

Lindenwood University

**Digital Commons@Lindenwood University**

---

University Documents

Lindenwood Historic Documents

---

12-11-1968

## **Summary Report and Recommendations of the Faculty-Student Committees on Men at Lindenwood**

Lindenwood College

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/university\\_docs](https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/university_docs)

---

SUMMARY REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FACULTY-STUDENT COMMITTEES ON  
MEN AT LINDENWOOD

The faculty and student committees making this report were assigned the task of studying the present circumstances of Lindenwood in the light of the changes taking place among private liberal arts colleges in general and among men's and women's colleges in particular. Our primary concern, of course, was a secure and dynamic future for Lindenwood, and although there was a feeling among committee members that some form of coeducation was the expected outcome, it was obvious that we must proceed objectively and allow the realities to lead us to our conclusions. If our investigation should lead us to the conviction that Lindenwood should remain a woman's college and that any form of coeducation would threaten the integrity and future well-being of the college, then our report would have to make this clear.

It is, indeed, unthinkable that there should be any other conclusion to our investigations and discussions than a set of recommendations which will preserve the advantages of the Lindenwood education, protect the college from the threat of obsolescence which private liberal arts colleges in general are facing, and prepare the way for growth toward the kind of relevance in higher education which could make Lindenwood one of the outstanding colleges of our nation. In this light, it is apparent that even a decision to remain a woman's college would not be enough. No college can simply remain what it has been for the past 20, 50, or 100 years. The changes in our academic, social, and political environment have already occurred. Some kind of program for development was clearly essential for our work to have any meaning.

How we proceeded and what kind of information we used will best indicate the degree of objectivity and of justness in our conclusions. We were--as is true of the whole Lindenwood community--divided in our personal opinions and no agreement could ever have been reached by simply taking a vote on what individuals wanted.

As a committee, we had to assume the role of trustees of the future, not the past or present, character of Lindenwood. Somehow information, reason, and the creative imagination had to be given the chance to point the way.

This is the procedure we followed. Each committee had its own area of emphasis. The faculty concentrated on academic and financial matters. The women concentrated on student life. The men stressed the relation of the dormitories and physical plant to the life of the college. All of the committees together, however, placed their particular emphases in the larger context of (1) what was going on in the nation, (2) what colleges similar to Lindenwood were experiencing, (3) what Lindenwood's circumstances were, and (4) what possibilities for the imaginative use of our resources existed now or could be brought into existence.

Among the facts about what is going on in the nation are such matters as the following:

(1) There has been great expansion in publicly supported colleges and universities. Three hundred new branches of universities, for example, have been established since 1945. Two hundred thirty two-year colleges have been built since 1960. In Greater St. Louis, the state university at Normandy has started from zero and grown to an enrollment of 8000 in three years. Community junior colleges are serving ten thousand students or so where two years ago they did not even exist. The state pays the costs for these developments and makes them available to state residents at moderate tuition rates.

(2) There is a trend toward providing state scholarships for students who attend private colleges in their own states. Illinois, New Jersey, and New York, for example, once supplied large percentages of Lindenwood enrollment but financial pressure in the form of state aid keeps many

potential Lindenwood students at home now that state scholarships are available. Missouri, on the other hand, provides no support for her residents who want to attend private colleges in their state.

(3) There is a lull in the college-age population which will last until 1972. In a period of increased opportunity for a good education at state supported universities, applications for admission at private colleges are declining.

(4) Because of generous state support, public universities are growing in quality as well as quantity. At the same time, the private liberal arts colleges, which have traditionally set the standards for excellence, face difficulties in getting top students for enrollment levels sufficient to support their academic quality. Every private college in the country must find new ways to be distinctive in order to provide for those students who need and want the intellectual and cultural life of a smaller, private, and therefore more idiosyncratic institution.

(5) Such facts have led to statements like this one by Dr. Miles, President of Alfred University. He takes his first three points from a report made by McGeorge Bundy's panel on higher education. These plus two of his own points make up his recommended formula for the survival of the small, private college:

- (a) Development of an efficient and economic administration
- (b) Development of strong private support
- (c) Development of state or federal aid for private  
institutions
- (d) Private college relevance to student interests and  
to world problems
- (e) A distinctive character

Dr. Miles' summarizing observation is that: unless the private college program is significantly different from that of the public institution, it doesn't deserve to survive.

\* \* \*

Among colleges similar to Lindenwood--that is, men's and women's colleges--we considered this kind of information:

(1) In their announcements this fall that they are becoming coeducational institutions, Vassar, Bennington, Wesleyan, Williams, Connecticut College, Princeton, and Yale have all acknowledged the growing difficulty of getting highly qualified students to maintain economical levels of enrollment for academic excellence. To quote from the Vassar faculty committee's report: "To teach men along with women here would be the sort of thoroughgoing, major educational venture that would not merely be intended to solve a few of Vassar's current problems and improve its 'image' but would help keep Vassar in the forefront of quality education where it wants to be." Princeton reports the difficulty of getting the best qualified professors for sexually segregated teaching and sees coeducation to be necessary for it to maintain its prominence in American education. In establishing a coordinate college for women at Hamilton College, the spokesmen, in the official announcement, claimed that their "mission includes the blazing of new trails and not just the widening of old ones."

In nearly every case, sexually segregated colleges moving toward coeducation have uppermost in their thinking--not the immediate threat of declining enrollment--but the absolute necessity to continue to be the kind of college which Dr. Miles would say deserves to survive.

(2) The prevalence of this thinking is further in evidence in a report made by the U. S. Office of Education that over 60 (26 men's and 36 women's) traditionally separated colleges have gone coeducational in 1968. Again, the prevailing reason is not economic but a conclusion reached in the light of current attitudes that (to quote the journal, Higher Education and National Affairs): "separate higher education for the sexes has outlived its historical justification, while coeducation is a more realistic reflection of society, provides a more stimulating, intellectual and social environment, and enables the institution to be more competitive in attracting the best students of both sexes."

\* \* \*

The information concerning Lindenwood's circumstances, placed in the context of our understanding of the national situation, renewed our confidence in the college's future, yet raised a question as to which alternative to choose to assure the best prospects for that future. The following facts will make this apparent:

(1) Lindenwood's endowment of nearly nine million dollars gives us, as an institution of our size, a secure base for growth comparable to the best of the eastern colleges which we have been studying.

(2) Lindenwood is in a growing urban community. Projections are that St. Charles will have over 200,000 population by 1990. Diversity in cultural and educational opportunity is at our doorstep.

(3) Our new curriculum, programs like the Communication Arts, the Mathematics Center, and plans for expansion in the Fine Arts, in Urban Affairs Study, etc. are already moves in the direction of the college that not only will, but deserves to survive. When we read Vassar's report on the new program now under consideration, we find a four-one-four calendar,

expanded on and off-campus independent study, January term programs, and Wednesdays free. They even propose a 34-course requirement for graduation in place of the old credit system. It is clear that Lindenwood--while it has not announced itself ready for coeducation--has already established a program which belongs to the future.

(4) In other ways, moreover, we find our situation similar to these colleges. The recently increased competition for well-qualified students has caused a decline in our applications for admission. We now have 577 students with a faculty and physical plant which could serve 800. We need this size faculty and plant not just for 800 students but, more importantly, for a creative academic program. We can't have strong sociology, mathematics, communication arts, natural science programs without a sufficient number of instructors. More students, in other words, are needed not simply to pay the fixed costs of maintaining buildings which are not fully utilized but to sustain the college academically. We need to grow beyond the 800 to become the college which will thrive in the world of the 1970's and 1980's.

(5) Our problem is aggravated by a low retention rate. Although it is improving, it still handicaps our development. In the past five years, the graduating classes at Lindenwood have represented 23-41% of the students entering as freshmen. The class of 1969, for example, entered as a class of 327 students and will graduate 122 of these, or 37%.

(6) At the same time, our entering classes of freshmen are smaller. The freshman class this year has 160 members instead of the 325 member class of two years ago. To keep the same total of 577 students, we need

a freshman class of 225 next year and many more if we are to grow toward a minimum economical and academically viable size of 800.

(7) One effect of our enrollment problem is that it makes our deficit too large for us to give full support to our new program and prohibits us from enrichment and further growth. Just to fill Ayres and Niccolls would provide dormitory income to offset fixed costs of maintenance and free funds for academic use even without counting the tuition income.

(8) A second effect of the enrollment and retention pattern is that our upper division is so much smaller than the lower division. In the fall term of 1968, for example, there are 69 classes out of 170 with fewer than 10 students, or 40%. Twenty-one (or 12.35%) have fewer than 5 students. While small classes are often desirable in certain subjects, having so many makes instruction excessively costly. It means, furthermore, that there are not enough majors in certain subjects to enable the college to keep and to attract the highly qualified instructors needed.

(9) Where do our students go after the first year or two at Lindenwood? Out of 2,295 transcripts (since 1951) sent by Lindenwood at the request of students transferring to other colleges, 2,276 or 98% went to coeducational institutions. Of these 64% were sent at the end of the freshman year, 32% at the end of the sophomore year. The implication is that over half of the students who come to Lindenwood as freshmen are not really interested in separate education except on the junior college level and therefore do not remain to give Lindenwood the upper division strength it needs to be first rate in its academic program.

\* \* \*



The information thus far considered pointed unmistakably toward some kind of change. What we needed now was an understanding of our resources and of the possibilities of their imaginative use. The following material represents some of the factors which led to our conclusion:

(1) Our program and its potential need more diversity in enrollment. Reports from students and faculty alike argued that men were needed in mathematics, chemistry, music, dance, drama, communication arts, and some of the new programs being envisioned.

(2) Enrollment projections indicate that we need to appeal to the 95% of the college-age population which we have traditionally ignored by asking only for women applicants.

(3) The Sibley deed and charter, on the other hand, tie the Lindenwood name to women's education and would have to be changed if we were to admit men in any substantial numbers. Our attorney informed us that this would be a relatively simple legal procedure but warned that it would require going into the courts and bringing a review of a charter which gives us unusual advantages. Our charter constitutes a legislative grant (one of five given in the state of Missouri) enabling us to use our resources in land and endowment in ways not available to other corporations. A review in the courts of this charter might jeopardize these advantages.

(4) We have, however, 134.239 acres of land, a good endowment, and dormitory and classroom space for 264 students more than we have enrolled. Portions of the land were purchased specifically for the use of an adjacent men's college.

(5) In summary, we had the need and the potential for men in the Lindenwood program, but a legal status which made outright coeducation questionable as the best course to take.

At this point, the choice of alternatives became clear. In the charter for the Lindenwood Female College is the stipulation that, by that name, it "shall have perpetual succession and be capable of taking and holding by gift, grant, devise or otherwise, and of conveying, leasing, or otherwise disposing of any estate, real, personal, or mixed, annuities and endowments, franchises and other hereditaments; which may conduct to the support of said college, or to the promotion of its objects; and all property of said corporation shall be exempt from taxation, and the sixth, seventh and eighteenth sections of the first article of the act concerning corporations, shall not apply to this corporation."

While we could not become coeducational without disadvantage, we could bring into being a separate men's college with its own name and charter; we could lease our buildings and land to it; we could contract ~~on~~ its behalf for the services of our faculty; and we could collect the income from tuition and fees as more than a return on our investment in legal and other costs for chartering the new college.

We could, moreover, preserve the full integrity of Lindenwood's deed, charter, endowment, tradition, and historic advantages as a woman's college--providing, indeed, by this action, for its growth and increasing excellence. We could also keep separation where we knew this to be important and could take advantage of having men in programs which will develop more significantly because they are fully supported and adequately diversified.

To these ends, the committee prepared a set of six recommendations. If these are approved by the Board of Trustees, we envision a three-year development somewhat as follows:

1969--Chartering of the college. Immediate recruiting of men. Promotion of the Lindenwood program with this greater diversity of enrollment in mind. Contracting, on behalf of the new college, for residence and dining facilities and for faculty instruction

and instructional facilities, tuition to be received by Lindenwood as payment for its services. Accreditation of the new college is automatic since it is the Lindenwood faculty, library, and facility being used.

1970--Establishing a holding corporation with a combined Lindenwood and men's college board of trustees to administer the lands and endowments held by Lindenwood and those which may be acquired by the men's college. Fund raising and special program development for the new college. Building of special facilities to accommodate the changing programs.

1971--Building of new dormitories, married housing center, athletic-recreational facilities. Nationwide publicity to bring attention to the two colleges and their programs. Acquiring of foundation support for special areas of study.

Finally, we envision in June of 1973, the first class of graduates from the new college receiving diplomas with the name of that college at the top but the recommendation for the rewarding of the degree by the Lindenwood faculty which has provided the education.

Respectfully submitted,

Victoria Lowe, Women-Student Chairman

Joseph McWhorter, Men-Student Chairman

Howard A. Barnett, Faculty Chairman

December 11, 1968

Lindenwood College  
St. Charles, Missouri