

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
Graduate School

Minutes of Executive Committee  
Thursday, May 20, 1971  
11:30 A.M. Campus Club

Present: Professors E. W. McDiarmid, Frank Ungar by invitation, D. W. Thompson by invitation, William Warner, Joseph Schork, Stephen Prager by invitation, Robert Dykstra, John Howe by invitation, David Berninghausen, Gerald Needham, Alfred Caldwell, Frederick Forro; Deans Luther Pickrel, M. Harry Lease, Millard Gieske; Graduate Student Representatives, Robert Bower, Dick Aura, Sue Coiner, Marguerite Bissonnette; Dean Bryce Crawford, Jr., presiding; Beverly Miller.

Dean Crawford opened the meeting, welcoming the Policy and Review Committee chairmen; he invited them and other members of the Executive Committee to the Directors of Graduate Study quarterly meeting to be held on May 26. He also invited all present to the final meeting for the year of the Executive Committee to be held on June 3.

1. Graduate Student Organization

Dick Aura then reported on the progress of the Council of Graduate Students. He informed the committee that a constitution and by-laws had been approved. He said that their first task was to get students active in selecting student representatives for the Policy and Review Committees. In the fall term they expect to get a discussion going on the Carpenter statement, presented earlier to the Executive Committee; they also hope to have a social gathering of some kind. The Council received 71 responses to their survey; the groups responding are now members of the organization.

2. Graduate School Reorganization

Dean Crawford reported that with the assistance of Gladys Upham of his office the Policy and Review Committees were arranging their initial meetings; he elaborated on potential Unit organization and combinations, as they had been discussed at the meeting he had had with the Policy and Review Committee chairmen. He pointed out that the Duluth Graduate Faculty Committee would be the "Unit" for Duluth programs and would also become involved in some policy matters.

Professor Forro raised a question about the old Biochemistry sub-committee under the new system. He wondered whether that sub-committee would be responsible to the dean or to a Unit Committee. Dean Crawford responded that there would be a Unit Committee which includes Biochemistry, and tentatively Microbiology, and that it is assumed that these fields will act jointly in reviewing

student programs in both fields. The recommendations from the Unit Committee will come forward directly to the Graduate School. It was the basic assumption of the Task Force that the Units would act as committees, jointly reviewing student programs. Only in a few select instances will fields be acting alone on their programs. These are in fields with distinct areas of emphasis which will assure a diversity of viewpoints and thereby the heterogeneity that the Task Force was concerned about.

There was a brief discussion of the volume of work which might reasonably be handled by a Unit, and it was agreed that the present Group Committee chairmen would be the best source of information in this regard.

The responsibilities of the Units and the relationship of the Units with the P & R Committees was clarified. Dean Crawford pointed out that on all individual student items recommendations would go forward directly to the Graduate School, not to the P & R Committees. Responsibility for A3 and B appointments and for the approval of off-campus courses would be borne by the P & R Committees.

There was a discussion of student representation on the P & R's and the appropriateness of the representation if graduate faculty appointments at the A3 and B levels are to be considered. Mr. Aura, Mrs. Coiner and Professor Thompson agreed that since these are the levels which involve approval to advise students, student involvement is probably most appropriate.

Professor Warner asked whether admissions would be referred to the Units and Dean Crawford responded that they would not. Admission, as in the past, will continue to be referred directly to the major fields in which the students are applying.

### 3. Preliminary Cost Analysis and Analysis of "Dropped" Students

Dean Crawford then asked Dean Pickrel to explain the analyses that the Graduate School Research Center has been developing on the costs of graduate programs. Dean Pickrel pointed out that a variety of pressures were on the University to develop such cost estimates to achieve a better internal allocation of resources. He distributed to the committee samples of the kind of data being used to develop cost analyses of academic programs. He said that a major contaminant in the figures is that they include students on the way to the doctorate who may have made substantial progress toward their Ph.D.s before receiving their Master's degrees. This may skew the figures on cost analyses for the Master's. They have been unable as yet to solve this problem. The figures do include, he said, costs for civil service and academic salaries, general equipment and maintenance; they do not include capital costs. There are wide differences in cost per

credit hour from one area to another. There is available a summary of techniques used in developing these figures which GSRC will be happy to provide on request.

Dean Pickrel then distributed selected figures on "dropped" students. These are figures being developed in an attempt to learn more as to the number of students who drop out of the graduate programs and the reasons they do so. He asked that the Executive Committee consider these figures and make suggestions to him. Dean Pickrel said he would like to discuss the matter individually with anyone interested. He would also like to take up the matter again at a later Executive Committee meeting. With respect to the "dropped" figures Professor Howe said he thought that information as to how many quarters in addition to how many credits a student had completed at the time he dropped would be helpful. Dean Crawford said he thought the Policy and Review Committees would be interested in this kind of analysis since it would highlight areas the Committees might wish to concern themselves with in the review process.

Dean Pickrel said the GSRC was also still interested in developing a definition of FTE (full-time equivalent) students.

4. Christiano Committee Report on Master's Programs

Dean Crawford reported that the Christiano Committee on the Master's program in IT fields had reported to him. Copies would be distributed to the Physical Science Group Committee and would also be sent to each of the P & R chairmen. He asked the Physical Science Group Committee to report back to the Executive Committee on June 3.

5. Joint Thesis Proposals

The committee then took up the matter of the proposal for a joint thesis effort. Dean Gieske said that a proposal was in from Speech-Communication but that the larger question arises from time to time. The problem is one of factoring out the individual's abilities from the joint effort. He thought that the Policy and Review Committees should probably take up the matter. The justification usually offered he said was both the scope of the problem being investigated and the fact that this kind of joint effort was probably what the student would become involved in after leaving the University. Dean Crawford said that the immediate response would be that the joint thesis would be acceptable if the individual contribution can be readily determined. The larger issue should be taken up by the P & R Committees.

6. Xeroxing of Applicant Files

Dean Crawford said that due to fiscal limitations the Graduate School was considering discontinuing, at least for the interim, the individual xeroxing of applicant admissions files. He wanted the Executive Committee to be informed and also to hear any objections to the proposal. Professor Howe suggested that it was putting the budgetary problem elsewhere. Mrs. Coiner said that the practice at least assured the student's record would be somewhere if the original were lost.

7. Foreign Student Registration

Dean Crawford said that the Graduate School would alter its procedures on foreign student registration effective with the fall term. In the past, because of the Immigration Department's requirements on student visas, the Graduate School required that foreign students register individually through its offices so that it could monitor, on a quarter by quarter basis, the maintenance of a full-time load by each student. Beginning in fall, 1971, foreign students will be permitted to register under the same procedures that domestic students use, with the understanding that if, at the close of the year when his visa requires renewal, it develops that the foreign student has failed to maintain a full-time load (9 credits per quarter or its equivalent in degree related work) for the academic year, the Graduate School will reserve the right to refuse to sign the I-20 form recommending a renewal of the student (F-type) visa. The Foreign Student Office is being informed and will be asked to publicize this change in procedures; the Graduate School will include this information in quarterly registration information and in the fall quarter issue of G.S. Form 7000.

8. Requirements for Admission to Ph.D. Preliminary Oral

In a further effort to reduce clerical work in areas where it will do the least (or no) harm, Dean Crawford said that it had also been proposed that the paperwork requirements for admission to the preliminary oral be simplified. At the present time the student must have completed his minor coursework and his language requirements, in addition to presenting evidence of the satisfactory completion of the preliminary written. If any of these requirements are lacking the student must take care of them before being authorized to take the preliminary oral. Since it is rarely, or perhaps more accurately, never the case that the preliminary oral is canceled because the student has failed to meet one of these requirements, but rather a case of seeing how fast the Graduate School can get in touch with him and he can take the necessary steps to get a waiver of the requirement, it is proposed that the Graduate School simply notify him, when authorizing the prelim oral, of the things that are lacking.

The use of time in such cases is not in actually doing the checking, which is relatively simple, but in getting in touch with the student by phone, and his getting petitions, etc., filled out and approved in the usually very limited space of time (5 working days) between the scheduling and the taking of the exam. It would eliminate for many students an undue amount of stress over administrative details which occurs at a time when most of them are under considerable stress already. Professor Forro said that he was reluctant to see administrative duties passed on to faculty. Professor Howe said that he thought that most of the missing items were probably not significant enough to justify canceling a prelim oral, and that the decision that the student is ready for the prelim oral, having presumably been made by the adviser in agreeing to examine him, should not be made by a bureaucratic process. Mr. Bower said that he thought that a change would be to the student's advantage; the other student members agreed. Dean Crawford said that if it was decided to approve these procedural alterations he was sure that other safeguards would effectively maintain the quality of the graduate program.

Respectfully submitted,

Beverly D. Miller

To: Members of the Graduate School Executive Committee  
From: Stephen S. Carpenter, Graduate Student  
Subject: Proposal for a Statement of Policy about Admission

The possibility of eliminating grades as negotiable credentials is the most important educational reform contemplated in American universities in recent years. I have come to believe that the admissions procedures of graduate schools provide an obstacle to this reform all out of proportion to their actual need. The academic professions, that is, the graduate schools, have come to determine the forms as well as the contents of undergraduate education to an unprecedented degree. It follows that if any substantial reforms in undergraduate education are to occur, the graduate schools have an obligation to lubricate the process, if only because doing nothing is so obstructive.

With this in mind, I should like to propose that the graduate school make a strong public statement to the effect that it encourages admissions from schools which do not grade, and that it is eager to explore alternative methods of evaluation.

Strictly speaking, of course, it is in a graduate school's vested interest to discourage any tampering with the undergraduate credentials system. The process of admissions is exasperating even when it is made easy. Added to this is the necessity for new students to be approved by both departments and the school as a whole. The school, incompetent to evaluate more specific virtues in applicants, needs a universal quantifier, an academic credit rating, so to speak, to reduce the "quality" of an applicant to a number readable by anyone. The

grade-point average fills this purpose perfectly, and it has been shown that the correlation between undergraduate grade point averages and graduate grade-point averages is high. (But the correlation between graduate grades and performance in the career, as Jencks and Riesman point out, is quite another story.)

The question before us, however, is whether an educational institution can in any conscience justify encouraging a practice which is so damaging to the purposes and to the very idea of education, and which causes human suffering. Although it is not the purpose of this memorandum to provide a detailed argument for the elimination of grading, I ought to sketch, in a general way, some of the reasoning proponents have used to show that this reform is more needed now than earlier. The reasoning accords with my instincts and my experience as a recent undergraduate and more particularly as a teacher of undergraduates.

The grading system has, to put it simply, increased its power to hurt students far more than its power to help them. This fact is both psychological and socio-economic. Students nowadays are much more likely to feel intense anxiety about their grades than in the time of the "gentlemanly C." They blame themselves for what they consider inadequate performance and they tend to accept with resignation and sometimes despair the judgements of the grades. This makes advancement difficult and sabotages communications between students and teachers. Much of the anxiety is justified. While the increase in the absolute number of opportunities opened by a degree is offset somewhat by the decrease in its relative social advantage, the social

disadvantage occasioned by failure in college has increased both relatively and absolutely. (See the essay accompanying this proposal.)

A teacher with a heart naturally finds it hard to give a student a poor grade when he knows that the grade will not likely have any effect whatever except in aspects of his life not remotely related to the subject matter of the course. Such teachers are statistically significant. Their behavior is understandable, but the general lowering of standards does no one any good.

A small but distinguished group of schools have recognized this problem sufficiently to initiate some sort of counter-program. The best have simply eliminated the negative aspect of grading as much as possible by permitting no record to be made of courses not satisfactorily completed, thus compensating for its increased destructive power. Such institutions are satisfied to make the student suffer only financially for his poor work, rather than to give him a mark that pursues him the rest of his days. Other programs are compromised so severely that they are useless or worse. Now and then, after much fanfare, a system appears which is indistinguishable from the old except that the letters have been replaced by pretentious words whose tone, writes Jaques Barzun, reflects the "Advertiser's soapy mind."

In view of the magnitude of the problem, experiments are disappointingly rare and timid. Even those who do not feel that the arguments deserve to be stated so strongly should agree that experimentation on a meaningful scale is warranted. It would be impossible to determine just what the smallness of the effort owes to the competition among colleges for graduate school admissions. Surely the competition is

enormous, and the graduate school admissions offices are correspondingly influential. But however great the influence may be, it constitutes a responsibility for the graduate schools to adapt to the reform not after it happens but before, in order to encourage experiments and to avoid obstructing the changes they recommend.

Finding alternative methods of ascertaining applicants' qualifications will not be easy. Recommendations obviously are not the whole answer, even such time-consuming processes as the course-by-course "evaluations" used at Santa Cruz. The potential of this technique for fatuity is well known to faculties, although it retains its usefulness for pointing up special qualities, or rarely, weaknesses of applicants not readable in their transcripts. Nor have standardized tests proved as culturally neutral as was once hoped. Still other methods of evaluation will have to be explored.

The most promising alternative, to my mind, is the submission of a portfolio, a sample of real work, as has always been the practice in fine arts departments. Within the departments, it is unlikely that the portfolio method would lower standards. In M.F.A. departments, it has the opposite effect - they would not think of admitting an applicant without having seen a sample of his work. If anything, these departments are more cautious about admitting poor students than are academic departments because the work of the art departments' students is more visible. They exhibit their work publicly, and its quality has a noticeable effect on the department's prestige. I do not wish to overdraw the analogy between M.F.A. procedures and academic procedures, but this method of admission strikes me as an effective and even more flexible

procedure than the transcript for some academic departments as well.

This is not the only alternative. Some departments might want specific questions answered in recommendations; some might devise tests or prescribed essay questions. Possible admissions procedures, within a generally flexible admissions policy, are as diverse as the various departments' needs.

Any new method will probably give the departments an even greater share of the responsibility for admitting new students than they now have, because of the absence of quantification. It is always a poor thing to weaken a unifying device in the rapidly-dissolving university. Even though the number of students rejected by the schools and accepted by the departments who could do any real damage is probably small, and some may be late-bloomers of promise, the graduate school admissions office has a symbolic and perhaps deterrent value. I am confident, however, that some equally satisfactory way of maintaining standards over the school can be found.

And, of course, any new method will also mean more work. The burden of judging human beings is a grave responsibility, and anyone who faces it understandably wishes, if he has the power, to shift it to someone else. But for colleges to send their graduates into the world with ready-made and ineradicable judgments attached amounts both to a breach of confidence in the professional relationship between teachers and students and, undeniably, to a breach of human freedom. The burden of judgment properly belongs to the institutions that make use of the judged. Graduate schools must realize this principle, and, among such institutions, they ought to be the leaders,

rather than the reluctant followers.

\* \* \*

The statement of policy might read as follows; I am sure that you can improve it:

The Graduate School at the University of Minnesota recognizes that the admissions procedures of graduate schools have a dilatory effect on educational experimentation on the undergraduate level. In order not to discourage such experimentation, it wishes to encourage, in any way possible, applications from undergraduate schools whose educational procedures do not result in a normal transcript. It wishes particularly to explore and negotiate whatever alternative means of evaluation might replace grading and class-standing in the admission process.

The proposal seems small, but it may well provide the only available opportunity for the graduate school to subvert its own detrimental influences. For this reason, it should be carried out as completely as possible, through all possible avenues of publicity. These might include avenues by which the school notifies other schools of its intentions, publications commonly read by college administrators, and of course, the Bulletin. It is particularly important that the Bulletin include the statement as soon as it is accepted - by way of an insert until a new edition is prepared.

Finally, if I can persuade you to believe it, as I do, then it would help the statement along immeasurably to include the following addendum: "We expect that students who have attended colleges organized according to a more constructive principle than the grading-system as we know it, will be better prepared, both intellectually and psychologically, for the advanced work expected of a graduate student at the University of Minnesota."

**STATEMENT TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
FROM A GRADUATE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE**

**Stephen S. Carpenter  
December 5, 1970**

During my membership in the Executive committee it came to seem more and more important that I present to that committee a brief, generalized statement of the points of view that I am expected to represent. It seemed so partly because there were not very many opportunities to give that point of view in meetings - there are few issues where the student point of view opposes the dominant stand of the Committee in a clear-cut way - and partly because my own slowness of wit allowed too many of these rare opportunities to slip by without the advocacy they deserve.

At any rate, speaking out on such issues is only one aspect of the role of student representative. The other, perhaps more important aspect, is to provide the decision-makers with observations that may be difficult to obtain from their perspective. Partly, as a layman, he can observe the administrative processes from a greater distance; partly he can see the results of administrative decisions and lack of decision as they play themselves out on the student level - as personal tragedies and as individual examples of the waste of talent. In this aspect of my job I cannot in all conscience limit my observations to those representing the interest of my own group of graduate students. Consequently, I pay more

---

It should be understood that although the essay, of necessity, is written from the perspective of Art History, broadened by a little study, my complaints do not arise from dissatisfaction with that department's behavior. Quite the contrary. It was the earnest and often futile efforts on the part of professors and T.A.'s there to give students an even break, frequently at considerable cost to themselves, which caused me to see the urgency of the problem.

attention here to the crisis of undergraduate education, where, I believe, the most urgent problems lie.

It is important to show that in universities and university-oriented colleges, which are the rule now rather than the exception, there is considerable unnecessary suffering and miseducation. The conservative point of view might be that it is the student's fault - they are lazy, arrogant and lack moral fibre etc. The radical point of view might state that it is the fault of a few hopelessly wicked men who hold the strings of power. The point of view sketched here, which should be called the student's point of view, holds that the injustices are not so much the result of slovenliness, wickedness or design as they are the result of inertia in the face of changing social conditions. It will take design to overcome them.

Although the presence of student representatives on committees reflects, among other things, official alarm about students' activities of protest toward institutions external to the university, and only incidentally to the university itself as an arm of the "system," it can never be the representative's duty to address this problem directly. Problems which arise from students acting in their capacity as citizens are not, strictly speaking, a part of the educational crises as such, which has to do with students being mistreated or miseducated. These problems are related to it only insofar as the university's mistreatment of students causes them to disregard its institutional interests in their protests, as when, for example, the protests precipitate a public-relations crisis that damages the university financially. Active protest, by and large, occurs on campuses where the students are least oppressed

and best cared for, and where education is at its best. As long as protest is the result of enlightenment rather than ignorance, the universities have little competence to stop it, even when it occurs within their walls.

\* \* \*

The students' primary relationship to the university has not been a great source of active protest and the solving of its problems would probably not reduce the protest of students toward externals. It has been shown that the previous quietism of students in American universities is an exception for the history of universities at large. Quite apart from protest, higher education is in crisis. This is true whether one judges it in terms of the public antiinstitutional expressions of some students, of the number of students (human beings) who suffer the experience of being crushed by an institution, or of the distance that has grown up in many of its aspects between the actuality of the university and its ideals. Furthermore the crisis is growing larger. It is not temporary.

In the course of their development, institutions sometimes gather power through no fault of their own, but through changes in the social relationship between the institutions and their parent culture. Corporations gain power over consumers, armies gain power in the governments they serve, and universities gain power over their students and the institutions they supply with trained help. This phenomenon is so widespread that it may be the dominant social characteristic of our time.

With respect to their students, the power of universities has grown and is growing particularly rapidly. The growth has accompanied developments

in the universities' wealth, in the respect and support accorded them by the population at large, in the value of their degrees as negotiable credentials, in the "professionalism" of their learned faculties, and in these persons' socio-economic status. University people at all levels rightly applaud such developments. But students, who are presumably the objects of all this new prosperity, are likely to feel for much of their residence both intimidated and neglected: intimidated, because the new social pressures to attend college carry with them corresponding threats; and neglected, because in spite of the pressures upon them, students find it hard to make fruitful contacts with professors, who always seem too busy.

Intimidation must be seen, therefore, not as a constant necessary evil in the processes of education, but as a condition which, in the absence of a rational program to control it, increases in proportion to the prosperity of the university. To put it simply, the changing social relationship between the university and the society at large has caused more and more of the opportunity, which children in this country are taught to expect, to be channelled through a single system of organizations, and the increasingly homogeneous character of these organizations has made the requirements for success both more competitory and more limited.

The result is that the university has increased its power to hurt its students vastly more than it has increased its power to help them. Fifty years ago the university had basically the same contents - history, the classics, science - it has now. It could help students toward better careers than their parents had and it could broaden their cultural horizons. But it could not do very great damage to a student's future by showing its disapproval. Abundant opportunities for social advancement in every possible

field awaited him outside its walls - if he did not succeed within them - and human virtues other than academic virtues were rewarded in ample proportion. This is no longer true, and more importantly, it seems to most students even less true. But the means used by the university to show its disapproval - grades, expulsion, bad letters - and the rights of students with respect to these institutional devices have remained almost unchanged.

It is true that opportunities within the university itself have increased. It provides jobs for scholars and pays them well. It also makes it easier for those who want an education to get it and this has a salutary effect on the community. In addition there is some evidence that the intellectual quality of instruction has, by some measures, improved. But this does not change the fundamental psychological and social fact - the confrontation of power and powerlessness.

Neglect of students, which degrades higher education in spite of improvements in intellectual quality, has one primary source: the system of rewards and punishments which the university and the professions bring to bear upon teachers does not reward good teaching. It is useless to pretend that it does. It systematically encourages teachers to spend time on other things, mostly research, that might be spent in one capacity or another with students. Arguments to the contrary make use of a paradox: that research improves one's teaching, sometimes for reasons which are quite mysterious, in spite of the fact that it robs time from teaching. This is true in some cases, particularly where the research is important or iconoclastic. But an appalling proportion of university research is both time-consuming and trivial, and has little to do with teaching, even

trivial teaching. To justify the university's system of rewards for faculty on the basis of this paradox, applicable as it is to a limited number of cases, is as intellectually dishonest as to construct Parmenide's whole system on a paradox of Zeno. At best the glorification of research is a matter of faith.

Of course it is true that an article of faith which has become one of the pillar's of a bureaucracy's program of self-justification is going to seem like a self-evident truth to those who were born and raised in the system. This is nothing unusual in our era. John Kenneth Galbraith uses the phrase "bureaucratic truth" to refer to a belief held almost universally within an institution (e.g. beliefs held by occupants of the Pentagon about the value of military force in foreign policy), even when they are almost obviously false without. The institution passes the belief on to its new members along with other necessary information, in its apprenticeship programs. A common piece of fatherly advice given to an entering T.A. is to spend as little time as possible at his job. I cannot emphasize too strongly the disastrous consequences, from the student's point of view, such thinking has upon undergraduate education, particularly in large public universities like our own. Faced with ill-constructed lectures, inaccessible professors, and callous T.A.'s, he is likely to feel that the T.A.'s advice is the fundamental operating principle of the institution.

In the scholarly professions, the belief in the primacy of research over teaching probably arose from the almost martial single-mindedness with which, until the "post-Sputnik boom," they pursued professional respectability and even the simple right to ply their trade in a country

where anti-intellectualism lurks. The battles of the A.A.U.P. were well and bravely fought, but now only the most anfractious Veblenian would insist that they have not been largely won. Although the realization may be painful to those who felt that the triumph of academic research would bring Utopia, the problems created by the victories of research are now far greater than those which remain from its defeats.

These two factors, intimidation (powerlessness) and neglect, are not unrelated. It is reasonable to expect that in an institution whose growth has, in effect, been unplanned, the least powerful group within the institution will be the group whose needs are least answered. Again, this is nothing unusual in our time. The problem at hand is to recognize the presence in the university of power and powerlessness, of callousness and suffering, of responsibility and frustration, and to act accordingly. Fixing the blame is not only useless but counter-productive because it must inevitably provide an excuse for doing nothing. With a few outstanding exceptions, no powerful group in the history of mankind has been able to avoid the temptation, within its own field of power, to blame the sufferings of the powerless on the powerless themselves.

Instead, these conditions must form the basis of a systemic rethinking and reconstitution of the university as a whole. The most fundamental assumption to be examined critically is the idea of a "contract" to which the student voluntarily submits himself in exchange for the goods of education. This assumption consciously or unconsciously underlies all coercive conditions in the university. The "contract" resembles Hobbes's "covenant" more than Locke's "Contract" because it is used to justify almost unlimited power, within the university, on the part of an unelected

authority which exists prior to the subordinate's entrance into the contract, rather than to provide a constructive model for an organization which, systemically, is continually responsive to its constituents.

The contract as a statement of authority has been justified in the expectation that students will be mobile: that they have sufficient freedom to move out of the institution when it grows too uncomfortable. As we have seen, precisely this freedom shrinks to less and less with the institutions' increasing prosperity. Consequently the contract is less an agreement freely entered into than a complex relationship where choice is limited by so many contingencies that it can only be called political.

Political theories that warrant serious consideration have always assumed that, although it is possible to move away from a political unit one finds oppressive, the political organization should never provide escape as the only alternative to endurance. They rightly understand that mobility may be most difficult for just those persons who have the most reason to leave. This is increasingly the case in universities. Escape either means dropping out into the world of the laboring man, who "has lost relative class status with the growth of higher education;" or it means to transfer, which is likely to be hardest for those who, for honorable reasons or ill, have had an unhappy college experience. These conditions are concrete realities with which only a wholly mythological view of the university can dispense - the only reasonable way to reconsider its organization is as a unit of political reality.

\* \* \*

The solution to the dilemmas of power is abdication. This is, historically, a venture into largely unexplored territory. I do not think, however, that the venture is hopeless. Admonitions that some and perhaps most of the experiments will fail must begin with the realization that the university's experiment with power has failed utterly - not in aggrandizing the university, but in enlarging the university's ideals. The university must renounce any powers for which it cannot, with conscience, accept full responsibility in all their consequences. This obviously means not total surrender, but rather the deliberate subversion, by the institution, of its own unwanted powers and influences, accompanied by a deeper and more accurately informed responsibility with respect to the powers that remain.

I believe, however, that if any powerful group has ever had sufficient love of truth and sense of justice to overcome its own narrowest interests it is the higher bodies of the university.

Abdication is by no means the easy way out. Any effort to shuffle the relations of power within a cumbersome and ill-defined institution is going to be difficult. It requires thought, study and attention to detail. It will only be achieved through programs of its own. Basically it will have to involve action in three directions: democratization and actual accountability, the rearrangement of the system of rewards for faculty to accord more harmoniously with publicly stated ideals, and the elimination or modification of structural devices which have grown to have an intimidating effect.

Democratization is perhaps the most widely advocated of these reforms,

and it confronts most directly the basic issue of power, but it has come to mean everything from total anarchy to the timid admission of a few handpicked students to committee meetings, and the establishment of narrow, tortuous routes for petition. The best way seems to be to establish some form of coalition, where each group has a strong voice in university affairs, but where the minority groups are not in danger of being wholly smothered by the majority (students). Of course, a major purpose of such a reform would be to hold accountable for his behavior any official who committed a wicked act or any committee which passed a wicked proposal. But I do not think that such acts are a very important cause of the university's problems - they come from dilatory behavior in the face of social change, not from conspiracy and dastardliness. No program of democratic reform is likely to succeed unless it can provide clearly marked ways for students to present major proposals to the university, from their point of view, concerning any of its activities - building programs, investments, campus police, new departments, fees, outside research, salaries, promotion procedures, credit modules, schedules, or grading practices. The student body, whose time is already spoken for, is unlikely to muster the effort needed to make itself into an informed electorate if all their representatives can do is to run dances or to haggle about minor fees with officials who have no direct power to set fees.

And naturally a new system would have to provide that officials who treat proposals too lightly could get hurt. This should come as no surprise, because part of abdicating is making oneself vulnerable - students and non-tenured faculty have been getting hurt for a long time. Elitism is a much-misused word in the context of education. But in one meaning

that is genuine and concrete it refers to the frequent cases where, for the sake of sparing a few hurt feelings at the administrative or tenured-faculty level, untold real suffering is tolerated at the student level. This mode of thought is simply one more habit inherited from the time when a university administration was as idiosyncratic and as harmless as a gentlemen's club.

Restructuring the system of rewards and punishments requires an activity entirely within the university's realm of competence, the dispelling of ignorance. While the amount, if not the quality, of research a man does is a public matter, departments and administrations rarely pursue knowledge more single-mindedly than they pursue ignorance regarding the quality of their members' teaching. Ways must be found to introduce knowledge about teaching into the making of personnel decisions. Unfortunately, where information has been gathered, it is usually through methods almost as primitive as the grading system itself. The methodological problem is delicate, but not impossible. Students are interested that excellent teaching be encouraged, that excellent teachers be hired, and that no excellent teachers be dismissed for lesser reasons. They do not wish to purge the occasional professor whose research is good, but who is congenitally unable to teach well. Students can easily absorb such experiences.

Again, it is not personalities, but conditions, which want correcting. The system of rewards is one of a whole set of conditions that demean teaching, including the priorities according to which funds devoted to "instructional costs" are spent, the imperialism of presidents and chairmen who tend to adapt teachers to needs of curricula rather than the reverse, and the resulting format, the huge lecture, which for reasons of economy

is imposed willy-nilly on undergraduate courses.

Such an atmosphere produces a sullen attitude, approaching cynicism, toward teaching undergraduates that sees it as an unpleasant and unrewarded chore. An increasing tolerance among one's colleagues for half-heartedness in teaching, mediocre teaching when excellent teaching would be possible with more effort, erodes standards generally. Perhaps the most telling symptom is the unabashed discussion and demands concerning one's "teaching load." What is shameful about this phrase is not its existence so much as the lack of self-consciousness with which it is used. A restructured system of rewards will have to consider not only material allocations, but also restoring to their full efficacy the inherent rewards of teaching, including "that balance between teaching and research which is perhaps the finest thing in academic life."

Certain structural devices in the university that are historically justified in themselves have grown more and more to intimidate rather than to coordinate students and faculty as well. These include most of the working parts of the course-credit-grading machine, particularly the means by which the university shows its disapproval. The mechanism makes assumptions about the characteristics of knowledge to which rather little knowledge, even knowledge as defined by the academic professions, conforms. But this is only a part of an all-pervasive atmosphere of intimidation, which includes a vast multitude of barely relevant procedural details, whose neglect entails punishments that from any reasonable point of view are outlandish. Students cannot count on the help of faculty advisors, who usually understand such procedures only imperfectly since they are never held materially responsible for the consequences of their advice.

The history of attempts to alter this basic structure is not encouraging. No alternative, though many have been tried and have proven themselves on a small scale, has ever really taken root. The reason seems to lie in a principle of inertia which the university shares with other establishments that are in some degree meritocratic: people whom the institution has rewarded with power seem reluctant to change a system that has been good to them, even when it is not good to most. Men admire most in others the virtues which reflect their own. Civilization, however, helps us to overcome such basic human foibles. As the need for change grows more urgent, the universities hopefully will abandon their monolithic system in favor of one that rewards a broader range of human qualities, by removing the obstacles to direct contact that strangle teaching relationships. Universities can learn to live without grading, with vastly more simplified registration procedures and requirements, with a flexible rather than a schematic conception of knowledge. The responsibility to all who have a conscience in the matter is to battle the forces of inertia. The chief villains and the chief hopes in this struggle are the graduate schools.

\* \* \*

What applies to undergraduate education applies, Mutatis Mutandis, to graduate education as well. The conditions for intimidation reviewed above remain, with respect to graduate students, in a more primitive state. The field of power within which the graduate students are subordinated resembles that of the undergraduates; that is, the powerful cherish the principle of self-education, holding the student responsible for all of his troubles whether or not faculty has failed in its responsibility toward him. And, sometimes tragically, the students themselves seem to agree.

The pressures to succeed, however, tend to be personal rather than socially-induced. Individually, graduate students in many departments are almost as neglected as undergraduates. But collectively they are not. In matters of institutional policy, funding and privileges, American universities treat their graduate students as well as any in history. However, the principle of intimidation remains true with respect to requirements, which are set by pork-barreling, and with respect to problem solving, where the school generally assumes that the best way to solve an educational problem is to place an appropriate pressure, requirement, fine or restriction upon the students - never a reward and never upon anyone else.

The graduate schools' main involvement in the educational crisis, however, is not in their treatment of their own students but in the extent to which they determine the character of undergraduate education. The power of the graduate schools is the most difficult kind of power to abdicate, since it is one of influence rather than of command.

The graduate schools must try, as conscientiously and effectively as possible, to subvert the influence wherever it can. Insofar as its influence is exercised through its admissions office, it can reduce it by making its admissions policy more flexible, so as not to impede experiments in undergraduate teaching.

Where the graduate school exerts influence by virtue of its role as the training-ground of college teachers, it must adopt a more realistic attitude toward this role. By this I do not mean to suggest that it should assume a competency it does not have. Even if the departments had enough members who were both good teachers and could explain why, they would have no way of knowing which members they were. But if the departments are not

competent to offer training programs they might still provide models for good teaching, if the school encouraged or coerced its faculty members to take a personal responsibility for the fate of their students. They cannot in good conscience offer a teaching degree, but they might still offer a Ph.D. "without emphasis" or a candidate's certificate.

Beyond this, the graduate schools must take account of the extent to which the species of knowledge taught to undergraduates are being squeezed out of the departments' conception of what is worth knowing or researching. The graduate schools face a dangerous confrontation with their own personalities. They are enormously powerful, and enormously proud, not entirely without justification. At present, or since the entrenchment of professional values has acquired institutional stability, there are two conflicting sets of possibilities the graduate schools face. One is a continuation of present trends toward narrowness in the graduate schools conception of knowledge and scholarly behavior, toward self-aggrandizement for its own sake, and toward an even greater irresponsibility, with respect to its social role - that is, toward the greater widening of the gap between the institution's power to achieve social goals and its actual achievement. The forces of inertia now overwhelmingly favor this course.

At the same time they are committed, by virtue of their humanistic origins, to a fundamentally liberal idea of their role in society, an attitude that frequently finds its way into presidential speeches, and to a belief in the unity of knowledge. The student point of view favors these values. It encourages efforts to reunify or even to reshuffle the fragments of knowledge, and to bring them to bear upon human problems, among which is the crisis of education.

This viewpoint is not, for the most part, nostalgic. With the possible exception of the twelfth century (the University of Bologna was run, quite successfully, entirely by the guilds of students) it does not find any period in the past where conditions were overwhelmingly better. It recognizes that the faults of the contemporary university are in large part the faults of its virtues. At the same time, however, it does not believe that those faults necessarily attend those virtues. With intelligent and properly implemented programs, the university can have prosperity without crushing most of its students, can educate large numbers of people without monopolizing the doors of opportunity, and can achieve an atmosphere which is conducive to both the growth and the dissemination of knowledge.

This, naturally, means that in the areas where it does not abdicate powers but accepts a fuller responsibility for those it retains, the administration must act decisively, sometimes overriding the wishes of the faculty. That is not to suggest that the best ideals of "coordinated management" should be abandoned, but rather that the students should be introduced as one of the groups whose needs are to be coordinated. Conservatives among the faculty insist that they do their best work if they are left alone. This is true mostly where the outside pressures which threaten them have nothing to do with the quality of a faculty's work. Students, as educational liberals, would like to see pressures applied to faculty to do good work in their most important capacity as teachers, at the same time as they would like to see some of the pressures lifted from themselves.

That does not mean that students are not almost as much haunted by

the idea of an ungoverned community of scholars as anyone else, but they recognize that what we have instead is an ungoverned marketplace of scholars, which is quite a different thing. In our time, at least, events have proven that ungoverned scholars do not form themselves naturally into a community. The "community of scholars" is a noble and not entirely mythological conception, which has not lost its power to stir our imaginations in spite of the abuse it has received at the hands of administration orators. But if it is ever to achieve reality, it is going to be the result of careful planning, not the coordination of narrow interests but their suspension, in favor of a high pursuit.