

PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO THE BOARD OF LINDENWOOD COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

May 29, 1970

This has been a traumatic year for higher education in our country. Events on college campuses have invaded the headlines. Our newspapers, magazines, television screens and radios on a daily basis cover happenings at colleges which have little to do with learning. Several of our greatest colleges and universities have closed this spring, short of completing the term. This year violence and various forms of intimidation have become a new and alarming part of the academic atmosphere on many campuses.

Over the past several years there has been a serious effort on the part of colleges and universities to search for new forms of governance, forms that would more deeply involve students and faculty in the determination of policy. Responsible academic leaders, and this term includes students and faculty, as well as administrators, sought approaches to the problems of governance that would make full and responsible participants of students and faculty. In some instances this quest for new forms of governance gave way to a desperate search for almost any form of governance.

The academic community has long had a way of doing things. The way included systems of respect and discipline and orderly accommodation to change through due process. The way included civilized procedures for dealing with the various members of the academic community. The ordinary decencies of life prevailed as we dealt with each other as members of a community held together by common respect and mutual acceptance of basic goals and objectives. The occupation of offices, even buildings, the screaming of profanities, the denunciation of individuals in what became name-calling contests, came upon the academic community as a storm without warning. Change within the institutions was not fast enough. Students began to revolt against the institutions themselves, and many came to refuse to accept the due process the institutions had set up to protect what can only be called academic

integrity. It is a tribute to the students and faculty at The Lindenwood Colleges that the extremes I am describing did not take place on this campus. There was no violence of any kind, and we were able to keep our heads and remain cool while we showed great concern about issues which divide us in many ways. I believe it was Clemenceau who said that democracy is a form of government in which people discipline themselves so they will not be disciplined by others. In a very real sense, The Lindenwood Colleges undertook self-discipline during 1969-70 so that it would not be necessary here to undertake any outside intervention to maintain order on this campus. But here, as elsewhere, there were a small number of students who were in revolt against society itself, and the Establishment in particular. These students have begun to identify our colleges and universities as instruments of the status quo. This conclusion may or may not be valid; I think it is not. The important thing is that it was the conclusion that colleges and universities served the status quo that radicalized some students in many cases.

Thus, it followed that if one was in revolt against the status quo, one was in revolt against the college itself.

The position of the colleges and universities would be precarious enough if they were caught in a revolution that was only political and economic in its context. We are caught in a great social revolution as well, a revolution which impacts on the most firmly established bulwarks of our society: the family, the church, sexual relations, commonly accepted goals and objectives. The revolution we are in sets sons and daughters against parents, against the life style of the parents, against ambitions and life objectives of parents.

Who would believe that the length of hair could divide as many sons from their fathers, as have been divided? Who could believe the style of clothing or the simple refusal to wear shoes could divide as many daughters from their mothers as have been divided? Who could believe that as many of us over thirty would look with displeasure and actual dislike on as many under twenty-one as we do, standing apart

from their music, looking with disdain on their heroes, reacting with bitterness to their attitudes about the society which we have built? And who would have dreamed, only a few years ago, that so many of the youth would come to dislike their parents, their homes, their communities, the basic institutions which provide our security and traditionally promote the general welfare? Who could have seen that the divorce rate would be as high or attendance at church as low as it has gone the last ten years? Who could have predicted that the largest gathering of human beings in the history of the world would take place in Woodstock, New York, at a rock festival, where a life style repugnant to most adults was loudly proclaimed by almost everyone present, and where almost everyone present was twenty-five or younger?

Perhaps there is no occupation in America which provides a greater vantage point than a college presidency to see the tension between son and father, daughter and mother, parents and children. In this kind of a revolution hearts are broken. In this kind of a revolution there is little room for love and compassion. Those who have gone to the extreme--on the side of the young, the hippies; and on the side of the parents, the inflexibly conservative and strict--what possibility is there that the same world can accommodate them both? The flower children, singing songs of love, have no flowers for parents and no love either. The rigid parent, transfixed by the life style of a son or daughter, hears nothing and sees nothing but the surface manifestations of a profound rebellion.

The Lindenwood Colleges, faced with this manifestation of student-parent conflict in some cases, did not follow the path that some colleges have followed, which is to recognize that today's student wishes to be totally divorced from parental control, and follow that recognition by failing to communicate in significant ways with parents. Certainly it's possible to recognize the growing independence of students. We do. Certainly it's possible that in the normal order of things students, in the age bracket of seventeen to twenty-two, see the world differently from their parents.

We know that. Certainly it's necessary to give students greater responsibility for their lives than they had when they lived at home. The Lindenwood Colleges give them this responsibility. But it seems to me, personally, that it's equally obvious that not all students are ready for total responsibility, nor is it a humane and responsible thing to sever the tie that binds a son or daughter with the parent by encouraging the son or daughter to disregard parental views. We have consistently tried to communicate fairly and honestly with parents, and we have tried to involve them in the life of the college as much as possible. Additional steps to do this are being planned, and it is hoped that through the Fathers Club and other organizations even greater levels of understanding between students and their parents can become part of the Lindenwood pattern.

But an annual report should not be a sermon or a sociological treatise, it should be a report on things that happened and things that one wants to happen. Where was Lindenwood College for Women during all this? What happened to Lindenwood College II in its first year of existence, in the midst of this revolution? Where were we?

The major mark of our existence in both colleges was diversity. Suddenly, as in a switch of channels on television, Lindenwood College for Women, which had changed gradually with the years and had embraced within its walls young women not exclusively but certainly primarily from similar backgrounds with common aspirations and certainly shared values for the most part--suddenly Lindenwood College for Women faced a large group of young men, looked around and saw black students in significant number, reacted to foreign students coming from Scandinavia and Peru, from Hong Kong and Beirut, from Thailand and Cypress.

Diversity hit us with a great impact because we found that we had become not just culturally diverse, but economically diverse; and we were rich and poor, from every social class and every economic level. In the freshman class there was a student who had published his first novel, and among the students there were transfers

from places as different as Pomona and the University of Missouri in St. Louis. Our diversity taught us that you cannot tell the true quality of a person by the length of hair or by matters of ordinary grooming. Phrases which had held us together, such as are found in the very liberal dress code at Lindenwood which says that here a young woman dresses appropriately for the occasion, came to have no meaning. We found ourselves no longer able to "define the social situation."

All these different young people began to do their different things, and we were not used to that. We had wanted diversity and had planned for it, but when it came we found that we were really not prepared for it. It's fair to report that over the course of the year a much broader and a much gentler understanding of individual rights and personal tastes developed. But still, our diversity and our new freedoms led to excesses. Broad-minded individuals who did not object to bare feet on the campus on a warm, sunny day found themselves "up tight" when bare feet appeared in the dining room and in the arcade of Roemer Hall. Fair-minded people who believed individuals should not be judged by the length of their hair suddenly found themselves in direct contact with a group of young people who possessed long hair and seemed to insist that it did have a meaning--that it was a badge of some kind, a token of an attitude about life.

When I began writing annual President's Reports I did not expect to be writing about bare feet or long hair, or the individual choice made by students of wearing apparel. It would be dishonest, however, to neglect to make the observation that a few things tied the college in a tighter knot than the impact of what could be called "the new life style" of some of our students on other students, some of the faculty, many of the administration, and certainly a lot of very vocal people in our town. My mail indicates real concern about the meaning of this new style, and that concern is from people who are not narrow-minded or intolerant. Reactions from town indicate vital interest in the meaning of this new phenomenon, and the people who express this interest are not more illiberal in their attitudes about

the "new life stylists" than the students who exercise this freedom at Lindenwood are about them. As students have gone to what some of us believe are extremes in their personal choice of apparel and in their appearance, it has become increasingly clear that this impacts on the ability of the college to attract other students who do not accept these styles and financial support from people who do not understand. The solution to the problems raised by the impact of what could be called a kind of youth culture on those of us who are older is to be measured in terms of support for the college at a time when support is vital to the life of the college. This is not a problem for the President, or for the Deans, or for the faculty in committee, it's a problem for this college community. It will only be solved by a very careful definition of the social situation here and by the fullest and most explicit explanation of what is expected of all of us here. The 1970-71 year will find us working together in the development of standards which permit us to exercise our freedom but restrict us within bounds that are acceptable to those who will recognize the importance of appropriate levels of self-discipline.

We moved through the year, with our new diversity, learning a great deal about the social revolution which is sweeping the country and questioning almost every generalization that anybody can make about today's situation.

If we were diverse, we were also tense. Lindenwood suddenly decided it should free itself of social inhibitions and restrictions as it has freed itself of traditional academic inhibitions and restrictions. If our curriculum could be loosened up and made modern, why could not our social regulations? Suddenly, the administration found itself under pressure from many directions. Remove the residence hall hours, change the sign-in rules, and eventually by late fall we were faced with the problem of dormitory intervisitation.

After weeks of discussion, debate, and a great deal of give and take, the intervisitation problem came to a head in the President's lap, so to speak. He decided that he ought to close the discussion. A very careful position paper was prepared,

and intervisitation was ruled out for the rest of the 1969-70 year and for 1970-71.

The President's action was not popular on campus, although there were many students who did not agree with him who were pleased to see a decision made because they were tired of the debate and the argument. It was the President's judgment, and that of his administrative colleagues, that a liberal policy of intervisitation in the residence halls of Lindenwood would lose a great deal of the financial support now coming to the college at a time when we could not afford the loss, would irritate a great many parents who had chosen Lindenwood because it was not as liberal socially as state universities, and would invade almost the last sanctuary the young women at Lindenwood College have--their residence hall rooms. But perhaps his most impelling conclusion was the deep feeling that intervisitation stacked the cards against a young woman who did not wish to accept the new social situation that is fast becoming the dominant aspect of student life on many campuses.

If we were diverse and tense, there was a certain additional intensity to be found in the academic program. Lindenwood, in the 1969-70 year, possessed a good faculty made better by several years of successful recruiting of new faculty. New levels of ambition began to be felt in mathematics and biology, where new faculty leadership raised the sights of everyone. The new science building aided and abetted these high ambitions, and vigorous encouragement by members of the faculty led students to engage in research. The year saw academic accomplishment that was truly remarkable. Two students had articles published in the Journal of Physical Chemistry and the Journal of Nuclear Medicine, journals in which student publications are not often found. One could see a matching growth in the creative arts, where the outstanding effect of the new fine arts building, compiled with new approaches to curriculum and teaching, paid rich rewards. In painting and print-making, in creative writing and broadcasting, new levels of accomplishment were achieved.

ough St. Charles to the County Court House when the N...
served in October. Our students acted in absolute decorum and followed the advice

The January term saw new peaks of excellence reached in terms of independent study and special courses that would not normally be offered at Lindenwood. This new academic intensity is recognized by all of us, but particularly the students. While they may be very critical of the administration, or the character of the social life, they almost invariably speak with high praise of the quality of the faculty and the standards which the faculty has imposed on students in recent years.

Reporting these academic accomplishments is not enough, for it is our business to see that they are understood and supported by the many friends of The Colleges. We have invested considerable sums of money in the Communication Arts program, in the Mathematics Center, and in the new fine arts and music programs. During the coming year we must make these programs more widely known. We must take additional steps to strengthen what we are already doing very well in these areas. At The Lindenwood Colleges we have become aware of the fact that there is an approach to the education of the exceptionally creative person that is different from the approach one must make to the education of an individual whose skills are more verbal or more mathematical. Standard aptitude tests and rank in class for high school students tells nothing about the level of artistic creativity. We are aware of this and intend to direct our attention to the development of an atmosphere which encourages and nourishes creativity.

1969-70 was also a period in which many of our students demonstrated levels of concern about problems external to the campus, but internal to their very being. The continuation of the war in Vietnam, which for a large majority of young people is a wrong war, became a marked feature of the lives of many students on this campus. Perhaps it was the influx of one hundred and eighteen young men that brought this concern. Certainly the previous year did not see the kind of interest and awareness that possessed us this year. For the first time there was a Lindenwood student march through St. Charles to the County Court House when the Moratorium was observed in October. Our students acted in absolute decorum and followed the advice

of the St. Charles Police Department as to how they should march and what they should do. Some people in St. Charles saw this as a sign of life and vitality; others, looking at the new kind of student at Lindenwood, saw it as an alarming demonstration of a life style that was not to them acceptable.

We were affected during the course of the year by the women's liberation movement, by the great new interest in ecology, and we had our own Earth Day celebrations. Speakers on the campus came from every direction, including some very radical and, in my judgment, irresponsible speakers. But the college policy, that our students have the right to hear any speaker who is properly registered and sponsored, put to the test proved valid. No one was shouted off the platform here, although some speakers certainly did not reflect majority opinion. No one was denied access to the college audience here, although it is clear that not all shades of opinion were represented in the selection of speakers. We remained, in this era of concern, a free place, not willing to be used by any group in a way that would expend our resources and make them unavailable next year and the year following for other groups who may have different opinions.

We ended the year with an outburst of concern over the decision by President Nixon to extend our military operations in Southeast Asia into Cambodia. I was proud of The Lindenwood Colleges on Monday, May 11, when all day long our faculty and students busied themselves in the most intensive kind of discussion and declared themselves in the most honest and open way as to their feelings about the new foreign policy, about the tragedy that had occurred at Kent State, and about the strong issues that divide us nationally.

Almost before we could get our breath, the black students at Lindenwood, representing just under six percent of our student body, chose to express their deep-felt feelings about the college and what we had done for them and to them. They made a series of demands which came under intensive discussion. The black students dramatized their position by refusing to leave our library during the

several days of negotiations and talk.

This intense concern on the part of our students for the world in which they are going to spend their lives is a matter of vital importance if we are to be a college that is not out of step with the urgency of our times. Let's listen to our students; we must aid and abet them in their expression of concern; and we must concede that their criticism of our institutions, and even our value system, has its merit. But we will not be fulfilling our responsibility as educators if we agree with things that we know are based on premature or superficial evaluation. Human beings listen and respond, and we have the obligation to respond to our students with reaction, honest and intense, when the times require it.

We have tested the nature of our freedom here by bringing a great number of speakers who have presented positions that are extremely critical of almost every aspect of our society. We must now show some concern for balance and depth in terms of the forum we present for views on the campus. It is to be hoped that in the coming year the various committees here which are involved in the development of our lectures and convocations will give regard to the fact that there are many in our society who believe that some of our institutions, built laboriously over the years at great sacrifice, should be changed only with great care and caution so that the contributions they make to us as free individuals can be maintained and prolonged. What I am saying, and what I am advocating, is simple. My understanding of the student generation is that it wishes to be heard, and we must listen carefully. But to hear is not necessarily to agree, and to treat people with respect is not to pretend that one agrees in the face of profound disagreement. What I hope for at The Lindenwood Colleges is a climate of give and take, within the bounds of respect, that has action and reaction flowing in all directions with no one preempting the institution for his particular points of view.

One could quickly say that all of this was merely part of being involved in the great crisis in American life which marked the 1969-70 academic year. One can

say that all of this simply proves the validity of the vital academic program at Lindenwood and the broad and intensive effort we have made to bring students of many kinds into our relatively small student body. One could say, as a member of our faculty does frequently, that we proved we were alive in 1969-70. We were alive, and we were bothering some people.

We were bothering, particularly, people in our community who had looked upon Lindenwood as a relatively quiet, dignified and serene place, where education took place in the classroom and the students behaved themselves, at least in public. The Lindenwood Colleges, as any educational institution, have extensive interrelationships with the community. We are dependent for police and fire protection on St. Charles; and our students, of course, are found in the stores and on the streets of the town. The town surrounds us, and our newspaper is read by many. Several hundred St. Charles people are contributors on an annual basis to the college; and they look at us, I hope proudly, as a place that they support voluntarily. The diversity, the social tension, the new life styles, particularly the political and social concern that marked our student body during 1969-70, brought the college to the town in new ways.

On the advice of many of our good friends, we undertook an extensive program of explanation, designed to bring about better understanding of our students and the nature of our academic community. Perhaps never in the history of the relationship between the college and the town has there been as much exchange of opinion in both directions, with students and a few faculty saying what they thought of the town, and the townspeople saying what they thought of the college in ways which the President tried to modify. Fortunately for him, some students understood the crisis in town-gown relations, and particularly the editor of our student newspaper undertook to improve the communications both ways.

If we began to bother the town, we also disturbed some of our alumnae. I can appreciate their concern. As an alumnus of Princeton, I am furious when I return

and see what they have done there in the last few years. There are girls all about, and it's hard to see how they have been able to fill Princeton with men who do not look like Princeton men.

The same phenomenon takes place at Lindenwood when the alumna returns. She may have yearned to run barefoot across campus when she was here, and she may have stormed because the administration did not permit it. But now she fumes because the administration does not stop it. And she may have known when she was here that something had to be done about the problem of bringing men into the environment, but now she looks at what has been done and decides that these men do not look like Betas she used to date twenty years ago.

One of the problems in alumnae relations here is the fact that for many years the college did not solicit alumnae support in a vigorous way. With an excellent physical plant and a level of endowment that surpasses most other institutions in this part of the country, Lindenwood did not present itself as a place that needed financial support. Those days are over. We now grant very heavy financial aid to a significant portion of our student body; we have an outstanding Mathematics Center; our Communication Arts Department requires a kind of equipment not formerly known to the college, including an active and important FM radio station, KCLC*FM. A computer purrs away in the new science building where there is opportunity for independent student research. All these things are costly, and there is no escaping the fact that Lindenwood must raise something in the area of \$200,000 to \$300,000 a year to meet operational costs in the years immediately ahead. Certainly a portion of this must come from those who know us best and have the deepest attachment to us: the alumnae of the parent college.

We must do a more effective job of communicating with our alumnae. In order to accomplish this we must make the concept of the coordinate college understood by alumnae, for we chose the coordinate plan of creating two colleges, with all the cumbersomeness and complexities involved, in an effort to maintain the integrity of

Lindenwood College for Women. If Lindenwood College for Women is in any way threatened by the very rapid growth of Lindenwood College II, a growth that far exceeds our expectations, it is all the more necessary for those who believe in the woman's college to support it vigorously now by giving it their financial support and by recommending it to young women who would benefit from its academic program. We have, in every sense, maintained the academic, the fiscal, and the legal integrity of Lindenwood College for Women. The college deserves the support of its graduates more than ever before.

The fact that the two colleges share facilities and faculty does not mean that they are the same, as can be quickly proved by talking to the student government leaders of the two colleges, or looking at the academic programs of the two colleges, or talking with the deans of the two institutions about the plans they have for the student bodies enrolled in each.

The college that is bothering people finds it very difficult to raise money. The 1969-70 year was one of serious deficit at The Lindenwood Colleges. Decline in the stock market impacted negatively on our investments; the cost of everything--labor, supplies, equipment, travel--increased drastically. Our new physical plant adds thousands of square feet of additional space to be maintained, heated and lit. And while our total enrollment was up, and our freshman class was larger than the previous year, 1969-70 still saw us with unused capacity at The Lindenwood Colleges. Therefore, we had less income than was budgeted.

Earlier we had gone ahead vigorously, building new buildings, enlarging the library, building the science building and the fine arts building, creating additional capacity at a time when the market for the private college was shrinking everywhere. A recent survey indicates that, with the exception of recreational and physical education facilities, The Lindenwood Colleges now have adequate physical plant in terms of laboratories, classrooms, library, and other academic facilities, for slightly more than twice the number of students that we have enrolled. Fortunately

for us, at the moment, our applications are running ahead of last year at this same time. We are one of the few colleges for which this is true. Present indications are that our retention of students will be improved. This combination means that there will be an increase in the size of the student body in the fall of 1970-71, but it will not be a great increase, and there will be resources that will be under utilized. This means that we function somewhat uneconomically, and every effort is being made to more widely distribute information about The Lindenwood Colleges so that we can put this magnificent physical plant to its best use.

The President is charged with fund-raising responsibility ultimately, and it's clear that a great part of his time should be in the field winning financial support for the institution. The tensions I have described make this task difficult. You cannot be negotiating with the black students and raising additional funds for them at the same time. You cannot be determinedly arranging for implementation of the free speech policy that Lindenwood has on its campus without offending some people who are traditional supporters of the college. The President cannot be under pressure for three weeks during which students are demanding intervisitation rights and be visiting the New York foundations at the same time. Nor can a president accept the fund-raising responsibility alone. He needs the help of his associates, and particularly the help of this Board. ~~Now. We are a private institution, and as~~

This report should not close without particular reference to the outstanding support we have received from the St. Charles community. We are raising more from our friends in St. Charles, including our own staff and faculty; more than ever before from corporate and foundation sources. If we have succeeded in securing additional financial support from St. Charles, it is because those who know the college well from our small city have worked as never before to gain us this new support. The Chairman of this year's campaign, Mr. Boyle Rodes, has done a great service for the college; and the Chairman of the campaign for the last several years, Mr. James Fitz, has continued to work this year with his usual energy and enthusiasm.

It has brought us a very significantly increased level of financial support, but it has also given the President and the members of the Boards of the two colleges a kind of encouragement that we needed in a difficult year.

We need to establish strong and vigorous Committees of Development for the two Boards that will work with the President in winning additional support for the two colleges from every source.

In the planning that has taken place here over the four years, certain things have fallen into place; and we are no longer in any sense an experimental institution. The college went on the 4-1-4 calendar when to do so was truly an innovation; but that calendar is now a tried and true part of our life here. We began to give certain kinds of emphasis to the January term at a time when there were few examples for us to follow, but now we provide an example for others to follow. The college did away with extensive requirements in general education and made it possible for students to tailor-make an educational program at a time when this was quite unusual. Our emphasis on independent study and on overseas and off-campus study--new to us three years ago--is now a working part of the Lindenwood approach to higher education. We said at Lindenwood in October of 1966 that we must so define our goals and objectives that those who believe in us would support us and those who did not, would not. We must reiterate that position. We are a private institution, and as a private institution we must be able to clarify our role in higher education so clearly that people will pay the tuition that we charge and know exactly what they are getting for it.

As a private college, we have a right to be, in a sense, exclusive. I am not advocating exclusiveness in a social sense--to be educationally viable we need all kinds of people here. I am not advocating exclusiveness in an economic sense; we could hardly do our educational job if we were all rich or all terribly poor. The college is a place in which people from different backgrounds can blend as long as they are willing to abide by the basic goals and objectives of the institution.

itself. Our exclusiveness then resides in the fact that we have the right to exclude those who do not respect the kind of academic freedom which makes a liberal arts college viable and effective. We have the right to exclude those who are not interested in learning, but are merely looking for a hideaway from the draft, or from the real world, or from a society they have come to abhor and believe cannot be changed. We have the right to exclude those who would undertake to transform us into an imitation university or a political or social action society. The resources of The Lindenwood Colleges have been put together over a hundred and forty years for educational purposes; and they have, and deserve, tax exemption for that reason. We cannot devote them to political action without threatening that exemption, nor can we devote our institutional resources and time to political action in ways which fundamentally interfere with the organized process of learning which must, in the long run, prevail at a liberal arts college.

We often hear young and harsh voices renouncing Lindenwood in years past as a finishing school. These same young people would now, in many cases, transform Lindenwood into a place for shouting and pushing, rather than a place for studying and learning, a place where the quick conclusion and the devastating phrase are enshrined rather than words of logic and reason. It has been many, many years since Lindenwood deserves to be called a finishing school; and I hope it will never be finished as a school--for it is a school, a place to learn, that we are and must be.

Where do we go from here? Is it not clear that we must seek students who believe in the liberal arts and will respect the college as a free place in which freedom to learn protects itself? I believe we have such students now. The philosophy of Lindenwood College for Women, where we are dedicated to the idea that there are special and different things that can be done to educate young women for the years ahead, must be widely known. The President cannot do it, but he must do much of it. The Dean of Lindenwood College for Women cannot do it, but she must do much of it. Members of the Board of the College must make it their business to understand what

we are trying to do in the college and join us in an effort to make the college program better known.

We must bring our finances into line with reality. I believe there was justification for the deficits we have had. We did not overspend seriously in budgeted items; we invested money in a turnaround which we knew would be costly. We must reduce our expenditures, and I regret to say that it is clear that we cannot maintain the level of financial aid we have been granting for the last three or four years. The projected deficit is almost exactly equal to the total given in financial aid in 1969-70. The Finance Committee of the Board has agreed to work with the administration during the course of the summer to find new sources of financial support, to look very hard at all areas of the budget that are not frozen by contract, including the costs of maintenance of our facilities, and to review investment policy which is a troublesome problem in times of economic shifts as significant as those that are now taking place in the stock market. This is to say that we do not accept the thought that we can afford another deficit of \$300,000 in the year following one in which the deficit has been over half a million. I welcome the decision of the Finance Committee to work with us in doing something about that.

We must not only raise more money for current expenses, but we must raise money for capital purposes. Our construction program over the last several years has taken close to a million dollars out of our reserves. This million dollars is not bringing income to the college, but indeed has been devoted to the erection of buildings which now add to the costs of maintenance in the college. It must be replaced, and we must undertake a vigorous campaign for capital purposes, including additional funds for endowment. It is my hope that this Board will take the step I have long advocated of increasing its size. To mount the committees we need, including the strengthening of the Finance Committee and the Development Committee, will require us to bring into our midst a significant number of new people who believe in this college.

Within a matter of days, the steps we have long planned to create a coordinating Board, comprised of three members from this Board and three members from the College II Board, will be consummated by the granting of a charter to The Lindenwood Colleges in Jefferson City by the Secretary of State of Missouri. This action follows the approach that has been taken with the North Central Association in lodging accreditation for our two colleges in a coordinating legal entity. The Board of The Lindenwood Colleges will have as its primary function the coordination of the efforts of our two institutions. It will in effect serve as if it were a joint executive committee.

The most important thing we must do is clarify our understanding of the exceptional academic program that has become part of the life at The Lindenwood Colleges, so that each of us, members of the Boards, members of the administration, the faculty, and our students, can give answers to the simple question, "What is it that we do at The Lindenwood Colleges that justifies the expenditure of over \$3,000 each year by the parents of our students, and by those students who are self-supporting?" It is the vital question which we must answer if we are to survive. The money will come if we can answer this question; students will come if we can answer this question; new Board members will come if we can answer it. Anything else we need will be here.

We have determined that the present academic or teaching facilities can accommodate at least twice as many students as are presently attending the College. This substantial increase to a 1200-1400 student enrollment will be possible by means of greater time efficiency of space utilization along with a slight increase in the average class size.