

Lindenwood University

Digital Commons@Lindenwood University

Reports & Self-Studies

Lindenwood Documents, Booklets,
Miscellaneous

6-15-1970

The First Annual Report to the Lindenwood College II Board of Trustees

Gary H. Quehl

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/self-studies>



Part of the Education Commons

THE FIRST ANNUAL REPORT TO THE LINDENWOOD COLLEGE II

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

from

THE OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT AND

DEAN OF THE COLLEGE

OVERVIEW

This first annual report to the Board of Trustees of Lindenwood College II has at least one major limitation that influences its character. Unfortunately, the pages that follow must be viewed as a kind of interim or temporary arrangement of thought because all the data are not in. Moreover, the kind of report that must and will be made to the Board at a later date is postponed at this time because the vision of what we wanted to have happen and what actually did happen during the 1969-70 year is still somewhat blurred. In short, the year that has just ended is far too warm for any meaningful historical analysis.

I must also state my preference for a different kind of reporting than that which follows. My own inclination is toward a more philosophical approach in attempting to make sense out of human experience. A cool presentation of data can reconstruct the anatomy, but the true spirit and life of "the year that was" at Lindenwood II cannot be portrayed in this way.

In having to temporarily settle for this less substantive kind of reporting, I must say, however, that the data which are offered here were gathered as carefully as possible. In this sense -- and only in this sense -- should the interim report be considered "objective" in nature. My attempt to interpret and illuminate the data must be viewed as a very personal kind of thing. Those who disagree with my assumptions and my observations will do so honestly but probably rather strenuously. And this is as it must be, for the key to an understanding of our first year of planning and existence is to be found in the constant attempt to define the proper

relationship between utopian preferences and realistic necessities. This was and is a very personal activity. Each student, faculty member, administrator, or trustee who shared in any of the common experiences of the year viewed them and must report them in his own way.

The 1969-70 academic year was purposely designated as the year to firmly establish the style of student life at Lindenwood II. It was a year for planning political philosophy and for creating community government organization, and very little else in the dean's office received a higher priority. The joys and the disappointments that were encountered, the planning and the dynamic cycles of growth that occurred -- indeed the whole array of creative human stuff that gave our new college substance -- will receive a careful and, I hope, sensitive treatment in a forthcoming report to the Board.

In presenting my observations, I have chosen to organize the report as a series of three profiles. At this time, my foremost concern is to successfully convey an understanding of the nature of the male students who came to us, how they performed, and the ways in which they impacted on Lindenwood College for Women. My secondary purpose is to share at least some sense of the dynamics of organic growth that took place during the year. Finally, I have also briefly discussed what I believe to be the need to more carefully define our social situation as a prerequisite for the important work that must be initiated next academic year. As our student life programs enter a new level of maturity in the second year, we will move our level of formal planning to the next stage of development, which is the creation of a distinctive academic program for Lindenwood College II.

Gary H. Quehl
June 15, 1970

I. PROFILE OF THE LINDENWOOD COLLEGE II STUDENT

Standing as a major assumption of this interim report is the belief that each college and university has a distinctive climate which acts as an invisible thread to attract some students and repel others. I offer this assumption not only because social scientists have found it to be true; I recommend it as the centrally most pertinent criterion by which we should evaluate the immediate past, judge the present, and plan the future of Lindenwood College II.

There are more than 2,100 colleges and universities in the United States. With such numbers and diversity, we can assume that an opportunity exists for almost anyone who wants to go to college. It is reasonable that we should try to discover, then, as much as we can about the kind of young men who would be attracted to a new college, especially one that is located on a campus which has served young women for almost a century and a half.

This knowledge is important because it whets our curiosity and helps us to understand our first year, but it is more important because the young men who joined with us this year have already contributed heavily to that intangible force known as institutional image. Those young men who entered in the fall of 1969, those who will return in the fall of 1970, those who left us during 1969, and those who will not return in the fall of 1970 have already set in motion a dynamic process of institutional self-selection. What we have been this year directly influences what we will be and can be next year; prospective students have already been attracted by whatever prismatic image now exists, and others have been repelled. And, as we shall see throughout the report, this magnetic field has also had a profound impact on our parent college, Lindenwood College for Women.

The identification of positive and negative internal forces is essential, especially because the negative pull operates more strongly than the positive, which is one reason why it is so difficult to reverse or even arrest. If a college or university develops a widening reputation, say, for violence, what is important is not so much that radical students will seek it as that non-radical students will shun the institution. Thus, as we cautiously but confidently begin next year to define and build our distinctive educational mission as an institution of higher learning, I would urge that we carefully identify those existing forces which may impair that mission for Lindenwood II.

Let me proceed, then, by forwarding several basic questions: Who were these young men that came to Lindenwood College II? Why did they come? What, by virtue of their background, did they bring with them in the way of attitudes, preferences, values, and personal objectives? Because we are two colleges, how do the answers to some of these questions compare with what is known about Lindenwood College for Women students? Finally, what can be said, in a comparative way, about those new students we already know will be joining us in the fall of 1970?

Social and Economic Background Characteristics

Data about the social and economic background of our students are limited in this report to the freshman class of Lindenwood II and Lindenwood College for Women, since it is these students who will cogently affect the future reputation and image of the colleges. A more penetrating treatment of similar data is offered in Basic Institutional Data of The Lindenwood Colleges (pp. 49-52), Part II of our recent North Central Association self-study.

Of the characteristics considered, it is important to discover that there are very few salient student differences between the colleges; those few differences worth identifying are geographic distribution and the religious background and preferences of the freshman class of each college. While these differences are important and undoubtedly do contribute to a kind of value differentiation between the colleges, the most telling observation is that there are greater social and economic differences within each college than between them. We have, then, achieved a rather heterogeneous student population when social and economic background characteristics are considered. A summary of these characteristics follows:

The Number Who Enrolled: Lindenwood II enrolled 115 full-time and 51 part-time students during the 1969-70 academic year. Fifty-eight (58) of the full-time students were freshmen, and slightly less than one-half (57) were transfer or returning upperclass students. Of all the contemporary attempts to bring men to traditionally women's colleges, either coeducational or coordinate, ours appears to be among the most successful.

Age: Lindenwood II students were slightly older than their female counterparts. Males ranged in age from 16-41, with an average age of slightly less than 20.

Racial Background: Both of The Lindenwood Colleges largely enroll Caucasian students, but substantial gains have been made over the last several years in attracting Black and Oriental students. Lindenwood College for Women enrolls slightly more non-Caucasian students than Lindenwood College II (9% as compared to 7%).

Urban-Rural Distribution: While The Lindenwood Colleges have accelerated the tendency to attract students from urbanized settings, this is more true of Lindenwood II students. To a greater extent than women students, males come from large cities (15%, 11%) or the suburbs of large cities (41%, 32%).

Geographic Distribution: Students of The Lindenwood Colleges represent 38 different states and 12 foreign countries. The majority of both male and female students come from the Midwestern states, although this is more true of female students (65%, 52%) than males. Missouri leads all Midwestern states for both males and females.

The major difference in geographic distribution between Lindenwood II and Lindenwood College for Women students is found in opposite parts of the country. Significantly more male than female students come from the East and Northeast (33%, 11%). Female students, on the other hand, come in greater numbers than males from the West and greater Southwest (12%, 3%).

Insofar as we have information about new male students for next academic year, the geographic distribution holds to the same general pattern, with the exception being that fewer men appear to be coming from the Midwest and South-Southeast; significantly more will come from states in the West and greater Southwest.

Lindenwood II enrolled a larger percentage of foreign students this year than Lindenwood College for Women, although it would appear that next year will see an enrollment of about the same proportion of foreign students in each college (2%, 2%).

Educational Background of Fathers: Differences between the educational attainment of students' fathers are less significant than the distribution of differences throughout The Lindenwood Colleges. While it is true that a greater proportion of the fathers of female students have earned post-graduate degrees, one-half of both male and female students report their fathers have earned at least a college degree, and more than two-thirds are alleged to have had at least several years of college in their educational background. The most significant observation to be made about fathers' educational background is that we have a rather large proportion of women students whose fathers achieved less than a high school education (21%). This is much less true of the fathers of Lindenwood II students (13%). It is reasonable to suppose that fathers' educational attainment bears a close relationship, in most cases, to annual earning power and, hence, their ability to finance a Lindenwood education.

Parental Income: Keeping in mind that the comprehensive annual fee for attending Lindenwood, excluding financial aid, is \$2,950, it is significant to discover that the distribution of annual income falls into three fairly equal categories for the parents of both Lindenwood College for Women and Lindenwood II students. Slightly less than one-third of the students in both colleges come from homes where the annual income is as much as \$10,000, and this is more true for female than male students (24%, 28%). The serious implications of our having to provide substantial financial aid to almost one-third of our male and female students are compounded not by lack of will or perseverance but by the very real financial crisis that faces The Lindenwood Colleges.

More than one-third of the male and female students report annual parental incomes of almost \$20,000; this is truer of male than female students (42%, 32%). Finally, more than one-third of the male and female students report that parental income exceeds \$20,000, this being more the case for women than men students (40%, 34%).

Religious Background - Religious Preference: Rather major differences in religious background exist between the students of Lindenwood II and Lindenwood College for Women. More than three-fourths (80%) of the women, but less than one-half (47%) of the men, were raised in a Protestant denominational tradition. This difference between the colleges is largely attributed to a higher proportion of Roman Catholic male students (33%). Each college has approximately the same proportion of Jewish students (9%, 9%) represented.

Among the most compelling differences in values between Lindenwood II and Lindenwood College for Women students is seen in the choice of present religious preference. More than one-half of the male students, but less than one-fifth of the female students, reported they had no present religious preference. The greatest change for both male and female students occurred among those who had been raised in a Protestant denominational tradition.

Secondary School Achievements

Lindenwood II freshmen earned a considerably larger number of secondary school distinctions than the national norm for college male freshmen.

While in high school, the Lindenwood males exceeded their counterparts across the nation to the extent that a greater proportion of them were elected president of a student organization, participated in a state or regional speech contest, had a major part in a play, won an award in art competition, edited their school paper, had an original writing published, participated in a National Science Foundation Summer Program, were active in a state or regional science contest, and received recognition in National Merit competition.

Compared to the national norm for college male freshmen, however, fewer Lindenwood II students earned a high school varsity letter in athletics (21%), or a position in their high school scholastic honor society (19%). That they exceeded the national norm in National Merit Scholarship recognition but fell below the national norm in secondary school scholastic accomplishment is an especially distinguishing feature of the

1969-70 Lindenwood II freshmen class. More will be said throughout the report about this disparity between academic ability and performance.

Why They Came: Institutional Image - Cause or Effect?

We know that the public reasons people give for making choices do not always bear a direct relationship to their private decision-making processes. Nevertheless, the Lindenwood II students did have an opportunity to record their reactions to a series of twenty-four possible reasons that may have influenced their decision to enroll in Lindenwood II. For the highest percentage of Lindenwood II students, the reasons that most influenced them tended to cluster around the notion of "college as an intellectual process." The men said they enrolled to discover more about certain fields of knowledge, and they came with serious intellectual curiosities they felt only Lindenwood II could satisfy. It is significant to note, however, that less than half of the freshmen said they chose Lindenwood II because they enjoyed studying or wanted to continue academic work. This seemed to suggest the presence of a strong intellectual drive that was not then accompanied by an equally strong commitment to the ground rules that are required in the formal learning experience. It also helps to explain the disparity between their high intellectual ability and rather mediocre high school performance.

While the male students have repeatedly stated that they came to Lindenwood II because of the distinctive features in our academic program (flexibility, elective system, independent study, interdisciplinary coursework, the January Term, the 4-1-4), my own judgment is that many

were also lured here to participate in the creation of a new social organization and to act out their value preferences and personal objectives.

The opportunity for personal creativity, and the elbow room to exploit it were seen as distinguishing features of Lindenwood II. For better or for worse, correctly or incorrectly, many young men tended to view the new college as "a pretty free and swinging place," one that set few limitations on their personal freedom.

It is possible to substantiate this notion if one momentarily assumes that a student probably comes to a given college because he tends to see that college in the image of his own values, preferences, and personal objectives. Using this reasoning, the political preferences of Lindenwood freshmen, for example, would suggest that Lindenwood is a very "liberal" place. On this value, the Lindenwood II freshmen greatly exceeded both the freshmen of Lindenwood College for Women and the national norm for college male freshmen. Lindenwood II students stated they felt the Federal Government should play a greater role in developing tax incentives to control the birth rate, provide compensatory education for the disadvantaged, control firearms, eliminate poverty, and desegregate schools. They also felt the army should be voluntary, that marijuana should be legalized, that divorce laws should be liberalized, that abortion should be legalized, and that capital punishment should be abolished. One detects by almost any standard, then, that the typical member of the 1969 Lindenwood II freshman class regarded himself as being socially and politically liberal. Since Lindenwood II had no history before this year, can it be assumed that these students saw Lindenwood II as a socially and politically liberal place? Experiences during the year seem to indicate this was true.

Significantly more than the national college norm for college males, Lindenwood II freshmen also expressed the preference to influence the political structure, to influence social values, to protest U. S. military policy, and to protest racial and ethnic policy. This would suggest that the average member of the freshman class saw himself as being prone to active involvement and, hence, that he also tended to see Lindenwood II as a place where a kind of meaningful program of social action could be developed.

Continuing with this same line of reasoning, we can assume that the average freshman probably saw Lindenwood II as a place that provided many degrees of personal independence but where people were tolerant of each other. For example, more than the national male freshman norm, the Lindenwood II freshman tended to place a high value on the opportunity to develop a philosophy of life, to help others in difficulty, to have friends different from themselves, but not to be obligated to other people.

Finally, the average Lindenwood II freshman saw himself as being very creative and expressive. He saw Lindenwood II as a place to achieve in a performing art, to create works of art, and to write original works.

It is hard to escape the conclusion, then, that the Lindenwood College II freshman undoubtedly had a particular image of the college when he arrived in the fall: He saw Lindenwood II to be socially and politically liberal, as a place to foster programs of social action, as an environment where he could exercise personal independence but find and respect different kinds of people, and as a place where he could be creative and expressive. It would be interesting to discover whether his acting out of these values actually gave Lindenwood II the image he saw it to have.

Academic Ability and Interests

The Lindenwood Colleges use two conventional measures to assess a high school senior's aptitude for college work. While other more subjective and, perhaps, meaningful criteria are also used in making individual admissions decisions, Scholastic Aptitude Test scores are a good general indicator of the kind of student verbal and mathematical ability that is required for college work. A more accurate predictor of an applicant's chances for success and staying power in college, however, is his past record of achievement, which is most commonly and efficiently measured by his secondary school rank in class.

The profile of the 1969 freshman class of Lindenwood II yielded a very unusual and somewhat disturbing relationship between these two conventional measures. Freshmen men generally were found to possess a higher than average verbal and mathematical aptitude for college work ($V = 561$; $M = 566$), and, in this regard, they greatly exceeded the freshman class averages of Lindenwood College for Women ($V = 496$; $M = 478$). That the Lindenwood II freshmen were a capable group, then, was never in question. What aroused our concern is that they generally exhibited a rather low ranking in their high school graduating class, and this measure ought to have correlated highly with their more than average level of verbal and mathematical ability. As compared to Lindenwood women freshmen, who stood significantly higher in class rank, less than half of the Lindenwood II freshmen achieved well enough in high school to place in the upper half of their respective graduating class. From this information, it seemed reasonable to conclude that we had recruited a class of very capable young men who had yet to establish themselves as being motivated and committed to the formal learning

process. Later in the interim report, data will be offered to show how true this actually was but how decidedly it could be changed.

In looking forward to next fall, we are pleased to discover that those male students who have been admitted and have at this time indicated they will join our freshman class appear to support an entirely different kind of profile than the 1969 freshmen. Not only do they stand higher in terms of average verbal and mathematical ability (V = 588; M = 582), their markedly higher secondary school class rank suggests a much stronger drive for personal achievement. One-third of these students have ranked in the upper ten percent, almost fifty percent have ranked in the top quarter, and almost three-fourths of next year's freshmen will have been graduated in the top half of their high school class. If our reports about prospective new students continue this way over the summer, we can be most confident about next year -- especially if this progress can be attributed to the kind of institutional image we have tried to project.

For many years, Lindenwood College for Women attracted students who were largely interested in the disciplines of the humanities. It has only been during the last decade -- and really the last four or five years -- that we have expanded our curricular offerings to include, indepth, major social science and natural science disciplines. However, the magnetic tradition of Lindenwood's commitment to the humanities had a stronger pull in attracting students to Lindenwood II than did either the social sciences or the natural sciences. Approximately 44% of our returning male students have tentatively chosen to major in the Humanities Division,

with our new interdisciplinary Communication Arts Center serving as the area of concentration that has attracted the greatest male student interest (20% of the student body). Approximately 28% of all returning men have made a tentative decision to major in the Social Science Division, and our Department of Political Science seems to be drawing the most sizeable interest from the student body (18%). Finally, about 20% of the returning Lindenwood II students have made a tentative decision to major in the Natural Science Division. Our newly conceived and reorganized Center for the Undergraduate Study of Mathematics is responsible for attracting the highest percentage of the male students (11%) to the natural sciences. Because college freshmen typically change their academic interests several times before settling on a divisional major and an academic discipline, little real confidence would normally be placed in the tentative interests expressed by new students prior to the end of the fall term. Of those young men who will join the freshman class of 1970, however, it would seem that the same divisions and the same three areas of concentration (Communication Arts, Political Science, Mathematics) will continue to draw about the same proportion of student interest as they did from the 1969 students.

Academic Performance During the 1969-70 Year

Given the rather low level of motivation for formal learning that was suggested by their secondary school class ranking, it was not surprising that many students in the 1969 freshman class got off to a very slow and, for many, very painful start in their academic program. Essentially, most of the freshmen lacked adequate study skills, but at bottom many also lacked a history of self-discipline that makes excellent academic performance possible.

Their inherent abilities, their keen and probing interests, their rare insights into significant ideas and problems, and their penchant for active involvement in vital social issues were all clearly visible during the fall term. But somehow they could not hitch these analytic and creative talents to the formal classroom experience. An anxious climate of discontent crept into the fall term: Procrastination in completing course assignments, a brilliantly deceptive program of individual excuses for almost everything, and excessive class absences in the name of "independent" and "informal" learning were more the rule than the exception. It must also be said that many faculty members' high level of expectation for and generous patience with the new male students had an inadvertent way of accelerating these chaotic tendencies.

The ensuing panic that consumed many freshmen as fall term final examinations approached exceeded anything many of us had ever witnessed from college students. For many, this anxiety produced a kind of sincere desperation that comes when people discover they really do want something very much. The fact that rather significant numbers of freshmen failed to accomplish more than a very mediocre academic record during the fall term followed them home to haunt their Christmas vacation. Of the 58 full-time freshmen who enrolled in the 1969 fall term, three were suspended and ten were placed on academic probation.

The jolt of the fall term was a sufficient stimulus to most freshmen, and they returned searching for a different kind of commitment. One student expressed it for many when he said to a member of the faculty, "You guys shoot with real bullets." The January term was exciting for both

colleges, and the academic program finally caught on in Lindenwood II. It's contagion propelled us through the rest of the year.

Our fifty-seven transfer and returning students started the 1969-70 year in a very different way. Those members of our original group of fifteen students in 1968 who returned generally did so with the conviction that Lindenwood II offered them an outstanding academic opportunity. A few failed to find this kind of personal objective, and their failure to establish their way firmly in the academic program led to suspension in one case and academic probation for three other students.

The most dramatic performance emerged, however, from our 33 first-time transfer students, some of whom were extremely capable but had not performed well at the first college they attended. We originally admitted to Lindenwood II about fourteen of these transfer students as academic risks, and we were quite pleased to discover that our confidence in their ability and motivation was justified. Almost all of these "risk" transfer students (12) not only removed themselves from academic probation by the level of fall term performance, they generally led the way to arouse a climate of confidence and commitment that so many of our freshmen students needed.

Throughout the academic year, individual students of Lindenwood II emerged to place their talents on public display; academic excellence in a variety of forms was not uncommon. Plays were written and produced; films were shot, edited, and shown. At the end of the fall term, 11% of the student body had earned a grade-point average of 3.50 or higher, which placed them on the first Dean's List ever published at Lindenwood II.

This year, the Common Course faculty initiated a program of incentive awards for the purpose of stimulating and recognizing outstanding freshman work. At the end of the spring term, these faculty carefully selected the four most excellent independent study projects, from among all Lindenwood freshmen, that were produced during the last seven weeks of the Common Course. Three of these awards were earned by Lindenwood II students. Receiving "Highest Honors" and a \$300 scholarship was Daniel Maddox, for his paper, "A Molecular Basis of Learning and Memory: A Chemical Soul?" David Churchill received "High Honors" and a \$200 scholarship for his essay, "The Cosmic Comedy, A Narrative Symphony in Three Parts." That his work is of such quality that it deserves to be published surprises no one, for David published his first novel before coming to Lindenwood II. Tied for third place with a female student, and receiving "Honors" and a \$100 scholarship, was Edward Zimmer, for his "Nine Middle Poems." And so it went, throughout the year.

The extent of change and growth that occurred during the year can be most clearly seen when the all-college grade-point averages for each term are compared. At the end of the fall term, the Lindenwood II average was 2.39. By the end of the spring term, the Lindenwood II grade-point average had risen to 2.65. The Lindenwood II freshman class average moved from 2.23 in the fall to 2.52 for the term just ended.

The Graduates, Attrition, and the Returning Students

A small group of six men constituted the first graduating class of Lindenwood College II. Standing first in this class was a 41 year-old man who distinguished himself as our outstanding senior scholar. He completed his Lindenwood program in the discipline of history. This will be his second career, for he already completed a long and equally distinguished career of service in the United States Air Force. Another graduate joined a well-known St. Louis radio station, and still another will begin to test a career in the theatre. Two other Lindenwood II men headed for graduate school, and one has had the uncommonly good fortune of being invited to release his creative talents as an intern with one of the nation's more creative and successful motion picture producers, Edgar Sherick.

In this age of the buyer's market in higher education, when students (and parents) can move rather freely from institution to institution, a college can roughly measure the success of its impact by the degree to which it is able to retain a high proportion of its student body. When approximately one-half of the students that attend American colleges and universities leave before advancing their education to the point of graduation, we would hope to look forward to a much better record for Lindenwood II. While there is no way of predicting whether Lindenwood II will fail to retain as many as half of each freshman class over every four year cycle, the voluntary choice of 77% of our students to return next fall is significant, especially for a new college.

Some may wish that this attrition rate were lower, but we should not necessarily consider voluntary withdrawal to be a misfortune for either the student or the college. Twelve students withdrew during the 1969-70 year for what can only be described as "personal reasons," but three of these students who dropped out at the end of the fall term have made application to return to us next fall. Six other students informed us that they plan to transfer to another college or university, and they mentioned among their possible choices the University of Maine, Boston University, the University of Minnesota, St. Louis University, Bard College, Quinnipiac College, Monmouth College (N.Y.), North Texas College, and the University of Colorado. These institutions share very little in common. Perhaps each student who transfers out is attracted to an intangible thread of institutional reputation that more readily meets his personal needs and expectations than did Lindenwood II. The same dynamics operate for the new students who will transfer to Lindenwood II in the fall.

There are other students, however, who will not return next fall because they failed to achieve minimum standards of scholarship. Among the 115 full-time students that enrolled in the fall of 1969, ten have been suspended or permanently dismissed from Lindenwood II (four at the end of the fall term and six at the end of the spring term). One student who was suspended at the end of the fall term has requested that we allow him to return on academic probation next fall. His sharing of intimate personal experiences since the time of his withdrawal leads me to believe that Lindenwood II may, in fact, be the best place in which he can live and grow. Finally, it must be attributed to the good sense of our students,

to the patient counseling of our faculty and administrative staff, and to the effective impact of our judicial code and student-faculty judicial board that while some students did have disciplinary action taken against their personal misconduct, no case was sufficiently serious to warrant suspension or dismissal from the institution.

In completing the reading of this profile of the Lindenwood College II student, one may detect that I have prudently attempted to look at the best, while having to share the worst. This impression is essentially correct, although I have attempted to avoid dealing in fewer lofty generalizations than my personal biases would support.

Whether one is prepared to accept at face value this assessment of the 1969-70 Lindenwood II student body, he will find it hard to ignore the mounting evidence that they have had a profound impact on the campus, and that it has largely been good. The mixed cadre of able, anxious, idealistic, confused, pleasant young men that entered last fall accomplished distinctive personal achievements, and they succeeded in giving the idea of our new college life and substance. The rich history of this record will be reported at another time, but the following two profiles attempt to give some insight into its essence.

II. PROFILE OF LINDENWOOD COLLEGE II AND LINDENWOOD COLLEGE FOR WOMEN:

A STRUGGLE FOR LIFE STYLE

The rubric used to identify this part of the report may be a bit misleading, for it might suggest that the creation of Lindenwood II contributed something entirely new in the way of fundamental social values that never before existed on the Lindenwood campus. At bottom, such a view might hold that male students imported these values and, hence, that most problems which now exist at The Lindenwood Colleges can be rather directly traced to the presence of men and the creation of Lindenwood College II.

Ostensibly, this would seem to be an unnecessary and even defensive opening statement, but the Board should be informed that there are those among our internal and external constituency who subscribe to such a theory and often act as if it were true. I suggest that it is a simplistic and indefensible notion. Almost every time I have personally acted on behalf of this theory during the year, I found an unexpected complicity of more than just Lindenwood II students. We truly are The Lindenwood Colleges.

Advocacy is essential for attitudinal change. That is why I would like to propose an alternative theory: The social and intellectual climate of The Lindenwood Colleges during the 1969-70 year can better be understood as a complex reaction to a set of highly volatile values and circumstances than as a collision between two very distinctive life styles -- one good, the other not so good -- represented in Lindenwood College for Women and Lindenwood College II.

What I am really suggesting is that there are desirable and undesirable elements in the life style of both Lindenwood College for Women and Lindenwood II, and that the real struggle is not between the colleges but between those social characteristics that would deny us or ensure us of our common future as The Lindenwood Colleges. A few personal thoughts about several of these dynamic elements may at least convey the range and kind of dominant ethos that emerged last year.

The Adrenalin Factor

From the very beginning of the year, one detected a climate of curiosity, excitement, and aspiration that acted as a community of persuasion to generate a whole series of legitimate issues, which ranged from rather "local" concerns between individuals, student sub-cultures, and between the two colleges to the domestic and international problems that plagued Everyman this year.

What began as a sonorous drone crescendoed to a kind of shattering, pounding, probing of issues, ideas, and assumptions that drained every member of the community, at some time, of emotional energy and patience, personal trust and confidence, and even the vision of our larger purpose. For example, the national reputation that we have rather immodestly accepted for our freshman year interdisciplinary course, The Common, was lost in the petty whine of student complaints about required class attendance (the only general institutional course so required). To recover from such discouragement, however, one needed only to stroll by Ayres Hall or Ayres Hall Annex almost any time of the day or evening to hear an aroused debate about Vietnam or Israel or the population problem or pollution or

the racial crisis. When students tired of these issues, there was always a local supply available: dormitory intervisitation, the "repressive" administration, student evaluation of faculty. So it went, from Moratorium Day in October to Earth Day in April to "A Day of Learning" in May.

The adrenalin factor allowed no single view to capture the campus for long. While many sincere students insisted that the colleges should take a corporate position on such public policy questions as Vietnam and Cambodia, other more prudent students took time to write personally inspired letters to the local newspaper in defense of President Brown's decision to keep the colleges free and open to all ideas that compete for the assent of man. Such was the vitality of the year!

The Academic Program

Since implementing our new academic program in 1967, Lindenwood College for Women achieved many extraordinary objectives. Not the least of these was to improve the rate of student retention, especially after the freshman year. More than one-half of the freshmen women students did not return as sophomores in 1967. In two short years, this attrition rate has been reduced to 22%, with the good likelihood that it will again be sharply reduced next fall.

While the academic program and great teaching were obviously the most important factors in achieving this new level of student retention, the faculty held to their basic belief that the new academic program would never become truly dynamic and valid until male students became a significant part of the educational program of Lindenwood College. In discussing

whether we should establish a coordinate college for men, the faculty consistently maintained that the classroom learning climate would be greatly improved. Many women students expressed this view, but many others did not.

It is difficult to determine the extent to which faculty expectations were confirmed during last year. Given the aptitude of male students, faculty members started the year with high hopes. Certainly, however, the faculty were generally disappointed at the performance of male students during the fall term, but this changed noticeably in the January Term, and it dramatically improved throughout the spring term. There does not appear to be any evidence, at any rate, that the presence of male students in most classes operates in any other than a very beneficial way to the education of young women. From what we have seen, I would suggest that the benefit is mutual.

Campus Leadership Opportunities

One of the traditional reasons that is offered in defense of a woman's college is that it allows, and especially encourages, young women to seek leadership opportunities and experiences that normally might not be available on a coeducational campus. Had there been a strong tradition of effective student leadership at Lindenwood College for Women over the last three or four years in key positions, such as editor of the newspaper, one could point to the presence of male students and expect a women's challenge to their vigorous attempts to take over key campus positions. But there was not such a tradition and they did. Most of the major leadership positions in the radio station, the campus newspaper, and other

literary publications have been won by male students. There is evidence, however, that a new kind of leadership style and commitment is emerging from Lindenwood College for Women, and that competition for key positions of responsibility will be keen in the years ahead.

Student Social Behavior and Appearance

Despite the vitality of the year just ended, there were other characteristics of the campus ethos that added a disproportionately harmful contribution to the reputation of The Lindenwood Colleges. I am referring to a radical change in the style of public student behavior more than to the serious private problems which have to some degree always existed at Lindenwood and every college, (e.g. drugs, abortion, alcohol, theft, etc.). My intention is not to create the impression that the latter problems are unimportant or that they go unattended or unobserved by at least some members of our community; it is merely to suggest that a very noticeable change in what some young people came to do publicly on the Lindenwood campus last year marked a change in life style that has had a significantly negative influence on our institution.

I need not elaborate much on these problems beyond mentioning them, for they are quite familiar to all of us: unclean bodies, unkept long hair and beards, blatant displays of affection between the sexes, bare feet regardless of health standards, and bizzare dress. The list is endless and well-known because these traits have become a standard part of the uniform and code which identifies members of certain youth cultures. The fact that most of these public behaviors are rather petty (to even mention) and that they actually harm no one except, perhaps in some psychological way,

the offender, in no way reduces the power of these traits to generate annoyance and anger and even violent reaction from the general lay population and even within the broader student population. There is little doubt that this polarization between American life styles unnecessarily harms young people and intimidates large segments of an older generation. But it also unnecessarily harms an institution that is dedicated to learning about the more profound experiences of man. To be so caught between the cracks in the veneer of our civilization represents a cogent warning that a college cannot afford to ignore if it is to have any kind of future. Unfortunately but especially is this the case for the private liberal arts college.

III. PROFILE OF LINDENWOOD COLLEGE II: THE NEED FOR CLEAR DEFINITION

I mention the power of aroused and countervailing public opinion because -- from an administrative standpoint -- the most pressing problem facing The Lindenwood Colleges is that we have not been able to attract in sufficient kind and numbers the new young women we need if we are to ensure the future for which we have all planned and worked so hard to attain over the last number of years. Many of the reasons for this problem are clearly beyond our control, but there does exist the factor of the negative pull that can be attributed to many of the public social behaviors that have been mentioned above. While there is no doubt that we are a better institution of higher learning than we have been in recent years, the ominous presence of these public behaviors -- often purposely put on display by a small number of men and women students -- has created precisely the kind of reaction that is prophesized by social scientists: To the degree

that our two colleges encourage a developing reputation for this life style, what is important is not so much that those who live this style will choose to attend The Lindenwood Colleges as that those who do not will shun the colleges.

Admittedly, then, the negative pull seems to operate more strongly than the positive. But the struggle for institutional reputation and image need not be dominated by gloom alone or by dwelling only on the crass. It is true that some men did use illegal drugs. Some of the men also had unkempt, long hair and beards, as do many young men these days. Some of the men failed to observe elementary physical hygiene standards and this offends many of us, as well it should them. A very few of the young men would have enjoyed nothing more than to lead a campus revolt, regardless of the issue, but they found few takers and largely ended the year as impotent isolates in the peer group. And some of the men were arrogant and disrespectful of other people, and other people's ideas, and other styles of life.

But for the most part, the men of Lindenwood II did not possess or display these qualities. Most of the men can be considered to have a "liberal" social orientation, if we mean that they are vocal and do believe deeply and sincerely about important human questions, such as our foreign policy or our environmental disintegration. And we are a richer educational institution because of it. Most of the men have successfully struggled with those potent forces which might have defeated Lindenwood College II as a special place of learning. Most love this institution and regard it as their home; they respect and value its faculty; especially do they appreciate and value the special opportunities for personal growth and the chance to create a new tradition in a new college.

With few exceptions, it is these latter young men who will return in the fall of 1970. We must, I believe, receive them as the full citizens they have become. We should exercise special care not to destroy their trust or faith in our leadership or their confidence in our good intentions with perjorative language or by taking unwarranted action, based on any of last year's experiences.

Those eighty or more men who return next year will continue to make us a better place; it is these men who will enculturate our new students. And it is the two classes together who will largely determine what kind of place we can become and will become two years from now.

In continuing to establish our reputation, I have confidence that we will heed the words of warning that Robert Hutchins gave to Harris Wofford, Jr. before planning of the New College at Old Westbury, in New York began:

"You will be blown away unless your educational banner is very good, very clear, and very firmly planted, and unless you make very sure that every person you ask to join you understands and agrees." ¹

Unfortunately, this advice was not taken, as Old Westbury now stands in witness. As Vice-President and Dean of Lindenwood College II, I believe we must move confidently and firmly away from any ambiguity about the kind of place we cannot afford to become. We should apply the same standard to Lindenwood College II that has so effectively guided the sweeping change in Lindenwood College for Women over the last four years. We must, in the words of President Brown, at the time of his inaugural

". . . keep our definition so clear, with our statements so specific that our strengths will shine forth only moderately brighter than our weaknesses. Our program and its emphasis will be made clear for those who believe in it to accept and support. Those who do not should not." ²

¹ Harris Wofford, Jr., "The New College at Old Westbury," Educational Record, Winter, 1970, Vol. 51, No. 1, p. 35.

² Inaugural Address of President John Anthony Brown, Jr., October 20, 1966.