that "the individual recognize that he is a human being preparing to teach human beings, and that he teach those things which will make those he teaches

[1]Memorandum from L. J. Hetenyi, Director of Teacher Education Program, Michigan State University Oakland, Rochester, Michigan, April 1, 1961.

into what we think we are." In answer to the question, "What do teachers teach?"[1] He said,

> Every teacher teaches something--be the something a skill, a constellation of concepts, a set of attitudes, a body of facts, or what have you. Likewise, every teacher teaches somebody. One may lecture into a vacuum, one does not teach without somebody doing the learning. A teacher teaches something to somebody, and to ignore either element makes the concept of teaching meaningless. If one accepts this contention, the 'what?' is appropriately answered by the identification of subject matter (conventional or otherwise) while the consideration of pupils and their concerns is included in the question 'whom do we teach?' The answer to the first question is reflected in the curriculum by courses in a whole host of studies usually identified by state certification authorities as majors and minors; the answer to the second is seen in equally significant work in psychology, sociology, educational psychology, . . . Methodology,[2] field observation, supervised teaching and internship in order "to make the teacher skillful in specific behavior aimed at instruction."[3]

The curriculum development for both the elementary and secondary programs required compromises in order to fit in the state requirements for certification, the University Courses and the subject matter majors. The curriculum options for prospective elementary teachers were three--a general program, particularly designed for the early elementary grades; a concentration in science and mathematics program; and a concentration in foreign language program. Although the science and mathematics and the foreign language concentrations were designed for elementary teachers, the programs were also valuable to the junior high school. The Teacher Education Program felt a responsibility for the preparation of teachers for the junior high schools, but except for this one specific effort the rest of the program proved ineffective in a creative way. The secondary

[1] Laszlo J. Hetenyi, "Philosophy of Education in the Undergraduate Curriculum," Educational Theory, Vol. 18 (Winter, 1968), 52.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid., p. 53.

program was strong in the major disciplines and matched or in most cases exceeded in rigor the requirements found in other institutions around the State. MSUO's weakness was in its minors, which were barely acceptable for certification.[1] The required University Courses, the subject matter major courses and the state requirements left little or no room to acquire a subject matter minor. Most teaching minors were social science group minors earned by combining University Courses.

To further strengthen the Michigan State University Oakland candidates for certification, it was proposed in 1961, and became policy in 1962, that each graduate "demonstrate proficiency in the use of English as determined by the English department."[2] The faculty wanted some assurance that the matter of literacy would not be left to chance. A candidate who was not cleared forfeited his right to be sponsored for certification.

To insure the "total university" concept, every effort was made by the Dean of the University, the Director of Teacher Education, and the Associate Dean of Humanities to have subject matter department staff teach and become involved in the Teacher Education Program. The Psychology Department was the first department to cooperate when it took over the pertinent phases of Education 245, Psychological and Field Studies in Education. The Mathematics Department, in the second year, taught three required courses for the elementary candidates--Mathematics 314, Structure of Number Systems, Mathematics 315, Algebraic Structures, and Mathematics 316, Geometric Structures. The methodology courses, the

[1] Hetenyi, Memorandum, 2.

[2] Michigan State University Oakland Catalog, Michigan State University Oakland, III:1 (Rochester: September, 1962), p. 30.

internship, and the internship seminar in secondary education were taught by the discipline department in the final years. While the liberal arts faculty was taking responsibility for certain phases of the Teacher Education Program, the teacher education faculty was teaching several of the University Courses, such as; Western Institutions and Social Ideas, and Introduction to Music. This plan worked quite successfully and achieved the general goal of making the University faculty responsible for the teacher education product.

Administratively, the Teacher Education Program was assigned, the first four years, to the Division of Social Sciences, with the few faculty appointments being divisional appointments rather than departmental. However, Professor Hetenyi felt his specific position as Director of Teacher Education should report to the Dean of the University for the purpose of "program planning and direction, but not one (administrative post) involved in the direct 'line' organization of the University."[1] This arrangement, he believed, would permit him a more direct channel to the divisional deans and subject matter department heads, without having to go up and down the administrative ladder to enlist departmental participation. Although the suggestion was considered reasonable, it was not acted upon because the departmental cooperation with the Teacher Education Program was such that the need for changing the administrative structure was not warranted.

As early as April, 1961, the notion of a graduate Teacher Education Program was considered. There were two approaches suggested each requiring eleven semesters to earn a Master of Arts in Teaching. The

[1]Hetenyi, Memorandum, 6.

first was rather standard in concept, which required the student to complete a bachelor's degree and then take three additional semesters sometime in the future to earn the M.A.T. The second avenue envisioned an uninterrupted period of eleven semesters for exceptionally promising students. The first four semesters would be identical to the first approach in case a student changed career objectives after starting college. The remaining seven semesters, however, would be planned as a continuous unit. This program would not require a master's thesis, but the quality of performance would be maintained at a level which would preclude any chance of the M.A.T. being "a cheapened" advanced degree. In both approaches, the master's would be directed toward a teaching degree, not a research degree. As viewed by Professor Hetenyi, the program could serve both the secondary and elementary teachers, but in the latter case it would be more difficult and probably would have to be organized around a special education curriculum.

Separate and distinct from degree programs in teacher education, the University found itself to be ideally located to serve the purpose of improving teaching in southeastern Michigan through "a series of research studies and cooperative ventures with teachers now in the field."[1] Three programs were outlined by the Teacher Education faculty as possibilities for future consideration as the University staff increased in size. The first program approach, and most feasible for the immediate future, was several in-service seminars or workshops organized to deal with one or more academic disciplines during a school year. The precise purpose of the project would be to bring together high school and college faculty members who had a common concern in the substantive issues of a

[1]Hetenyi, Memorandum, 7.

specific subject matter area. A second program, requiring more time and considerable financial assistance, would be a research program investigating the educational problems of the gifted. Because of the number of private and public institutions within a few miles of the campus, it was believed that excellent laboratories would be readily available. The third program would be directed toward identifying exceptional public school teachers "to do research and teaching at the University."[1] In this program teachers would be appointed for a period of two years. The first year, the project would be directed toward "research in curricular and/or methodological problems . . . . The second would involve teaching duties at the University and preparation of research findings for publications."[2] The benefits from any of these programs would accrue to both the school systems and the University. Education would be served and man's knowledge would be increased about a subject that he identifies as a top priority item in his daily activities.

Seventy-five of the first 147 degrees granted at Oakland University were conferred on teacher education graduates. Certification was granted to 39 elementary graduates, and 36 secondary graduates. The majors for secondary teaching were as follows: 13 in English, 7 in mathematics, 6 in foreign languages, 4 in history, 4 in social sciences, and one each in chemistry and physics. Dr. David Beardslee, Chairman of the Psychology Department, and Director of the Computer Data Processing Center, reported from his analysis of the grades for the first graduating

[1] Hetenyi, Memorandum, 8

[2] Ibid.

class that the initial teacher education group had achieved one of the basic aims of the program, "i.e., the teacher education program will have established itself as being comparable in difficulty to the liberal arts sequence and to the other professional programs."[1] The grade point average for secondary teaching graduates was 2.76 on a four-point scale. Those in elementary earned a 2.64, and the students in all other liberal arts and professional programs earned a 2.72. According to Professor Beardslee, "These variations are so small as to suggest three samples of a single, reasonable homogeneous data group."[2] Finally, it should be noted that nine out of the fifteen University academic honors awarded at the first commencement were given to teacher education graduates.

In any teacher education program, the methods and internship courses play a prominent part in the preparation of the future teacher. MSUO's curriculum called for the students' first exposure to these two very important phases of the teacher training experience to come in the sophomore year through a twice-a-week classroom observation period in a nearby school. This experience provided some background for the potential teacher to understand and appreciate the methods courses and internship to come in the senior year. Further, the student had a chance, at this early date, to consider whether or not he would really like teaching and would be suited to the life and work of a teacher. The methods course and internship were offered for the first time in Winter 1963. The methods work was scheduled during the first five weeks, and the internship during the last ten weeks. In both cases, this division

[1] Report on the Teacher Education Program 1962-1963, Oakland University, June 1963, p. 1 (in the files of the School).

[2] Ibid.

of work was to occupy the students' full time. However, there was less than complete satisfaction with the methods course. The period was judged too short. Many instructors did not use the period optimally by assigning appropriate amounts of work to the student, and it was felt in the secondary area that more concentration was needed on the methodology of teaching a major. For the first class, the general view regarding the internship was quite favorable. "The consensus of co-operating districts was that students were well prepared, did an unusually good job of planning and instruction, and displayed superior professional attitudes."[1] As might be expected, harmony between the cooperating teacher and the intern did not prevail in all cases, and where it did not, these cases were worked out to the mutual satisfaction of all concerned. The single most troublesome problem in the whole internship program was the use of the evaluation form. Confusion and tension developed because some students and cooperating teachers believed that the teachers' evaluation of the students' work had been changed by the supervisor. Because of this problem, plans were made to eliminate the grade column in 1964, and to use only the ten point rating scale. The other major problem of the internship program dealt with the utilization of the MSUO staff resources.

> The one obvious weakness . . . was the excessive overloading of faculty members engaged in this program. Had it not been for the staggering number of hours put in by Mr. Evarts, serious weakness in the school visits would have developed. In almost no instances was this attributable to insufficient effort by the supervisors . . . Unfortunately, several carried too many other responsibilities to deal with the supervision quite as originally planned.[2]

[1] Ibid., 2. [2] Ibid., 3.

Professor Hetenyi proposed to follow the recommendation of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education in establishing appropriate student intern loads for supervisors in the future.

Like any new venture, the Teacher Education Program had its moments of success and failure. However, with the talent and leadership available to it, the successes were many more than the failures. Internally, the University staff was reasonably satisfied with what the program had accomplished, based on their own involvement and observation, and the reaction to the program from external sources. It was recognized that adjustments and changes would be required to improve the program, but in general the format would stand.

Business Administration

The participants in the Meadow Brook Seminar on Business, like the ones in Teacher Education and Engineering Science showed no reticence in saying that business must have broadly educated people to recognize "the plurality of business methodology and the nature of change in a dynamic society,"[1] as well as having the technical and vocational training required to perform a specific task. The early recommendations of the Michigan State University faculty committee appointed by Vice President Thomas H. Hamilton in 1957, also proposed a strong emphasis on general education. In fact, the suggested curriculum allowed for 60 to 66 semester hours outside of business and economics subjects in three proposed majors--Financial Administration, Industrial Relations, and Production and Distribution Management. By December, 1957, after hours

[1]Thomas H. Hamilton and Durward B. Varner, The Meadow Brook Seminars on Higher Learning--Education for Business, A Syntheses and Summary, Michigan State University-Oakland, (Rochester: 1958), p. 2.

of subcommittee meetings, the Business Administration curriculum was narrowed to a single General Business Administration major. One of the features of this program was a course in the Principles of Administration, which was to provide "basic principles of administration common to education, government, and business."[1] Michigan State University had no equivalent of this course, so this was to be newly designed for the MSUO curriculum. However, the general character of the courses to apply to the business content of the curriculum followed closely the General Business major at Michigan State University.[2]

Business & Economics (2 courses)	Statistics (1 course)
Principles of Economics (3 courses)	General Psychology (1 course)
Principles of Accounting (3 courses)	Finance (2 courses)
Psychology of Business (1 course)	Money & Banking (1 course)
Labor & Economics (1 course)	Business Law (1 course)
Marketing (2 courses)	Management (2 courses)
Government Business (1 course)	Mathematics (1 course)
Business Policy (1 course	

Following the Meadow Brook Seminar, the Business Administration program changed again. It moved from the specific to the more general by integrating the course work into meaningful units which focused on the direction and responsibilities of people in society. For example, the early planners included a year's course in the principles of accounting, which was to prepare students to handle accounting entries, to prepare profit and loss statements, to make balance sheets, to set up and manage the accounting records of partnerships and corporations, to work with fixed assets and revenue statements of manufacturing operations, et cetera. The accounting requirement for MSUO students was limited to one course and parts of other courses as needed to explain a business

[1]MSUO Curriculum Committee Report, Michigan State University, December, 1957, p. 5 (in the files of the University).

[2]Ibid., 6

concept. The emphasis was directed to the statistical techniques used by business to solve problems, rather than debits and credits. The reasons for this trend are twofold. First, the general recognition that business and industry are becoming more competitive and therefore need to be more sophisticated in their management techniques as they deal with people, capital, research, labor, government, and training. Second, the individuals involved in the refinement of the MSUO program were economics and statistically oriented instead of business education oriented.

During the first two years the business curriculum required the major to take four economics courses, three mathematics courses, but none of the more traditional courses found in other institutions. These two years permitted Michigan State University Oakland more time to develop its program and to hire the needed faculty. In the summer of 1961, Dr. Kenneth Roose joined the faculty and became the Associate Dean for Social Sciences, in addition to Professor of Economics. Dean Roose's arrival heralded the true beginning of the Business Administration Program. All that had been done served as a solid foundation for what was to follow. The third year courses were planned during the summer and taught in the fall and winter semesters; but while the program moved forward in a deliberate manner, things were beginning to happen which were to firmly establish and give direction to the business program for years to come. In September, 1961, Michigan State University Oakland received a grant of $15,000 from the Ford Fund to be used to study existing business administration programs, to meet with corporate executives, and to consult with leading scholars in the field, with the intent of establishing a new and dynamic undergraduate business program.

Before starting the search, Dean Roose and his colleagues reviewed the literature and studied in detail the two significant studies of business education financed by the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. After many visits, discussions, and miles of traveling, the Michigan State University Oakland approach to education for business was released. Dean Roose said,

> In constructing this program we have accepted the recommendation of business leaders and educators who urged us not to train students for their first job, but to develop their capacities for mastering the challenging task and jobs that lie ahead of them. As William Benton, a successful businessman and former U. S. Senator, wrote recently in a national magazine: 'It is not the function of an institution of higher learning to train a student for his first job, the common fault of business colleges. The principal objective should be to equip him with the navigating instruments for what Dr. James B. Conant, former President of Harvard, calls the continuous voyage--the process of self-education. . . .'[1]

The basic assumptions used by the economic-business faculty in designing this improved concept of education for business included the following five points:

1. That preparation for business leadership for tomorrow requires a strong liberal arts and science training today.
2. The future business leaders must become informed about the ever-changing world problems.
3. That the first responsibility of the program is to develop an analytical and self-reliant person, not to train the student for his first job.
4. That students must develop the ability to develop and analyze problems; to establish priorities, to understand people; and to continue in self-education upon completion of their undergraduate careers.
5. And, finally, that a good undergraduate education for business should provide: a) a broad understanding of the role of corporate enterprise in our society; b) a recognition of the significance of government, business,

[1]K. D. Roose, "The Business Education Program at MSUO," Michigan State University Oakland, Rochester, Michigan, Summer, 1962, p. 1.

> and labor as great power blocs in the economy; c) an awareness of the social responsibilities of corporations and their executives; and d) an introduction to the decision-making processes of successful business enterprises.[1]

The Ford Foundation and Carnegie Foundation studies had a great impact on the ultimate MSUO program. The emphasis that they placed on the need for improved mathematics and statistics was reiterated by Dean Roose. He said,

> thus, Pierson in his Carnegie Study, The Education of the American Businessman, revealed that businessmen generally have been critical of students' mathematical and statistical training: 'Employers in a position to have an informed judgment on the matter stress the need for giving students a framework for conceptualizing mathematically and for grasping quantitative statistical relationships. Next to their weakness in written expression, employers appear more critical of the college students' preparation in mathematics and statistics than in any other area.' Gordon, too, in his Ford study, Higher Education for Business, reported that the testimony of businessmen, business school alumni, educators, social scientists, and mathematicians all stressed the importance of raising standards of mathematical and statistical competence.[2]

The ultimate objectives of the new Business-Economic Program was "to bring the disciplines of mathematics, economic theory, and the behavorial sciences to bear on the problems of the business community."[3] Dean Roose wrote,

> In emphasizing basic knowledge, theory, and analysis rather than specific business procedures we agree with W. Allen Wallis, former Dean of the University of Chicago School of Business, who has asserted that 'business experience . . . is best obtained in business itself, not in the classroom of colleges and universities.' Nevertheless, we hold with him that 'the schools of business can . . . prepare the student to get the maximum amount of educational value from his experience. The schools receive the students at a time when sensitising and preparation for self-education can be most effective. Furthermore, these are parts of lifelong

[1] Ibid., 2. [2] Ibid., 3-4. [3] Ibid., 4.

business education that the school of business can provide most effectively.'[1]

The lifelong concept of education, whether formally or informally, repeats itself again and again throughout any discussion about the learning process and curriculum objectives. Hence, the emphasis on analytical and basic principles in all curricula.

The broad gauge nature of the Business-Economics Program has many advantages in preparing students for many positions, but it also has some disadvantages as well. In general, Michigan State University Oakland's first graduates were received very well into business and industry. The companies particularly liked the systems and statistical orientation of the student because it made placement easier. The student was considered to be more open-minded during the management-training period because he did not think of himself as a labor relations major, a finance major, a personnel major, et cetera. The computer training received by the MSUO student was also considered a plus factor for them in placement. However, the lack of specific accounting training was considered a handicap by the employer and the graduate. In some cases this handicap was less than in others, for the student who was placed in a general management-training program it provided time for him to pick up a course or two at evening college; but for the graduate who found himself in a comptroller or accounting department, it required him to take immediate measures to remedy the situation. This deficiency was reported back to the head of the Business-Economics Department many times; but the same biased answer was always received: MSUO was not training accountants, it was preparing graduates for management positions. Be-

[1] Ibid.

sides, traditional accounting was as out of date as the long-quill pen, the high stool, and the green visor. This narrowness of attitude created problems for the business major, and until changed will continue to create problems in the future.

Engineering Science

When Mrs. Wilson was first asked what she would like to see taught at Michigan State University Oakland, her quick and unqualified reply was "automotive engineering." Having been close to the automobile industry through her own work career and her marriage to John Dodge, she always thought first of the industry that had made her husband famous and contributed so much to the easy transportation for the masses. Because of Mrs. Wilson's interest in engineering, MSUO always considered it an important part of its curriculum Ready to help shape the basic principles and concepts of the MSUO Engineering Science Program was Mr. James Zeder, former Vice President for Engineering at Chrysler and chairman of the Michigan State University Oakland Foundation Committee on Curriculum.

With the help of Dean John D. Ryder, of Michigan State University's College of Engineering, Mr. Zeder personally hand-picked the panel of consultants to the Meadow Brook Seminar for Engineering Science. These nationally and internationally known men were all friends of Mr. Zeder and were pleased to be invited to participate in the discussions which would lead to the creation of a new program in engineering. This group identified as a major problem of engineering education "the change in the nature of society."[1]

[1]Thomas H. Hamilton and Durward B. Varner, The Meadow Brook Seminars on Higher Learning--Engineering Science, A Synthesis and Summary, Michigan State University-Oakland, (Rochester: 1958), p. 2.

They numbered these changes as two. The first involved the sheer size and complexness of the work facing the engineer today, and the second was the breadth of liberal education which the engineer found he needed in order to communicate with people outside but related indirectly to his career field.

> Many an engineer has learned, to his considerable discomfort, blueprints and formulae prove unsatisfactory as a media of information. Thus it becomes clear that the engineer of the future must not only become infinitely more skilled in his own discipline, but he must be at least an adequate generalist in the disciplines which premit him to understand something about the nature of the physical and social world and the human beings and their works with which that world is populated.[1]

With this as a background and the work of the Michigan State University faculty committee, the Engineering Science Program was launched. The curriculum used during the first four years did not differ much from the suggested outline presented by Dr. Lawrence Von Tersch to President Hannah in December, 1957, or the one worked out following the seminars and presented in May, 1959. The program was not built around "things" or the products of industries, but to be "designed to give the student a knowledge of mathematics and physical sciences and an understanding of the principles of engineering science that will make him most effective in a field where expanding knowledge is constantly changing applications and techniques."[2]

Professor William Hammerle, the first director of the Engineering Science Program, believed that engineering students learned to apply theory best when they developed their own problem, built the equipment

[1] Ibid.

[2] Michigan State University Oakland Bulletin 1960-1961, Michigan State University Oakland, (Rochester: June, 1961), p. 31.

needed in the project, and sought the solution. This was not a "cook-book" problem as is often used in laboratory situations, but an original project for which a solution had to be found. After working on several small projects during the sophomore and junior years, the senior project proved to be a real challenge as reported in the 1962-1963 Annual Report--

> development of advanced courses in science and engineering required simultaneous equipping of necessary laboratories. To capitalize on this necessity, a dozen seniors in engineering science were assigned the responsibility for developing a thermo-dynamics laboratory as a design problem. They were allotted $10,000 and had to determine what equipment to order. They visited every appropriate thermo-dynamics laboratory in the State. Since much of the equipment had to be constructed or assembled, and then connected to utilities, the students could apply their training directly to meaningful, practical problems.[1]

This approach to Engineering Science, along with the large number of liberal and general education courses, approximately 40 percent of all course work, supported the basic objectives of preparing future innovators and project directors, who were liberally educated citizens of the community.

Like the business graduates, the engineers found employment or admission to graduate school rather easy. However, some basic skills such as drafting, blueprint reading, and report writing, found in most engineering curricula, were noticeably missing and proved to be a handicap to the first class. A second problem area which created some awkwardness for the graduate was the general nature of the curriculum. While his peer from "X" college knew he was a mechanical or electrical engineer, the MSUO graduate was a little of each. This confusion was short-lived, because industry happily was able to match the MSUO graduate

[1] Annual Report 1962-1963 of Oakland University (Rochester: July, 1963, p. 2.

to their training programs and needs.

Establishing Priorities

Most organizations, new or established, operate from a list of priorities brought about by prevailing conditions, but because events do not happen one at a time, in sequence, it sometimes appears that everything is happening at once. Organizing and founding a new university is one of those situations which seems to have spontaneous converging at a single point in time, but because some things are more needed than others, the lower priority items receive less attention. In the first four years at MSUO, the one relatively unsolved problem was that of adequate management in the student affairs area. This was not necessarily caused by a lack of effort or skill, but a lack of resources, both dollars and staff. First things came first--buildings, personnel, curriculum, books, and students. Programs within the structure came second. The courses obviously had to be taught. Students had to be recruited for subsequent terms, and students' out-of-classroom needs had to be served. The latter had the lowest priority.

Student Affairs and the University's Three Deans of Students

Roy Alexander, the first Dean of Students, believed in people, and quickly established rapport with individual students and groups of students. It was his belief that,

> . . . students do not live in a vacuum, and there are secondary learning experiences which not only support the primary (learning experiences) but which are important in themselves. Living and working with other students can teach much about man's historic endeavor to control himself and achieve desirable objectives

> through cooperation. The assumption of the responsibility in student organizations can develop integrity. And most important in a public university is the realization by students that the knowledge and skills which they acquire must be brought to the service of the people composing their society.[1]

All offices on campus, in September, 1959, found no shortage of jobs to do and responsibilities to assume. The Dean of Students office was no exception. Reporting to Dean Alexander was the Director of Counseling and Testing, the Director of Physical Education, Recreation, and Intramural Activities, the Director of the Student Center and Student Activities, and the nurse in charge of the Health Center. In addition, the Exploratory Committee on student government, the lecture-concert program, and the student publications found their leadership in the Dean's office, although there were part-time staff consultants actually working with the students in the latter two cases. Other responsibilities included student summer job placement, management of the National Defense Education Act loan fund, working with area householders in matters of off-campus housing, and a myriad of usual dean of students activities including contacts with students, student discipline, and off-campus speaking engagements. The need for more help was obvious to all, but the problems of budget and items of higher priority in the University took precedence. The early publicity both written and spoken repeatedly emphasized the University's intention to provide an atmosphere where students would become personally acquainted with the faculty and staff. Michigan State University Oakland did not want grades to become the only connector between faculty and students. These pronouncements seemed to answer the need of students to enroll in an institution where

[1]R. J. Alexander, "Michigan State University-Oakland Purposes," Rochester, Michigan, 1958.

the stated objectives included concern for individuals. This is not to say that other institutions are not concerned, but that MSUO made it a point to advertise it. The number of students using the counseling and testing center in the 1959-1960 school year was evidence of the need. During this period, one professional counselor had 436 interviews in three quarters. More than 51 percent of the student enrollment had at least one interview, and approximately 62 percent of the initial group interviewed returned for additional appointments. An analysis of the interviews divided the group into three general categories--academic 41 percent, vocational 31 percent, and personal-social 28 percent. Each year the percentage increased slightly over the previous year as the enrollment grew; while the counseling and testing center was meeting specific needs for some students, a feeling of respect and trust was building between faculty and students in the classroom, in the grill, or in the faculty offices. Dean Alexander believed a major responsibility of his office was to build a bridge between student activities and the academic program. He believed that "academic and student affairs must move in unison toward common goals . . . if our commitment that each student become 'proficient as a professional, competent as a citizen, and happy as a human being' is to be achieved."[1] To accomplish this "union," the Dean, working with faculty members established a collateral student-faculty discussion group for the purpose of exchanging ideas on any subject of interest to either group--current events, philosophical ideas, school problems, et cetera. The first meeting was held February 5, 1960, with history professor Gerald Straka posing the question "Will there be a

[1]Roy J. Alexander, First Annual Report on Student Affairs 1959-60, Michigan State University Oakland, June 1960, p. III.

third World War?" These collateral sessions became popular and well attended weekly events.

In January, as the result of a disasterous first quarter grade-wise, a study skill program was established involving faculty and staff members to aid students in developing for themselves the best procedures and techniques for studying. To accomplish these ends, the following topics were discussed over a seven-week period: a) Note Taking, b) Reviewing for Examinations, c) Writing Term Papers and Themes, d) Reading as a Study Skill, e) Reading Problems, f) The Library and Effective Study, and g) A Review of Effective Study Habits. This program was followed by a similar one in the spring quarter, and a series in the 1960-1961 school year.

Still another effort to tie the student activities program to the academic program was the publishing, in the Oakland Observer each week, an outstanding freshman theme chosen by the English department faculty.

The Dean of Students Office attempted to carry this concept of "union" into club activities, intramural sports, the advising program, and the student center activities. Reasonable success was achieved. However, in most human ventures personality conflicts and internal politics get in the way of the objectives and goals. In the effort to build a bridge between student activities and academic programs, Dean Alexander's previous academic experience in secondary public schools, and his basic commitment to the land-grant concept of education ran counter to what was happening at MSUO. Because of his position in the top echelon of administration, his effort to change the academic direction by seeking allies within the faculty and staff created an unhealthy

situation. Dean Alexander resigned in December, 1960, after serving the University unselfishly for over two years.

Mr. Hollie Lepley, Director of Physical Education and Intramural Activities, was appointed Acting Dean of Students until a new dean was employed. This "minding the store" assignment permitted the carrying out of existing plans and procedures, but did little to enhance the student affairs operation. No one was at fault. When a situation like this is created, the normal tendency is to maintain the status quo. Dean Lepley who had already proved to be a popular administrator with the students gave the leadership and cohesive quality needed during the balance of the year.

On July 1, 1961, J. Duncan Sells, former Director of the Financial Aids Office at Cornell University was appointed Dean of Students. The new dean was the first appointment by another new dean, Donald D. O'Dowd, Dean of the University. With this appointment, a significant change occurred in the administrative structure of the University. The Dean of Students who had previously been responsible to the Chancellor was now a part of the Office of the Dean of the University. Dean O'Dowd wanted to continue the "union" Roy Alexander attempted to create, but felt that greater acceptance by the faculty would be possible if the Dean of Students Office was a recognized unit of the instructional part of the University, as different from the non-instructional part.

Dean Sells was quickly accepted by the staff and the student body. His open and friendly attitude, coupled with the knowledge of having someone permanently at the helm again added to his ready acceptance. The Oakland Observer editorial of September 22, 1961,

confirmed his immediate popularity.

Thanks, Cornell!

Ask Dean Sells first.

A new operating procedure at MSUO. It is evidence of student endorsement of a new dean.

Dean Sells is actually interested. He listens. And when he gives advice he has something to say.

He has a sense of humor. He needs one for a job that is mostly overtime.

He is authoritative and responsible, but no one is afraid of him. Is it merely coincidence that with his arrival the dean's office was moved from the 'inner sanctum' of room 155 to a light, glass-enclosed area? Those who imagine a dean as an austere, hard faced indivudual, glaring at the world--or a distraught student--through beady eyes will be forced to construct a more accurate image. Dean Sells has rendered such a conception invalid.

'More students have come in to the Dean's office in the last weeks than came in the last two years,' says a member of the Administration.

We don't wonder how MSUO got along without Dean Sells. We know. It was rough. But he was worth waiting for.[1]

The Dean's liberal attitude regarding in loco parentis, his assignment to the Dean of the University's Office, the recognition by the University that the Student Affairs operation needed rebuilding and financial support, and a cooperative attitude by the new Dean all helped to change the image of the Dean of Students' Office. This original popularity with the students continued in most cases throughout the Dean's tenure.

Late in the summer of 1961, another important change occurred with the resignation of Dr. Robert Hopkins, Director of Counseling and

[1] Oakland Observer, (Rochester, Michigan), September 22, 1961, p. 2.

Testing. This resignation, even though sudden and coming at an awkward time, allowed the Dean of the University to institute changes in the aim of this University service and to transfer the function to his office. The reorganization placed the emphasis on assisting students with psychological problems, whether they be vocational, educational, social, or emotional in nature. This redirection of emphasis was also facilitated by a change in the department's name to the Office of Psychological Services. Although it was a year before the new director was employed, Dr. Elizabeth Beardslee provided professional clinical help during the 1961-1962 school year. The change in the nature of this University service proved most helpful.

The cooperation between the Dean of Students and the Office of Psychological Services on student behavior problems enhanced the proper handling of these cases. The students with a problem found help easier to get. Where many dean of students offices are looked upon with suspicion by students, Dean Sells created an image of help and fair play. His handling of discipline problems was generally viewed by the students as being just. Parents were involved in only the most serious cases, which further increased the trust of the student in this office and person.

The increase in the clerical, technical, and professional staff proved important to the student affairs operation from July 1, 1961 to June 30, 1963. With this help, on-going programs were improved and new programs were established. The whole University felt a lift by this new attention to the non-instructional side of University life. With the advent of new dormitories, a base was provided for student activities which affected the commuter students' attitude toward returning to the campus for special events. To visitors, whether adults on campus for a

meeting, or high school students looking for a suitable college, the atmosphere of the institution gave the impression of things happening. Yet the one problem that was not solved, was the inability of MSUO students to organize a student government, and the inability to commit themselves to any long range project.

To remedy the student government's failure, Dean Sells appointed twelve students to a new group, in May, 1962, the Student-Faculty University Council, to discuss the needs of the undergraduate at MSUO. The Dean fell into the usual trap that faces one in choosing a "representative group." The students chosen were a good cross-section of the academic majors, but it did not represent the minority segments of the total student population. The group was homogeneous in its orientation and attitude, and, therefore, had a built-in bias, according to some students, from the beginning.

The faculty representatives of SFUC were members of the Academic Senate Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, who had agreed to join the student group to facilitate communication between the student body and the faculty. It was the hope of the Council, according to Dean Sells, to build "a tradition according to our own unique situation, and within this framework we should study the best means to prepare students academically and socially, both for now and after they leave."[1]

From the start, the Council was in trouble, partly because of the group appointed, but more important, the ill-advised position taken regarding how to report the Council's meetings to the Oakland Observer. The Faculty Committee on Student Affairs, on the advice of Dean Sells,

[1]Oakland Observer, (Rochester, Michigan), May 25, 1962, p. 1.

made a written suggestion on the subject of press coverage. "In view of the need that such communication (between students, faculty, and student administration) be open and free, we feel that it is in the best interests of the University if press reports be cleared for factual accuracy with a person designated by the Committee."[1] This position was rejected by the Oakland Observer Editor, William Hoke. A compromise was attempted by the chairman of the University Publications Committee, Dr. Donald Hildum, to change the submission of copy idea to a consultation, after each meeting, between Dean Sells and the newspaper representative. Mr. Hoke rejected again any notion of control. It was the newspaper staff's position that a student group, representing student opinion, discussing student issues, should be open to the press. This debate continued through the summer, but neither side relented, and finally the Oakland Observer ignored the existence of the Council in all future issues of the paper. The Council continued to meet occasionally during the 1962-63 school year, but slowly lost most of its original momentum by April, 1963. In some ways, the Council achieved little, based on its original goal, because of its short life, but Dr. David Beardslee who chaired the Council felt that some specific gains were made. He pointed out that during the year a solution was found to the public transportation problem for dormitory students on weekends, that a new student orientation program was established that provided an outstanding service to the new freshmen and the University in the summer of 1962, and the students had a sounding board against which they could bounce their many problems and frustrations.

[1]Oakland Observer, (Rochester, Michigan), June 8, 1962, p. 3.

Again, the effort to create a University-wide communication link between the students, the faculty, and the administration failed. Again the Oakland University student proved that he was not to be organized. But, even without a formal structure, most things were done on time and with some degree of success, even though efficiency and finesse were both lacking.

Probably the most significant administrative change and contribution to the successful functioning of the University involving the Dean of Students Office during the first four years was its assistance in establishing a working advising program. It became the focal point in working with students identified by the faculty and staff as being in academic difficulty. The Dean attempted "to diagnose the problem and initiate corrective action in consultation with faculty members."[1] His involvement and actions provided direct support to the classroom teacher.

Like most colleges and universities, the advising program is always in flux, and in need of improvement. Michigan State University Oakland found, as other institutions had, that there is no single model which meets the needs of all advisees. What is appropriate for one individual is inappropriate for another, and, if the advisor views this important educational function as an assignment to be done as quickly as possible, very little benefit is derived from the advising session. All too often this situation prevails. However, with this all-out effort by the Dean of the University, the Dean of Students, the Office of Psychological Services, and the faculty, MSUO took the first steps to reduce the heavy attrition which had prevailed since September, 1959. Students

[1]Annual Report of the Dean of the University 1961-1962 (Rochester: Michigan State University Oakland, July 24, 1962), pp. 2-3.

for the first time were watched and pampered through the advising program. The importance of the Dean of Students position in the administrative structure in a college or university cannot be over-emphasized. Here is where the blending process of the instructional and non-instructional aspect of college life gets its leadership. The person who fills this position must be sensitive to the mood and temper of the student, faculty, and staff, and be able to recognize any symptoms of impending problems. He is caught, more often than not, between two forces, one of which will usually criticize him during and after the confrontation. His roles are many, involving ability to mediate, discipline, sympathize, innovate, support, and lead. Michigan State University Oakland was slow in recognizing the many-faceted sides of a dean of students job, and in so doing caused itself unnecessary problems of morale, efficiency, cooperation, and programming. Coupled with this, was the re-occurring informational void about the student body which plagued MSUO from fall 1959 to spring 1963. These two factors had much to do with the confusion, ineffectiveness, aimlessness, and frustration which characterized the Dean of Students Office during certain periods. Some would argue that this evaluation is too harsh in light of specific program successes, and the great amount of energy and time unselfishly given to provide the students and the University with a meaningful program, but it also must be recognized that at the end of the first four years the University was still searching for a means to make its student affairs operation function effectively especially in the area of student organization.

Faculty Selection Key to Institutional Quality

An institution of higher learning needs many strengths, but a

weakness at any point in its structure detracts from its ability to achieve its goals and objectives. The most vulnerable spot for a university which will cause it the greatest distress is an incompetent faculty. For a new institution the selection of the original faculty is crucial, because these same individuals, a year or two later, become the base for recruiting new faculty-scholars. A medium grade faculty will likely attract medium grade colleagues which can set a pattern difficult to reverse. Chancellor Varner commented in 1959, "It is the quality of the faculty that distinguishes a university." Using this statement as a benchmark, MSUO proceeded to select faculty members who would provide students with leadership to knowledge through information from the past, reaction to the present, and experimentation in the future. To achieve this leadership, faculty recruitment was aimed at selecting individuals who would not be bound by a set pattern but would attempt to create an active community of learning by stimulating "students to go beyond normal boundaries of course requirements."[1]

A new institution has certain inherent disadvantages in attracting an able faculty which cannot go unnoted. For some faculty members, the lack of an established library or intellectual tradition would be a drawback. For others "the absence of a graduate program would provide a major stumbling block."[2] MSUO was particularly disadvantaged in the spring and summer of 1959 by the national publicity that the State of Michigan was receiving about its financial crisis. To counteract these

[1]"Michigan State University Oakland," Michigan State University Oakland Publication, 1960, p. 8.

[2]Annual Report 1959-60 (Rochester: Michigan State University Oakland, July, 1960), p. 15.

problems

> the decision was made that the faculty should be recruited from among the young and promising; that we should perhaps pay more than the 'going rate;' that the emphasis should be placed upon the excitement in helping shape the nature and character of a completely new institution unfettered by custom and tradition.[1]

The faculty hired was a young, ambitious group of highly competent individuals ready to shape and mold a new institution of higher learning. The opportunity to participate in this "New Kind of University,"[2] "Blazing a New Trail in Education"[3] where the "Objective is to Make Every Man An Egghead"[4] was like heady wine. The newspaper and periodical coverage of Michigan State University Oakland's birth was exceptional, but lost in this coverage was the question whether or not the academic qualifications of the student body was adequate to meet the challenge placed before it. The "Charter Class" was an above average group; however, it would be fair to say that the faculty and the students were not well matched. This situation existed during the first three years, although it should be noted that each entering group of students was academically better prepared than the previous class. Some faculty were disappointed with MSUO, but most were caught up in the dynamics of the institution and the earnestness of the students to learn. One faculty member quoted in the Chicago Sunday Sun-Times said, "These students may not be as bright to start with, but they are working harder and reaching

[1] Ibid.

[2] Chicago Sunday Sun-Times, September 20, 1959, Sec. II, p. 1.

[3] The Detroit News, August 25, 1959, Section D, p. 8.

[4] New York Herald Tribune, September 13, 1957, Sunday Education Section, p. 1.

higher to meet the challenge."[1]

At the end of the second year, the following paragraphs appeared in the annual report summarizing the faculty situation.

> It is doubtful if any faculty in any institution in America has been so hard pressed as has been this young group in these first two years. The student-teacher ratio is high; the teaching load ranges from 12 to 15 hours per week; yet much more is involved. There are numberous committees concerned with the full range of policies to be established in a new institution; there is a continuing concern for working through building programs and building plans, for counseling of new students, and for relating this institution to the community. One of the penalties of this heavy work load is the great shortage of time remaining for faculty members to conceive new programs or to study new ways of presenting the material at hand. In short, it leaves them virtually no time for reflection and hence making innovation difficult to achieve. It is hoped that during the next few years it will be possible to free more time for faculty members for the reflection that is necessary to creativity.
>
> Even so, the enthusiasm of the faculty is high and their commitment to developing a first-class educational institution continues to be complete. The vigor, the youthfulness, and the enthusiasm of this group--while it may occasionally create problems--bodes well for the future of this institution.[2]

In many ways, virtually every faculty member had to be teacher-scholar-administrator during these beginning years.

The pressures and demands of a new university in its first years are unusually heavy on its staff. Even though an institution is small and the students few, all the functions normally required in running an institution are expected. The many jobs are performed with only a few people, and everyone finds the days long and full; however, this situation

[1] Chicago Sunday Sun-Times, December 25, 1960, Sec. II, p. 2.

[2] Annual Report, July 1, 1960 to June 30, 1961 (Rochester: Michigan State University Oakland, July 1961), p. 3.

does not go on forever, but relief can be expected as staffs increase, policies are established, procedures become routine, and the curriculum takes on a degree of permanency.

The third and fourth years brought some relief to this faculty. More attention was directed into scholarly pursuits. Faculty members were sharing their learning talents and skills with the academic community in their various disciplines through publications, professional meetings, and papers presented at state and national gatherings. The increase in the faculty size permitted a broader base for committee work, academic advising, curriculum development and teaching assignments; the improvement in the academic quality of the students allowed more innovative approaches to teaching; and the introduction of upper-level courses provided an opportunity for the faculty to teach their particular academic interest. These items, and others like them, greatly helped the faculty morale and redirected the faculty's attention from a narrow inward orientation to a broader view of the academic community.

The Administrative and Organizational Structure

Administratively, the University did not differ markedly in its organizational structure from the structure found in most state institutions. But the fact that it was the creation of a major state university in an affiliate relationship made it different in the midwest at the time. Most colleges and universities responsible for establishing a separate educational unit do so with the branch concept in mind; but as pointed out earlier in this history, MSUO was never considered such by those who founded the institution. Except for the fact that John A. Hannah was President of both Michigan State University and Michigan State

University Oakland and both institutions reported through his office to the Board of Trustees, MSUO was given the freedom to develop an educational concept different from the land-grant base of Michigan State University. Notwithstanding, President Hannah, the attitude and actions of the faculty and staff worked on the premise that the chief administrator was Chancellor Varner. This functioning was not disrespect nor a deliberate action to ignore the relationship to Michigan State University; but a feeling created by the charge and freedom allowed by the President and the Board to develop separately. Other than the Chancellor's relationship to the President, no person or department was regulated or responsible to a Michigan State University administrator, department or college.

The notable organizational difference attempted at Michigan State University Oakland was the idea that there should be no subdivision of the faculty. It was to be a single entity serving the teaching responsibility of the University. Departments and department heads did not exist; but there were unofficial chairmen of subject matter areas and an informal arrangement of subject matter divisions--humanities, social sciences, and science and engineering. As early as January 23, 1961, when the Chancellor was asked about establishing departments and departmental chairmen, he indicated his belief that the University would be advantaged if these designations could be avoided, but commented that he would welcome any ideas both pro and con on the subject. Time and an increase in size proved that the practical matter of getting things done required a more formal organizational structure in order to accomplish the University's business. Effective July 1, 1961, the informal division arrangement was officially recognized and three associate deans were

appointed to carry out the academic business of the University. However, it took two more years to formulate the department structure, including the appointment of department heads. The Board of Trustees approved the recommendation of the Chancellor on May 16, 1963 to establish departments each with a department head. To assure at least a review of departmental administration, the department heads' appointments were granted on a renewable three-year basis. The University Course structure and requirements made it appear that a single university faculty approach was feasible. But the years of orientation or conditioning that the faculty and staff brought with them from other institutions made the idea almost unsuitable from the start. Even the interdisciplinary humanities oriented faculty members looked upon themselves as specialists in a subject matter area first. In fairness to the concept it can be said that the single faculty idea worked satisfactorily the first year, reasonably so the second year; but became ineffective with the advent of upper-level courses and the identification of subject matter majors.

A second organizational difference which cannot be listed as innovational but does point up the posture of the institution toward the singular organizational thrust is in the instructional area. The admission and registrar functions are usually found reporting to the Dean of Students or the academic dean. Seldom does one see these offices reporting to the chief administrative officer. However, given the choice, the Director of Admissions and/or Registrar, like nearly every other officer in the university, would prefer this arrangement. At MSUO the decision was to place these functions administratively under the Dean of the Faculty which in a tangible way tied the office of the Director of Admissions and Registrar to the instructional part of the University.

Organizationally this arrangement is considered by the Director of Admissions and the Registrar as best for the support of their functions and thus best for the University. Some educators would disagree with this position by saying that these functions are student personnel functions and should be responsible to the student affairs division of the institution. But the facts remain that the admissions requirements are formulated by the faculty and the student recruitment program should be organized to match faculty and student not the non-instructional officers and the student. Second, the registration and records functions are oriented to both the academic program and student personnel functions; but again the specific duties of the Registrar and his staff are performed more in support of the instructional function of the institution than the non-instructional functions. As stated above, the idea of locating these offices under the academic dean's purview is not new; but it was done at MSUO to reinforce a larger concept.

The original administrative structure lasted two years at which time it was decided that an even closer knit framework would improve the communications and division of responsibilities. Where, at the beginning, the major divisions of the University were: the Chancellor's office, the Dean of the Faculty's office, the Dean of Students' office, and the Director of the Business' office; the new structure placed the Dean of Students' operation under the Dean of the University, formerly the Dean of the Faculty, thereby creating a tripartite management structure. In this set-up, the Dean of the University increased the authority of his office several times over that of the Dean of the Faculty. The absorption of the student personnel services into the Dean of the University's office left the Dean controlling not only a greater portion of the University,

but, more important, he was in a position to directly influence the budget allocations for areas previously related to those for which he was responsible. For the first time there was a unified course of action to bring together and coordinate the educational purposes and programs of the University into a single and meaningful thrust.

This organizational structure supported the philosophy of administration to which Chancellor Varner subscribed--democratic with a touch of laissez a faire mixed in for spice. He believed, as did most of his staff, that a combination of the faculty, the students, the Board of Trustees, the administrative officers, and the non-instructional personnel were needed to guide and lead the institution. Not one of these groups singly could be expected to know what was best or to be given unchallenged authority. They had to work together because the University was made up of these component parts and if one was missing the others became meaningless. James S. Kinder said, "An administration exists for the purpose of enabling the institution to carry out effectively its aims and policies rather than as an end in itself. Administration is an inherent part of the whole educational process rather than merely a tool, adjunct or facilitating device."[1] The Chancellor believed that the administration does not entirely govern nor does it entirely transmit policies. Its authority is "with" rather than "over" others and administration should grow out of "The policy-making and the operating phase of the (University). . . ."[2] It "must be integrated so that the policy

[1]James S. Kinder, The Internal Administration of the Liberal Arts College (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934), p. 84.

[2]Ibid., p. 132.

flows out of operations and operations truly represent policy."[1] MSUO during its first four operational years worked on the premise that those directly affected by the results of planning should have a share in the making of the plans and the various groups in the college community should assume administrative responsibility for those areas in which they participate.

The administrative officers felt a joint responsibility for all University activities. They viewed themselves as leaders, planners, organizers, coordinators, executors, and servants. They knew they must guide the groups that make up the University so that the aims of the University are fulfilled and the community served. Chancellor Varner in his role as chief administrative officer readily accepted the responsibility of leadership by stimulating planning, urging an evaluation of program activities and coordinating all elements and groups into a harmonious whole.

[1] Ibid.

CHAPTER VI

REALITY PLUS OR MINUS

This study has examined the causes and effects of the founding purposes and the personal involvement of many people on the development of Michigan State University Oakland. The "MSUO Story" demonstrated that higher education follows the cyclical process of man's undertakings and is altered only by the creativeness and adaptability of those involved at a point in time. The reporting of events and the analyzing of their effect on the growth of the University has served to chart the path of the institution in accepting the challenge of its planners to depart from the traditional and pioneer a new route for its students. The ability of the staff to adapt in meeting the daily problems of this new university was of singular importance to its success during its first four years of operation. However, there were occasions when considerable apprehension and misgiving was felt by even the most dedicated. A departure from the known can be unsettling to the strongest believer, but the uncertainty of its implications are sure to be disturbing to members of any group. The strength of MSUO was the belief and involvement by many (students, faculty, administrators, and community citizens) in the dynamics of its day-to-day operation.

Confidence and belief in the future best describes the Michigan State University Board of Trustees acceptance of the challenge to build a new four year university. Such an act, although rather bold in light of the financial condition of the State of Michigan, revealed the adaptability and the willingness of the Board to try a different approach

from the land-grant stance of this and other boards over the previous 102 years. MSUO's commitment to the liberal arts was looked upon as up-dating education to fit the times even though Michigan State University's Basic College (general education) had been operating since 1944 and the College of Science and Arts was among its largest divisions. The facts are that nothing really new was created but a fresh attitude toward the purposes of a college education was considered. For centuries man has promoted the idea of liberal arts as the basis for a proper education, and many institutions, usually private in organization, have followed this approach. However, with the advancement of technology and the broader base from which college students are selected, more and more emphasis in both private and public institutions of higher learning, especially the latter, has been toward fractionizing and specializing in the curriculum. This is not to say that specialization is all bad, but in the process of specializing there has been a tendency to include more of the "how to do" courses and fewer of the courses with the purpose of humanizing man. Michigan State University Oakland arrived on the educational scene just as man was raising the question whether too much emphasis was being placed on materialistic things or whether man should return to the fundamental pronouncement of Aristotle when he said, "The human race lives . . . . by art and reasoning."

The mood of educators and people in general was right for a rediscovery of the liberal arts. The Meadow Brook Seminars' participants, being individuals sensitive to the sign posts of society, reacted with an unanimity to broaden the humanistic qualities of the subject matter areas. This direction in curriculum development held for MSUO a subtle refinement which called for the graduates to be "innovators and direc-

tors" rather than "applicators and technicians." These words held a promise to both the students and the faculty. But the notion at best must be recognized as unrealistic when applied to the cross-section of student ability even when there was a modicum of selectivity in identifying the students for admission. Individual differences played an important role in the University's lack of success in channeling each student into the desired role. For these students to have achieved the goals established would have required the manipulation of many factors beyond the control of the curriculum. In other words, the program by itself could not secure the desired results, but in each entering class the foundation for a few innovators and directors was laid. Recognizing this condition for what it was, the University hoped that its graduates would at least be innovative applicators rather than just applicators or technicians.

Curriculum and Objectives Draw Attention

One of the major factors which drew special attention to the Michigan State University Oakland's curriculum and objectives was the fact that it was a state supported institution. The program undoubtedly would not have attracted the same attention if the University had been privately organized and funded. But for a publicly supported university to have as stated goals a program with a strong liberal arts flavor and a selective admissions policy equal to or greater than other public colleges or universities in the state made it unique in the eyes of many people. However, it must be acknowledged that attractive objectives, selective admissions, and curriculum uniqueness are not a substitute for a successful on-going program with thousands of loyal supporters. Added

to this, it also must be recognized that a new institution can capitalize on its newness and dynamic qualities only about so much, and stands a good chance of hurting its growth if the students, faculty, curriculum and goals are not reasonably matched. Further, a new institution can be extremely handicapped if the university's personnel are not sensitive and adaptable to needed changes. However, the university need not forfeit its standards in order to adjust to an untenable situation, but the university's personnel must be willing to act on factual information to adapt or change the circumstances to eliminate the unsatisfactory condition.

Flexibility Helps to Solve Problems

Michigan State University Oakland had several incidences in its first four years which, if the faculty and administration had been rigid in their positions, would have made the University's impact on higher education in Michigan much less than it was. Any one of the several problems identified in earlier chapters had they been left unsolved could have caused a redirection of the University's objectives. But, a willingness to change personnel, reorganize the administrative structure, increase budgets, accommodate unsatisfactory situations, adjust the curriculum and build the faculty strengthened the University. In the process, a loyalty and an _esprit de corps_ were forged by the involvement of people in the problems and the ultimate solutions. A democratic approach and a sensitivity to the vested interests of the people involved provided an atmosphere for cooperation and trust in working

through these problems. Using Ordway Tead's "Collective Cooperation"[1] approach, the University was able to make decisions which allowed the institution to adjust the conditions while at the same time bring its staff and student body with it.

Local Autonomy and a Supporting Hand

The decision of the Board of Trustees and President Hannah to support and grant MSUO the freedom to shape its own destiny was a highly placed trust in the University's faculty and administration and it was unprecedented in recent years in Michigan. For example, the control of Sault Sainte Marie campus of the Michigan College of Mining and Technology and the Flint and the Dearborn campuses of the University of Michigan was in the hands of the faculty and administration on the parent campuses. The departmental units on these three campuses were extensions of the departments, schools and colleges at the main campus. This same situation existed at the regional campuses of Pennsylvania State College and the University of Indiana and Purdue University during the 1940's and 1950's, and early 1960's. In none of these cases were the faculties permitted to organize separately. All powers were vested in the specific parent institution's Faculty Senate. Even though the regional campuses had delegates to the Faculty Senate, policies governing student affairs, academic calendar, class scheduling, athletics, new academic programs, standards for degrees, appointments, tenure, et cetera, were established

[1]Ordway Tead, The Art of Administration (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951), p. 166. Collective cooperation is a continuing organized procedure which is centering the attention and the creative genious of those in the appropriate posts of management and those throughout the rank and file, on the progressive improvement of any and all phases of operation looking to the increasing productivity of the entire enterprise.

for system wide implementation. The specific situations of the regional and branch campuses received limited consideration. The academic autonomy of Michigan State University Oakland allowed its staff the freedom to innovate and fit decisions to the needs of the institution. This trust by the Board put the responsibility for the University's success or failure on the individuals whose professional future would be enhanced or damaged by their joint action. This independence was recognized as a strength in its administrative organization by educators in other institutions, by business and industry, and by the public who had occasion to come in contact with the University. MSUO's relationship with Michigan State University allowed it to have the best of two worlds: it could, on the one hand declare its autonomy and act independently within the broad policies of the Board, or on the other hand declare the affiliation and seek refuge under the protecting arms of a major state university. Two significant examples of the latter condition were accreditation and teacher certification. The first example was that MSUO derived immediate accreditation with the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges through its relationship with MSU. An asset which other institutions find noticeably lacking and attempt to achieve at the earliest possible date. Grand Valley State College is a case in point, where without the advantage of a sponsoring institution it had the continuous problem of explaining and in some ways defending its lack of accreditation. Recognition by the State Department of Education and letters from several institutions (Michigan State University, University of Michigan, and Western Michigan University) stating they would accept Grand Valley credit in transfer helped to reduce this deficiency.

The second example was the fact that Michigan State University's

College of Education, after reviewing the MSUO Teacher Education Program, willingly agreed to sponsor all of the University's qualified candidates for teacher certification. This was an asset of unbelievable value to the Charter graduates in obtaining employment especially out-of-state. In contrast to the ease with which MSUO obtained teacher certification for its graduates, Grand Valley on the other hand found the certification of its students more involved. However, Michigan State University came to the rescue by working out arrangements through its College of Education to sponsor Grand Valley teacher education candidates for certification. The students were required to enroll for one quarter with MSU for their internship and be supervised that term by the University's College of Education faculty.

Curricular Changes and Accommodations

Robert Burns often quoted lines from an ode To A Mouse, "The best laid schemes o' mice an' men gang aft a-gley," fit in many ways the development of most of men's ventures. Michigan State University Oakland was no exception. As late as six months before classes were to begin the curriculum plan was to follow a three-course three-quarter arrangement. However, when the faculty arrived in the summer of 1959 and started planning the courses for the first year they adopted an earlier recommendation of the MSU Faculty Curriculum Committee to follow a four-course three-quarter system. This jolt to the curriculum structure had its later repercussions.

The original curriculum stance was to implement a highly prescribed program. It was believed by the planners that an orderly selection of interdisciplinary courses that taught something while students

were learning to learn would provide a foundation to the educational goals of the University. The plan was designed to allow the faculty and the students to do an in-depth study of a specific area with an imposed limit of three areas or courses each quarter. The concept of this approach was readily accepted by the planners. The problem occurred when a fourth course was added by the "charter faculty" which required the same energy and time for the fourth course as each course under the three-course system. The extra load, which was later adjusted, was a primary cause of the heavy attrition during the first three years.

The interdisciplinary nature of the University Courses supported the prescription concept of the curriculum planners and it was viewed by many faculty as the exact broadening experience needed for the kind of student admitted during the first four years. However, as each term passed, the faculty found reasons to adjust the number of prescribed University Course credits in order to accommodate "major requirements" and to allow all students to have at least two electives. The continued interdisciplinary nature of the University Courses, and the heavy course weighting in the humanities, was as a result of the imbalance in faculty hiring. With the larger number of faculty teaching courses in English, history, philosophy, foreign languages, et cetera, the modifications to the University Course structure did not work in favor of adding more social science and science courses. To some extent this affected the attitude of the social science and science faculty toward the University Course prescription but not enough to eliminate it or to create a division within the faculty.

Student Identity or Lack of Identity

While the faculty had its moments of difference the students were seeking their identity within the University. As each new fall class began their studies, more of an emphasis was placed by the individual on the academic purposes for his being at college. A general lack of identity with the University was balanced by an apparent cohesiveness to the group, but not one which permitted the total group to band together for unified action extending beyond short range projects. This attitude of the "Charter Class" prevailed through their graduation and affected other entering groups during the 1960-1963 period. In light of the pronouncement both oral and written about the University in its early days this attitude could have been expected but was not. The goals established and made public did not provide for any rallying points. There was no glue or mortar to bond the students and the University together. The no athletics, no fraternities and sororities, no ROTC, and the no nonsense position were further reinforced by the fact that the University did not have a distinctive name of its own or any residential facilities. With these voids the students looked around for an object with which to identify and all they had was the public relations releases which described the students and the University as different from other college students and institutions. The "we are different" posture grew into almost an obsession which caused the students to react that if "we are different" then we should be different. This attitude buttressed with the fact that the students did not have much to do outside of studying made for a non-organized oriented student life. At no time during the first four years did this particularly bother the faculty but for those responsible for the overall success of

the institution, including extra-curricular life, it was a major concern. If the administrators both teaching and non-teaching were given the chance to begin again, more effort, time, and budget would be directed toward the non-classroom side of student life. If athletics, fraternities and sororities, and ROTC were to be excluded again, special effort would be made to find meaningful substitutes which would provide the student with rallying points.

A Miscalculation Produced Changes

The lack of a student life program also had a direct effect on the student recruitment program. Many capable students having a choice of colleges and universities chose to go elsewhere on the basis that if two institutions had good academic programs but one offered little in the way of extracurricular life and the other had an on-going program the latter was chosen. One of MSUO's major miscalculations was the discovery that students want something more from a college or university than just the academic program. The idea that students would flock to the University if it furnished an outstanding well thought through curriculum supported by a capable and excellently trained faculty proved wrong. In fact, the idea backfired and a totally new approach to recruiting had to be conceived and it was not until the third year that these steps were taken. Given the chance again, MSUO would staff to sell the University, not wait for the student to come knocking on the door. Some have said that maybe the smaller numbers were a blessing in disguise during the first years which allowed the University time to adjust its programs before the numbers inundated the institution. But the truth was that the administration and some faculty were concerned. However, it is possible

that the small numbers had a direct effect on the speed with which adjustments and changes were made. No one joined MSUO to be identified with a shaky or mediocre operation. Therefore, the University turned to its main resource, people with ability, to work out the needed solutions to problems. Through the alert and dynamic leadership of Chancellor Varner and his staff, most difficulties were spotted before they reached crisis proportions and the flexibility of a young institution worked to its own advantage. The trademark of the University from its beginning was that it never let its pride get in its way. In other words, people made the difference between success and failure. Good people given the facts can generally produce good results.

Faculty Hiring

The first people hired at MSUO were hand picked by Chancellor Varner. The first year's faculty and the teaching and non-teaching administrators were chosen because of their ability, their enthusiasm, and their cooperative attitude. This is not to say that all abrasive edges were dulled but to indicate the willingness of people to work together to achieve the most from a situation. As in almost any venture the involvement of the chief administrative officer in all the details of an organization must cease as the organization expands. A university is no exception to this fact. A prime example of this truth was when Chancellor Varner, who had personally recruited the faculty during the first two years, had to relinquish this responsibility to others as the press of work grew and the University grew. This decision to decentralize control had both a positive and negative effect. In the positive sense, the decision to turn this matter over to department

heads and deans acknowledged their importance to the University and subtly gave them a vote of confidence for a job well done. In addition, faculty hiring was used by the department heads and deans to build a feeling of belonging among the faculty members already on the staff. For example, when candidates for a teaching position visited the University it was the rule to involve as many of the present faculty as was feasible, an experience generally not available to a junior faculty member at an older institution. This procedure turned out to be a fringe benefit to the University because in several cases this added to other things helped the candidate to make up his mind to accept MSUO's offer in order to participate in this experience in the coming years. One faculty member said, "One of my most exciting experiences at MSUO was the first time I was asked to interview with others a prospective faculty member in a department other than my own."[1]

In the negative sense, the University lost both the objectivity and prestige of the Chancellor when he withdrew his personal involvement in hiring new faculty. A small, new, unknown university takes a chance in turning over this operation to the staff too early and stands the chance of forfeiting many of the contacts opened to the chief administrative officer.

It was decided early by MSUO that a university builds its reputation on the quality of its faculty. Every effort was made to get the best people within the limit of the money available for new positions. This early decision and action had two advantages. First, the faculty hired while the Chancellor was doing the recruiting set the minimum

[1]Interview with Frederick Obear, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Oakland University, August 28, 1967.

standard for subsequent people. Second, this action helped, at least in the early years, to make up for any loss in quality when the faculty was given the recruiting and hiring responsibility. Whether the chief administrator's position and skill actually made this difference in the candidates interviewed and ultimately hired is a matter of speculation but generally faculty people are usually less persuasive and objective than most university presidents and chancellors in this role.

To look at faculty recruitment from the point of view of the Continuing Education Department, there is often a chasm which is difficult to bridge between the credit and non-credit programs. Most faculty members have little interest and less enthusiasm for adult non-credit classes. In a state institution this is hard to reconcile when public service is a recognized role. However, MSUO took a non-direct approach in orienting its faculty to the total role the University was expected to play in the community. For all practical purposes the University was seen as two separate operations by the local population notwithstanding the Chancellor's public statement acclaiming the virtues of adult education. This basic philosophical difference, found in many institutions between continuing education and the credit programs was further aggravated by the published goals of the University. The early news release announcing MSUO's birth carried nothing about the community service role of continuing education. The interest was in the "egghead" concept, not the "life-long learning" concept.

Community Support Is Important

No institution of higher learning past, present, or future can ignore the value of community support and this support is best achieved

by a recognition that the community exists and that the community is going to admit the institution's product--students--into its corporate whole. The role of good community relations is the responsibility of every individual enrolled or employed on a campus but only a few of each accepts this responsibility. The main burden is left to the chief administrator whose job requires more and more of his time to interpret the institution to the community while in turn selling the community on the privilege they have to support the institution in dollars, land or non-monetary gifts. As obvious and asinine as it sounds, a new university has no alumni. MSUO and other new institutions have handled this problem by turning to the community and enlisting the support of wealthy and influential people. The Michigan State University Oakland Foundation stands as a model for other new colleges and universities. This group has asked for nothing but has given freely of its talent, dollars, goodwill, energy, and time and in the process enlisted hundreds of people to take the place of a non-existing alumni. As "associate alumni" they have meant much to the success of this University through their contributions in whatever form they have taken. This organization is not the result of one person's effort but the combined efforts of many people who believe in the value of higher education in today's society. However, to keep people interested and working, human beings need constant encouragement and this role was handled aptly by Chancellor Varner. As the chief administrator, he not only had to identify projects to be done, but he had to have the creative enthusiasm to spur others to want to do them. This he did with the greatest finesse and imagination.

Community relations at MSUO has meant personal involvement. One

might ask the question how is personal involvement kept from developing into personal meddling without alienating individuals who can be most helpful to the institution? In the case of the Michigan State University Oakland Foundation which could have become a divisive force as easily as a source of help, the group's role was defined early and understood by all members. The Foundation, approved by the Board of Trustees, was formed specifically to lend the influence of the membership to support money raising projects, and to provide a reservoir of decision making talent. For the Foundation to have become involved with management matters, it would have run directly into the Board of Trustees' responsibility. The goodwill that this citizen's group was able to muster would have been lost to the community and the University in that event. The promise to each member was to call them only when their specific talents were needed. This non-commitment to required formal meetings had two advantages. First, it was easier to recruit busy people possessing the talents needed and second, the members recognized their "on-call" status which helped to eliminate any feeling of becoming involved in day-to-day operations. The management and control of volunteers can be regulated by the length and nature of the project on which they work. The chance of meddling at this level is quite remote. Where the major responsibility for initiating and motivating community relations rests with the chief administrator it can likewise be said that the direction and control also rest with him. A community relations program to be valuable must be planned and guided with the greatest care if it is to be a benefit to an institution rather than a millstone.

Two Division Syndrome

Today most college and university curriculum are divided into two major divisions--general education courses and major courses. The many other courses appearing in catalogs except for the teacher education courses are not to be ignored but for the moment and this paper set aside. MSUO for all of its ideas of a highly prescribed curriculum also fell prey to the two division syndrome--the university course division and the major course division. The division was a real one except in Teacher Education where the University Courses were used to fill out teaching minors. Because of the latter situation and the fact that everyone was taking basically the same pattern of courses during the first two years MSUO did not experience the usual student resentment toward general education courses. On most campuses, general education is faced with the disadvantage of an implied rigidity which is difficult to circumvent on account of the required nature of the courses. Because of the general acceptance of the MSUO curriculum concept the University was able to maintain its basic idea to distribute the University Courses throughout the eight semesters as part of its philosophy that the program would produce liberally educated men. This procedure made the point, with students, that general education can be continuous and accumulative in much the same way as major courses.

Even though the University Course structure was accepted the number of courses was often debated as being excessive. It was felt by some faculty that the number of courses severely impaired new approaches to education and experimental course offerings. They argued further that the rigidity of the prescribed course concept made it extremely difficult to recommend to students that they broaden their edu-

cation in line with their interests and talents. Professional program advocates particularly felt that the number of University Courses and the rigidity of the structure severely limited any growth in their areas. Their concern was the curtailment of the collateral courses available to support departmental majors.

The amount of discussion and ferment within the faculty about the University Course structure guaranteed that changes could be expected during the next year or two. There was concern for a better articulation in curricular content and presentation and the opportunity for more curricular experimentation. The object of this ferment was to provide students with more occasions to investigate interests heretofore unstimulated.

The major course division was able to develop freely within the nine course limitation set by Senate policy. Any dissatisfaction with the curriculum, at this level, was a matter of departmental adjustment or change.

As ideal as an individualized curriculum for each student sounds, the practical matters of economics, staff, and student maturity have to be considered in most institutions. Two basic assumptions have guided the planners of curriculum development at least in recent years with the advent of masses of students to educate. The first assumption is that the student is a mature person who has established his values and the second assumption is that the student is still formulating his values. An institution with the former orientation will give the student little direction and let him increase his independence by using it. However, educators for all their liberal posing still show concern for how the student uses this apparent freedom and places certain limitations on

the individual through graduation requirements thereby assuring in a minimal way that the institutions' standards are maintained. In the latter assumption the curriculum is spelled out in detail on the basis that there are certain things a person should experience educationally to help him develop his value system. MSUO as it developed attempted to be both things to its students but in a sequential way. The University Course structure with its prescriptive program assumed that most students at 18-22 years old were still formulating their value system. The attitude and stated position of the faculty was to move each person from a dependency role to an independent status as soon as the student could benefit by the change. This change for most students was gradual and related to their maturing. For the occasional student who on admission was ready immediately for independent study, the faculty willingly tailored a program for him. This attitude was reflected by Dean Hoopes when he said, "Our aim is to render the professor dispensable at the earliest moment. The University is a place of the mind and the mind is an activity, not a repository."[1]

Three Important Actions

Among the many decisions made in the first four years, three actions stood out which significantly affected the direction and thrust of MSUO. The first was the personnel and concurrent organizational changes in the office of the chief academic officer. The second was the reorganization and implementation of the divisional structure in the curriculum. The third was the change from quarter to trimester system.

[1] Chicago Sunday Sun-Times, September 20, 1959, Sec. II, p. 2.

The plan to make the faculty a single body under the leadership of a Dean of the Faculty was easy to manage the first year, but the creeping departmental attitude which appeared in the second year as discussions of majors took place had a diluting effect on the singular stance of the faculty. The awakening of the staff to the fact that students were leaving the University, for whatever reasons, at a rate unsatisfactory to the planned growth of the institution brought about another recognition that some changes were needed. Finally, the acknowledgment that the student life program had not stirred an identity response in the student to the University was cause enough to initiate discussions which led to the reorganization of the administrative structure of the University.

A broader view of the academic role and the ensuing changes provided a unifying of the University toward its total educational goal. The dropping of the title "Dean of the Faculty" for "Dean of the University" and a change in personnel had a subtle and positive effect on the University community. Dean O'Dowd, the new Dean of the University, brought to the new position excellent academic credentials, personal vigor, management ability, creative talent and courage. His social psychology background proved valuable to the University in understanding the combination of social and personal forces at work in the institution.

This reorganization put in priority order those things needed to reverse the student recruitment problem, to vitalize the student life program, and to create in the faculty a recognition of the disparity between the students' ability and the academic program. The latter was not a watering down of the academic standards but an identification of the unrealistic demands placed upon the students in the classroom. The

student life program was particularly enhanced by the appointment of a personable new Dean of Students and the transfer of a popular faculty member from the Music Department to the Dean of Students Office to give direction to the student activities program. Professor Robert Holmes achieved some success in combining the scholarly thrust of the University with a performing arts and lecture series which furnished a strong academic flavor acceptable to both the student body and the faculty. This effort did not help to create in the student more identity with the University but it did create the attitude that more was happening on the campus which was an improvement over previous years. Relief for the student recruitment program was delayed a year before any significant action was taken but the postponement allowed the University time to analyze the data available on the students enrolled, which proved in the long run to be most valuable for launching a new admissions program with an adequate staff.

The second significant action taken by the University between 1959-1963 was recognition and implementation of the divisional structure in the curriculum. What had been unofficial was confirmed. Although this might have appeared to be a capitulation to uniformity and a giving up of the innovational qualities of the institution, it was really the first step toward building the framework for an emerging university, an acknowledgment on the part of the staff that MSUO was destined to become a large institution. In two short years it became evident that the small college concept originally held was going to be difficult to maintain for very long. The public acceptance and support had both an encouraging and a predictive quality of things to come. It was discovered that to keep the singular faculty structure was unrealistic and it would

not succeed except possibly in an utopian setting. For the first two years the University had an assembly-type faculty government where the loudest voiced junior faculty member's vote was equal to the vote of the most senior member of the staff. The initiation of the divisional system and the increased size of the faculty provided the impetus for establishing a representative faculty government. It was achieved in the fall of 1961.

The divisional arrangement reinforced the move to develop subject matter departments two years hence. The faculty was split on this topic with a rather large minority arguing against further decentralization. However, even this group saw that if the University was going to grow as indicated a departmental structure was required, especially if the growth included a graduate school.

This transition to divisions was smooth and proved within the first year that the decision was a good one for the functioning of the University. The separate identification assisted in recruiting senior faculty members and helped the students in their identifying with the University in a meaningful way.

The third significant action was the shift from the quarter system to the trimester system. Some value was received because of the mechanics of operating a semester length term over the shorter quarter system, but the paramount advantage was the reinforcement it provided the MSUO image--the institution with an innovative approach to education. It helped to project further the new look and the dynamic quality of the University. However, the true value of the change was not known by the time the Charter Class graduated but there were signs that the third semester would not hold up more than five or six years. The enrollment

in the third semester proved disappointing in each of the first two years. Students indicated a disenchantment with the idea of accelerating their college years because of the constant pressure of studying. Some students felt this pressure earlier than others, but the majority ran out of energy by the end of the fifth consecutive semester.[1]

Image Served Both as an Advantage and a Disadvantage

Looking briefly at the identified weaknesses of the University the same problems which caused adjustments and changes in personnel, in the curriculum, and in the administrative procedures must also stand as the obvious deficiencies in the operation. First was the miscalculation of how attractive MSUO would be to potential students based on a new curriculum and an able faculty. Second was the lack of resources and attention to the development of an adequate student life program. Third was the youthfulness of the faculty and the seriousness with which they implemented the announced goals of the University. In a capsulized form the University gained much by the projected image that "MSUO was something special" but this same image caused most of the University's problems because the statement was taken at face value and acted upon by people who believed that "MSUO was something special."

[1]In the first year of the trimester system, 1961-1962, the University had the initial indication that students need occasional breaks to recharge their think-cells as well as refresh their physical being. The winter term had no official holidays, such as Thanksgiving, to break the 15 week semester. When this was realized, it was too late for some students and most students showed exhaustion both in energy and spirit. This situation was corrected in subsequent winter and spring semesters.

Legislative Support Key to Future Development

Hopefully, this history of MSUO, now Oakland University, will serve as a valuable document and story for those persons or groups charged with the planning of other new institutions of higher learning or for future historians interested in knowing the personalities and events which launched this dynamic institution. But before putting the last punctuation mark for this study into place, it seems appropriate and desirable that the University's future direction and promise be considered.

Oakland University's growth could take any of three rather distinct forms as outlined by Chancellor Varner at a two-day meeting at St. Clair Inn, St. Clair, Michigan on March 11-12, 1966. The Chancellor described three models, each with its own outcome.

"Model 1

This model is that of slow but steady growth with the concentration on a good undergraduate program, with master's programs offered in some areas. Under this plan, Oakland would grow at the rate of 200 to 300 students each year, attaining a size of about 7,000 by 1975. The concentration would be on undergraduate teaching, including master's level work in those areas where it seemed appropriate. The curriculum offered would be expanded gradually in the two fields already authorized--performing arts and business administration--but likely would not expand beyond these areas. The student body would be essentially as it is today, although it might be necessary to be a bit more selective in order to keep within the growth pattern described.

Model 2

This model would call for rapid growth, with a possible 12,000 to 14,000 students by 1975 and an expanded curriculum with a concentration on undergraduate and master's level work. New programs would need to be offered in such areas as journalism, nursing education, social work, and several new fields in teacher education. The growth rate would be on the order of 1,000 a year. This would involve a vigorous and continuing faculty recruitment program and would necessitate the identification and employment of faculty members committed to undergraduate and master's level work. The

> student body would likely be a little less good than our present students--which means they would be a little less good than the present Michigan State student body. This course of action would create an institution that would be quite similar to some of the regional universities.
>
> Model 3
>
> This model is that of a rapidly growing institution destined to be a large and complex university with a 1975 enrollment of from 12,000 to 14,000. The curriculum would be expanded; degrees would be offered at the bachelor's level, moving rapidly to master's level work in most, if not all, departments; and plans initiated to offer the Ph.D. in certain areas in the five- or ten-year period ahead. Business administration, performing arts, special education, nursing education, public administration, and possibly some professional programs would inevitably develop in the years ahead under this plan. Graduate assistants would be necessary to help manage the teaching responsibilities at the undergraduate level and for furthering the research activities of the senior faculty. The public and community activities of the University would be substantially expanded under this plan, with a great deal of involvement in research and community action related to the urban and suburban problems of Metropolitan Detroit."

Looking at these models in terms of the 1963 faculty and curriculum, the people served, and the projected educational needs of this state, Model 3 held the most appeal and appeared both justifiable and attainable. However, it was recognized if Model 1 was determined as an appropriate course for Oakland University by the Board of Trustees little adjustment to the existing program would be needed to achieve it. Model 2, on the other hand, was considered the least desirable of the alternatives and would have been in direct opposition to the original goals of the University. This model would require the greatest changes in the attitude of the staff and in the academic thrust of the curriculum.

In light of these general statements, one of the paramount factors which will determine the University's direction is the method used in hiring faculty in the years immediately ahead. This decision is a crucial one for any institution new or old. If the recruiting process is

non-directive, the University's image, style, and goals will be decidedly different from a planned approach. The latter method provides for some selectivity whether it be little or great and it permits the University to direct its energies to the model of its choice. However, the natural inclination is to move upward on the "image-scale" of other institutions and faculties.

The direction of Model 3 for Oakland University would continue the dynamism associated with the University. Expanded academic programs, continued growth in public and community activities, increased student enrollments, enlarged physical plant, and added services for the people of the state would be a natural outgrowth of Oakland University's short but impressive past.

Model 3 would add a new dimension to the present Oakland University curriculum by establishing graduate programs. For the University to move in this direction, extensive discussion and planning would be required to know when to initiate the first step. A premature move could only end in disaster which could upset the timetable of growth for many years. Graduate programs cannot be viewed in the same manner as undergraduate programs. Among the major differences are: (1) the amount of resources required to maintain a program, (2) the extensive acquisition of library materials, (3) the employment of well known scholars in the major academic fields being offered, and (4) the recruiting of good graduate students. All these items spell out the need for considerable financial resources. The cost of a reasonably financed graduate program is about three times that of a like undergraduate program. Everything costs more. The state institutions look to the legislature for the primary financial support but recognize that student

tuition provides a part of the resources and hope to supplement these two sources with private and/or federal grants.

Besides the dollar dependency, a graduate program to be outstanding must have in its faculty as many nationally known scholars as the university can afford. These "academic stars" attract the grants mentioned above but just as important they also attract the good graduate students. Both the graduate faculty and students are extremely valuable to a university. The good graduate student helps to hold the faculty, attract other students of similar ability, and supplement the undergraduate teaching needs with above-average assistants.

Oakland University, to pursue Model 3, must first gain some assurances regarding the financial support from the legislature. It's one thing for the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees to approve graduate programs, but it is another to have the support of the legislature. To date the dollar support for Oakland University from the State of Michigan has been something less than spectacular. Each year there has been a struggle to maintain standards and to achieve a modest growth. With this as a background, Oakland University should not expect more generous treatment at the graduate level. If the financial support is not forthcoming, Model 3 may be delayed for a number of years even though the University is superbly located to serve large numbers of the State's students.

Another factor which cannot be ignored beyond the next few years if Model 3 is to be achieved is the pressure from the faculty of the University's professional programs. In order for these programs to survive at all, it is essential that graduate programs be established. Otherwise, engineering, for the lack of funds to acquire faculty and

equipment, will revert to the liberal arts science majors. The same is true in business administration in light of the theoretical approach currently followed. If, on the other hand, Oakland University's business curriculum was more typically designed, then an undergraduate program could exist; but certainly not with much of a future. In fact, it might be better off to revert to an economics major in the liberal arts division.

Oakland University's growth in both students and curricula depends greatly on the legislature's understanding of the University's objectives and their agreement that this is what the State of Michigan needs. Anything less than this will move the University reluctantly to Model 2 and undoubtedly mediocrity, a stance that the Board of Trustees and the bulk of the faculty, administration, and the first 147 alumni would not accept.

How effective the Board of Trustees can be against the legislature is questionable, notwithstanding the Board's constitutional independence, but the fact remains that without proper funding nothing of significance can happen. At this point, someone might ask why does Oakland University look upon Model 2 with such disfavor? The answer is readily found in the goals which founded the University, the progress and achievement of its first four years, and the fact that the State needs more quality in its institution of higher learning rather than more of the status quo which exists in some of the State universities and colleges.

Even Model 3, in some ways, would be a compromise for some of the original staff but one that would be acceptable. This movement toward a complex State university while maintaining quality control

would permit the flexibility of curricular experimentation so important to the faculty and the University. The undergraduate curriculum could group students and courses in any manner to provide exciting approaches to education which would serve the needs of the micro and macro communities within the University and the State.

From the point of view of many citizens, Oakland University has both the natural assets and personnel resources to ensure its future success. What it needs most urgently is the confidence and support of the legislature and the governor to help it achieve what it is capable of being.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

1. Baker, Ray Satannard, and William Dodd II (ed.). Public Papers. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1925.

2. Baskin, Samuel. (ed.). Higher Education: Some Newer Developments. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1965.

3. Bronowski, Jacob, Commager, Henry Steele, Allport, Gordon W., and Buck, Paul H. Imagination and the University. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.

4. Brubacher, John A. Bases for Policy in Higher Education. New York: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

5. Brumbaugh, A. J., and Blee, Myron R. Higher Education and Florida's Future. Vol. 1. Recommendations and General Staff Report. University of Florida Press. Gainesville, 1956.

6. Caplow, Theodore, and McGee, Reese J. The Academic Market Place. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958.

7. Dressel, Paul L. The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.

8. Falvey, Francis E. Student Participation in College Administration. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher College, Columbia University, 1952.

9. Good, Carter V., Barr, A. S., and Scates, Douglas E. The Methodology of Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1941.

10. Hamilton, Thomas H., and Blackman, Edward. (ed.). The Basic College of Michigan State. East Lansing, Michigan: The Michigan State College Press, 1955.

11. Harris, Seymour E. (ed.). Higher Education in the United States the Economic Problems. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960.

12. Henderson, Algo. Policies and Practices in Higher Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

13. Heald, Henry T., Chairman, Committee on Higher Education. Meeting the Increased Demand for Higher Education in New York. State Education Department. Albany, New York, 1960.

14. Holy, T. C., McConnell, T. R., and Semans, H. H. A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education. California State Department of Education. Sacramento, 1955.

15. Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College. New York: Harper and Brothers Publisher, 1957.

16. Kinder, James S. The Internal Administration of the Liberal Arts College. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher College, Columbia University, 1934.

17. Master Plan Survey Team. A Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960 to 1975. California State Department of Education. Sacramento, California, 1960.

18. The Minnesota Commission on Education. Higher Education in Minnesota. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1950.

19. Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Alfred A. Knoph, 1962.

20. Russell, John Dale. Higher Education in Michigan, The Final Report of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan. P. O. Box 240, State Capitol, Lansing, Michigan, 1958.

21. Preliminary Report to the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education. P. O. Box 240, State Capitol, Lansing, Michigan 1957.

22. Sanford, Nevitt. (ed.). The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

23. Steiner, Gilbert Y. and Ponleithner, Romayne R. Public Higher Education in Illinois. Staff Report to the Committee to Recommend a State Plan for Public Higher Education. Springfield, Illinois, 1961.

24. Tead, Ordway. The Art of Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951.

25. Trow, William Clark. Teacher and Technology: New Designs for Learning. Des Moines: Meredith Publishing Co., 1963.

26. Van Doren, Mark. Liberal Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Windstron, Inc., 1943.

27. Watson, John. Administration and Policy-Making in Education. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1959.

Articles and Periodicals

28. Baskin, Samuel. "Quest for Quality," New Dimensions in Higher Education, no. 7. U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., 1960.

29. The Birmingham Eccentric. 1957.

30. Chicago Sunday Sun-Times. 1959-1960.

31. The Detroit News. 1959.

32. Florida Atlantic University. Florida Atlantic University Bulletin. 2: 1. Boca Raton, Florida: April, 1966.

33. Florida Presbyterian College. Florida Presbyterian College Bulletin. St. Petersburg, Florida: 1966.

34. Good, H. G. "Historical Research in Education," Educational Research Bulletin, IX (February 5, 1930), 78-87.

35. Grand Valley State College. Grand Valley State College Catalog. Allendale, Michigan: June, 1967.

36. Gusfield, Joseph and Reisman, David. "Faculty Culture and Academic Careers: Some Sources of Innovation in Higher Education," Sociology of Education, Vol. 37 (Summer, 1964), 288.

37. Hamilton, Thomas H. and Varner, Durward B. "The Meadow Brook Seminars on Higher Learning, A Synthesis and Summary," Introduction by J. D. Ryder, The Journal of Engineering Education, Vol. 49 (March, 1959), 553-58.

38. Harvey Mudd College. Harvey Mudd College Bulletin. XI: Special Issue. Claremont, California: September, 1958.

39. Hellerick, Mahlon H. "The Vital Relationship Between Student Government and Campus Community," College and University, Vol. 35 (Summer, 1960) 270-273.

40. Hetenyi, Laszlo J. "Philosophy of Education in the Undergraduate Curriculum," Education Theory, Vol. 18 (Winter, 1968) 52-59.

41. Hofstra University. Hofstra University General Bulletin. 28: 1. Hempstead, Long Island, New York: March 1966.

42. Hourtoule, Gilbert O. "Student Apathy: A National Epidemic," College and University, Vol. 37 (Fall, 1961) 43-6.

43. Litchfield, Edward Harold. "Trimester: Education of Superior Quality in a Shorter Length of Time," College and University, Vol. 31 (Summer, 1955), 23-7.

44. New College. Bulletin of New College. 3: 3. Sarasota, Florida: September, 1967.

45. New York Herald Tribune. 1957.

46. Michigan State University Oakland. Michigan State University Oakland Bulletin 1960-1961. Rochester, Michigan: June, 1961.

47. Michigan State University Oakland. Michigan State University Oakland Catalog. III: 1. Rochester, Michigan: September, 1962.

48. Oakland Observer. (Rochester, Michigan.) 1959-1963.

49. Oakland University. Oakland University Catalog. VII: 1. Rochester, Michigan: September, 1966.

50. Pontiac Press. 1958.

51. Roskens, Roland W. and Hansmeier, Thomas W. "For Student Personnel Work: Our Desideratum," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XXXII (October 1961), 402-6.

52. Sprague, Hall T. "Academic vs. Non-Academic Activities," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XXXII (October, 1961), 406-8.

53. University of California. University of California, Santa Cruz Undergraduate Program. Santa Cruz, California: 1965.

54. University of South Florida. Bulletin of the University of South Florida. 1: 1. Tampa, Florida: 1959.

55. Wayne State University. Wayne State University Bulletin Monteith College. 43: 7. Detroit, Michigan: May, 1963.

Reports

56. Brick, Michael. The Need for Higher Education Facilities in Mohawk Valley. A Report to the State University of New York. New York, 1956.

57. "Michigan State University Oakland," Michigan State University Oakland Publication (1960).

58. "This Is Michigan State University Oakland," The Michigan State University Magazine, XX (November 1959).

Unpublished Material

59. Alexander, R. J. "Michigan State University-Oakland." Rochester, Michigan: 1958. (Mimeographed.)

60. Cusino, Paul K. "Annual Report of the Community Relations Committee." Rochester, Michigan: June 30, 1959. (Mimeographed.)

61. Eklund, Lowell. "Some Thoughts and Recommendations Regarding the Role of Continuing Education at MSUO." Rochester, Michigan: Michigan State University-Oakland, April 18, 1959. (Mimeographed.)

62. Gossett, Elizabeth H. "Annual Report of the MSUO Continuing Education Committee." Rochester, Michigan: May 22, 1959. (Mimeographed.)

63. Hamilton, Thomas H. and Varner, Durward B. "Meadow Brook Seminars on Higher Learning-Education for Business, Teacher Education and The Liberal Arts-A Synthesis and Summary." Rochester, Michigan: Michigan State University-Oakland, 1958. (Mimeographed.)

64. Juola, Arvo E. "Some Evaluations of the Freshman Population Based on Placement Testing." East Lansing: Evaluation Services Department, Michigan State University 1959. (Mimeographed.)

65. McKay, J. H. "Grades for Mathematics Students in Mathematics Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 as Related to High School Standing." Rochester, Michigan: Michigan State University Oakland, November, 1959. (Mimeographed.)

66. McKay, J. H. "Mid-Term Grades for Western Institutions (Sections 1B, 9A, 10A) as Related to High School Standing." Rochester, Michigan: Michigan State University Oakland, November, 1959. (Mimeographed.)

67. McKay, J. H. "Some Data on Drop-Outs." Rochester, Michigan: Michigan State University Oakland, June 6, 1961. (Mimeographed.)

68. Michigan State University. "Distribution of Grades." East Lansing: Office of the Registrar, January, 1960. (Mimeographed.)

69. Michigan State University. "Minutes of the Board of Trustees." East Lansing, Michigan. (in the files of the University.)

70. Michigan State University. "MSUO Curriculum Committee Report." East Lansing: December, 1957. (Mimeographed.)

71. Michigan State University College of Education. "Post-Secondary Education in Oakland-Macomb Counties." East Lansing: January 1957. (Mimeographed.)

72. Michigan State University College of Education. "Selected Population Characteristics of Oakland and Macomb Counties, Michigan." East Lansing: January 1957. (Mimeographed.)

73. Michigan State University Oakland. "Annual Reports." Rochester, Michigan: 1959-1961. (Mimeographed.)

74. Michigan State University Oakland. "Annual Report of the Dean of the University 1961-1962." Rochester, Michigan: July 24, 1962. (Mimeographed.)

75. Michigan State University-Oakland. "Convocation of Charter Class." Rochester, Michigan: September 17, 1959. (Printed.)

76. Michigan State University-Oakland. "Curriculum." Rochester, Michigan: May 1959. (Mimeographed.)

77. Michigan State University Oakland. "Introductory Comments for the Meadow Brook Seminars on Higher Learning-Engineering Science, Teacher Preparation, Business Administration, Liberal Arts." Rochester, Michigan: August 16, 1958, November 8, 1958, November 22, 1958 and December 13, 1958. (Mimeographed.)

78. Michigan State University Oakland. "Summary of Comments from Honors College Group Concerning Tentative MSUO Curriculum." Rochester, Michigan: Spring, 1959. (Mimeographed.)

79. MSUO Foundation Executive Committee. "Minutes of July 16, 1958." Rochester, Michigan: 1958. (Mimeographed.)

80. News Release from Department of Information Services. Michigan State University. January 3, 1957, 12:30 p.m. (in the files of the Department).

81. Oakland/Macomb County Advisory Committee to the Michigan State University. "Minutes of January 26, 1957." Rochester, Michigan: 1957. (Mimeographed.)

82. Oakland University. "Annual Report." Rochester, Michigan: 1962-1963. (Mimeographed.)

83. Oakland University. "Report on the Teacher Education Program 1962-1963." Rochester, Michigan: June, 1963. (Mimeographed.)

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES
31293106027828