Thirty-Two Years at Wayne State University:
A Long and Varied Career Revisited

by

Martin M. Herman

The “Mémoire: that follows is the original version of a chapter that appeared in *Reminiscnces of Wayne,* edited by Henry V. Bohm and Paul J. Pentecost, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Cushing-Malloy, 1999, pp. 96–119. The published version, approximately 30% shorter than the original, was revised and shortened by me at the request of the editors.

Biographical Sketch:

Martin Herman’s academic career began in the fall 1955, when he was appointed to the music faculty of Colorado College. In 1959, he left Colorado College to finish his PhD, interrupted in 1952 when he was drafted out of a doctoral program during the Korean War. After completing his graduate studies and following a Fulbright Research Grant in Paris, he joined Monteith College’s Division of Humanistic Studies in fall 1962. In 1969, he became Chair of Humanistic Studies, and from 1976–81, while still Chair of Humanistic Studies, simultaneously served as Acting Dean of Monteith, unhappily overseeing the phase-out of the College. In 1976, he was appointed Chair of the Humanities Department in Wayne State’s College of Liberal Arts, serving in that position until 1992. From 1984 until 1987, and again, from 1992–93, he concurrently served as an Associate Dean of Liberal Arts. During 1987–88 and 1993–94, he held the position of Acting Director and Interim Director, respectively, in the University‘s Cohn-Haddow Center for Judaic Studies. He retired in May 1994 and is currently active as a member of both the faculty and steering committee of the Society of Active Retirees (SOAR), Wayne State’s highly successful outreach program to the retired community.

© COPYRIGHT BY MARTIN M. HERMAN 1996,2007
All Rights Reserved

(Revised Draft: April, 1996)

Introduction

A preoccupation with general education is the common thread that weaves its way through the many strands of my long and varied career at Wayne State University. For more than three decades (1962–94), theorizing about general education and implementing general-education programs became so deeply embedded in the fabric of my professional life that virtually every task that I undertook (or was asked to undertake) was somehow or other related to that subject.

Welcome to Wayne State: January 1962

During the winter of 1962, I was living in Long Beach, New York, an upper middle-class (close-in) suburb of New York City, teaching vocal/choral music to a student body of high-achieving and musically-gifted elementary-school youngsters. I had returned to the States in the fall of 1961, following a year spent in Paris as a Fulbright Research Fellow, determined to seek a position in one of the innovative general-education programs then being developed and implemented at several of the country's more adventuresome colleges and universities. Trained as a musicologist at Yale and the University of Michigan, I had genuinely enjoyed my first position as an academic—a four-year appointment (1955–59) to the music faculty of Colorado College. That faculty, a gifted group of musicians and scholars, had created a multi-faceted (but professionally-oriented) music program for one of America's finest liberal-arts colleges; over time, however, I had grown disenchanted trying to teach aspiring performers and composers something about the "art of music"--not simply the "technique of music"--and made up my mind to seek a position in which I could deal with music less vocationally, more in the context of interdisciplinary humanistic studies and comparative arts. This "new direction," if such it were, did not signal a major change of attitude on my part; it simply reaffirmed a point of view to which I had long subscribed. As an undergraduate at the College of William and Mary, I had majored in Fine Arts and English, not music, for my interests (even my musical interests) were always more broadly-based than a strictly disciplinary approach to music was capable of accommodating.

In early January of 1962, while recuperating from the mumps, of all things, I received a telephone call from Woodburn (Woody) Ross, Director of Monteith College, regarding a position available that September on the team-teaching faculty of the College's Division of Humanistic Studies. At the time, I knew nothing of Monteith's experimental curriculum in general education. When its basic goals and design were explained to me, I immediately recognized how closely the College's philosophy paralleled my own and readily agreed to come to Detroit for an interview. Left to my own devices, it probably would never have occurred to me to apply for a position at Monteith. I became a candidate only because Woody Ross had heard about me and learned of my interests from several mutual acquaintances.

January 19, 1962, the date of my job interview, dawned cold and bleak. The stormy flight from New York to Detroit remains etched in memory as· the most turbulent I have ever experienced. I

was met at the airport by Jerry Maddox, an artist on Monteith's faculty of Humanistic Studies, and we drove to the University in his Citroen deux chevaux, an automobile resembling a sardine can powered by a rubber-band motor. This vehicle, familiar to me as an inexpensive means of basic transportation popular in France during the 1950s and 60s, was rarely imported into the United States during those years: it did not meet American safety standards and required substantial modification before it could even be licensed in this country. Furthermore, European and Japanese imports--particularly those of its ilk--were an anathema to Detroit, the "real" automotive capital of America and the world. Since I had spent the previous year in France, and since the French beret that I wore identified me as "candidate of the day," favorable omens seemed to be proliferating.

The interview went well. It included a series of lively meetings with several different groups of Monteith faculty members, a quick but intense indoctrination in Monteith philosophy, an extended lunch--provocatively punctuated by the type of barbed banter which I rightly recognized as a harbinger of things to come, a post-lunch tour of the campus, and a late afternoon meeting at which I was offered and accepted the position. Can anyone imagine something like that happening at the Wayne State of today? In light of current University policies dealing with faculty recruitment and appointment, it is impossible to conceive of a candidate arriving for an initial interview one morning and leaving that evening with a signed contract in hand. But that's precisely how it happened in January of 1962. Happily, the weather improved as the day wore on, and the return flight was serene and uneventful.

On Saturday January 20th, the day following my return to New York, I received a letter (dated January 17th) from Jack Bryden, then Chairman of the Humanities Department in Wayne State's College of Liberal Arts. After introducing himself and explaining that he had heard about me from Louise Cuyler and Bob Warner, both faculty members at the University of Michigan, he described his department's interdisciplinary curriculum and offered me a one-year replacement position beginning the following September. The letter both perplexed and amused me. While I was reasonably certain that member colleges of Wayne State acted independently when making faculty appointments, I was not at all clear (then) about how the Division of Humanistic Studies in Monteith College differed from the Department of Humanities in the College of Liberal Arts, a distinction that can be extremely confusing--particularly to a neophyte: both units were principally concerned with integrated and comparative approaches to the humanistic disciplines and arts. In responding to Bryden's offer (my letter of January 21st), I confessed bewilderment and explained that the position which he described seemed so similar to the one that I had just accepted that to me it appeared possible both were one and the same. Shortly thereafter (on January 29th), Bryden wrote and clarified the situation. Subsequently, Jack Bryden and I became good friends, and we enjoyed many a chuckle reminiscing about this unusual exchange of letters. In retrospect, it is ironic to note how history succeeded in rounding the circle. I did, in fact, become chair of the Humanities Department in September of 1976 and held that position until September of 1992. During four of those seventeen years, I concurrently served as an associate dean of Liberal Arts.

Monteith College (1958–81): Concept and Design

Interestingly, and somewhat surprisingly, both the conceptual and organizational antecedents of Monteith College are firmly rooted in the College of Liberal Arts. In the mid 1950s, the Dean of Liberal Arts (Victor Rapport) appointed a "philosophically balanced" ad hoc faculty committee to

review the College's group requirements and to recommend changes which might improve its general-education program. (During the mid-1950s, general education had once again become the subject of an intense national debate, an elaborate exercise in philosophical soul-searching characteristic of the way in which undergraduate education periodically subjects itself to self scrutiny and peer review.) The modest reforms proposed by the ad hoc committee were rejected as too "radical" by an extremely conservative College faculty. The disappointed Dean appointed a second committee, this one with a definite point of view and a specific agenda: The second committee conceived, designed, and proposed a comprehensive program of general education that went far beyond anything envisaged by the initial committee. It too was rejected. But much of that program, subsequently expanded and recast into a coherent curriculum; provided the foundation for a fully-developed proposal ("An Experimental College at Wayne State University," the so-called "Gray Document") which was submitted to the Ford Foundation for funding. In 1958, Monteith College became a reality when the Ford Foundation awarded Wayne State $700,000 to implement its plan for a cluster college dedicated to experimentation in general education. Students were recruited and admitted to the College, and the first Monteith class was convened in September of 1959.

Concept

Monteith College sought to combine a number of different objectives: (1) Its general-education program was designed to identify and impart *coherently* that body of knowledge and those intellectual skills (analysis, criticism/interpretation, and evaluation) that every educated person should command. (2) It was to be kept small in size—a maximum of 1,200 students—and its ethos would be that of a liberal-arts college, the type of institution that promotes interaction (student-student and student-faculty), fosters a sense of community, heightens the pleasure of assimilating knowledge, and encourages the pursuit of new ideas. (3) Its objective was to complement, not to replicate, traditional academic departments and specialized research institutes. (4) Its students would be encouraged to take full advantage of the services, physical facilities, disciplinary diversity, and opportunities for professional training available at the great urban university in which they were enrolled. (5) It was not to be an honors college—its student body would be a cross section of Wayne State's student body-and any student eligible for admission to the University could enroll in Monteith (if he or she so chose) on a first-come first-served basis. (6) Its faculty members were to be organized in academically-related divisions, not traditional disciplinary departments, and would be expected to commit themselves fully to the special demands of the Monteith curriculum: all of their time and energy were to be devoted to undergraduate general education; they were to team-teach with their divisional colleagues; they were to become well-rounded and sophisticated generalists; they would focus their scholarly efforts on interdisciplinary and comparative research—including pedagogical research—in addition to more discipline-based and specialized research; and they would work closely with their students. (7) Faculty rewards—promotion and tenure recommendations, selective salary increases, special recognition, etc.--were to be directly related to these expectations.

The Monteith concept challenged a number of higher education's assumed but unproven verities: (1) that large universities were inherently impersonal; (2) that undergraduates were intellectually ill-equipped to deal with interdisciplinary concepts or to perform well in small seminars and tutorials until they were at least juniors; (3) that general education was "something to be gotten out of the way quickly" so that "more important and more relevant" specialized studies could begin; (4) that general education consisted of sampling widely from a broad range of introductory-level courses in the traditional academic disciplines and was only marginally related

to the needs of specialists and professionals; (5) that large universities were inherently rigid and, consequently, incapable of innovating or adapting to new ideas and changing conditions; and (6) that an excellent liberal-arts education was available only to the affluent, only to those who could afford the cost of attending a private college or university.

Design

The Monteith curriculum was designed and organized to embody and foster these concepts. Its aim was to demonstrate how curricular structures could promote a sense of community, in a nontraditional student body of commuters, and create an atmosphere in which the free exchange of ideas was encouraged. (1) The general-education program, the core of the College's curriculum, consisted of a coherent series of year-long to two-year long basic course sequences--one each in Natural Science, Science of Society, and Humanistic Studies, and later, one in Socio-Humanistic Studies—plus a senior colloquium and a senior essay, the entire program constituting approximately half of the course work required of all Monteith students to satisfy their undergraduate degree requirements; the other half was left free for advanced study in Monteith or for fulfilling the requirements of any major or pre-professional curriculum offered elsewhere in the University. (2) The faculty, representing all of the traditional disciplines, was not organized along conventional departmental/disciplinary lines but was grouped into three academically-related divisions, each responsible for one of the three basic course sequences. (3) The basic course sequences were not simply surveys of the traditional disciplines; they were, rather, carefully crafted and integrated structures which did, in fact, impart a basic body of knowledge but did so while focusing primary attention on issues that transcended disciplinary boundaries. In addition to transmitting information, they sought to engender a spirit of inquiry and develop an understanding of how related disciplines may be interconnected. (4) The pedagogy was basically lecture-discussion: hence, each student was exposed to every member of the College faculty, and all members of each divisional faculty (working as teams) planned, gave lectures, led discussion sections, and evaluated their joint efforts. (5) Students, beginning in their first year, were taught—for the most part—in small discussion groups where emphasis was placed on acquiring the ability to formulate ideas and developing the capacity to communicate them—clearly and effectively, orally and in writing—to themselves, to their peers, and to their instructors, As one veteran Monteith faculty member put it: "We want our students to look at the world whole, but without missing the details."

In short, Monteith College attempted to combine the advantages of a small liberal-arts college with those of a comprehensive research university, particularly one located in an urban setting. It aimed to help its students understand themselves and their environment, make sound and ethical decisions, digest and manipulate information, and comprehend the consequences of their actions. It encouraged them to articulate their beliefs, cope with an exploding body of knowledge, tolerate life's inherent ambiguities, live humanely, and act wisely.

Welcome to Detroit: August, 1962

I arrived in Detroit during August of 1962 and almost immediately became aware of an intense local controversy, a heated debate raging about a 32-inch bronze statue entitled "Sunglitter" that Carl Milles had executed in approximately 1920. In the late 1950s, soon after Milles had died, the Detroit Institute of Arts commissioned a cast of the work (somewhat larger than the original) to be presented as the Institute's gift to Cobo Hall, Detroit's new civic center. (A work by Milles was deemed particularly appropriate because the renowned Swedish sculptor had served as resident

artist at Cranbrook from 1931 to 1950.) The newspaper accounts of the incident, as I recall, described in some detail how a City Councilman named Van Antwerp, and others who shared his views, had been offended by Milles' "graphic" portrayal of "a nude woman astride a whale" and had declared the statue pornographic. While the issue of the gift's acceptability was being debated, "Sunglitter" had been temporarily banished to the campus of Wayne State University—apparently on the grounds that faculty and student morals were so inherently corrupt that one additional bit of pornography could do little harm.

The story piqued my curiosity, and I went to see "Sunglitter" for myself. (She had been temporarily installed in the sculpture court that abuts the Community Arts building, the lovely sunken garden directly across from the College of Education.) I studied the work closely, carefully comparing what I saw with the press accounts that I had read. Subsequently, I wrote a letter to the *Detroit Free Press* reporting the results of my investigation. I expressed satisfaction that Councilman Van Antwerp indeed knew what a nude woman looked like, but registered concern because he apparently didn't know what a whale looked like. "Sunglitter," you see, was seated on a dolphin.

Alas, the letter was never published. But that was neither the first nor the last time that a piece submitted by me for publication has failed to appear' in print. The DIA's proposed gift to the city was "officially" rejected, but "Sunglitter," now ensconced outside the cocktail lounge on the first floor of Cobo Hall, may today be admired for what she is: an elegant and graceful work crafted by one of our century's most gifted and celebrated sculptors.

The Making of a Monteith Faculty Member: 1962–69

Not unexpectedly, my life as a Monteith faculty member turned out to be substantially different from the life I had experienced as a faculty member in a more traditional academic setting. The intellectual demands associated with designing and implementing a sequence of five (quarter) courses in which all of the humanistic disciplines and arts were integrated; and the social demands imposed by the College's team-teaching pedagogy, were substantial. Three to five hours a week were routinely set aside for curriculum planning and course development. A great deal of animated discussion took place during these planning sessions as faculty members, each trained in one or another of the humanistic disciplines or arts, grappled simultaneously with several different problems: (1) precisely what subject matter should be included in a coherent five-course sequence of humanistic studies, a sequence that would extend through two thirds of the sophomore year' and the entire junior year for all Monteith students, but a sequence that itself was only one segment of a carefully-planned and closely-articulated program of general education; (2) how might the selected subject matter best be organized, course by course; and (3) how might faculty responsibilities best be divided and assigned in a pedagogical system based on a lecture-discussion format?

As the musicologist on the faculty, my principal responsibility as a curriculum planner was to conceive and propose ways in which music could best contribute to the agreed-upon goals of the overall sequence. As a teacher, my primary task was to offer the lectures and presentations devoted to music in each of the courses. This was not a simple matter: lectures had to be carefully planned and suitably tailored to address a particular set of issues in a specified number of class meetings, One could not dawdle and fall behind. All lecture periods were assigned, and there was simply no way to "catch up" as there is when teaching alone. The team-teaching arrangement did, in fact, impose a special kind of discipline, and faculty participants were expected to

shape their contributions in two different ways: (1) every lecture or set of lectures had to be self-contained; and (2) every lecture or set of lectures had to address the agreed-upon objectives of course and sequence.

The time devoted to curriculum planning, the hours spent listening to colleagues lecture, and the effort expended in preparing and leading discussion sections—particularly in subject areas other than those in which one was professionally trained—yielded a gratifying but unexpected dividend: an extremely collegial and well-educated faculty. But the team-teaching format also yielded a less desirable by-product: the tendency to indulge in one-upmanship. With the entire divisional faculty in attendance at all lectures, it was difficult to resist the temptation of addressing one's colleagues rather than one's students. We had to remind ourselves frequently that the objective was to teach our students, not to impress or outdo each other. In short, the fashioning of a good Monteith faculty member was a long and arduous process, one that required considerable time and effort, but one that yielded rich intellectual rewards. Faculty members who accepted the challenge fully (not all did) became versatile and well-rounded academics. Both they and their students profited immensely from the give-and-take of an educational system in which all were joint participants:

But the commitment expected of Monteith faculty members extended beyond the demands of teaching the College curriculum and remaining productively engaged in scholarly activity. From its inception, Monteith had become a focal point (something of a laboratory) for all interested .in studying and assessing experimental programs in general education, and visitors from across the country and around the world—individually and in groups—arrived with increasing frequency to see how the College was faring. Meeting these visitors and explaining the Monteith program to them became an additional responsibility that the faculty was expected to assume. And it was a demanding task. Articles and books about Monteith began to appear in growing numbers—particularly after the Ford Foundation Grant ended (1963) and the University agreed to continue Monteith on an ongoing basis—and researchers interested in studying the Monteith program arrived in increasing numbers.

In the late winter of 1966, for example, the State Department had arranged for a touring group of several dozen college principals from India and Nepal to visit Monteith—for an extended period of time—and to study its curriculum in some detail. The delegation arrived from Southern California on a sunny but blustery morning typical of early spring in Michigan. The thermometer hovered in the low twenties and several inches of snow lay on the ground as a shivering group of dignified but lightly-dressed and sandal-shod men and women deplaned. Of necessity, the first order of business became a trip to Hudson's where coats, sweaters, scarves, and overshoes were purchased for all who needed them. Thus fortified against the elements, our visitors could better concentrate on general education, the subject they were investigating during a six-month tour of the country. Following an initial orientation period; during which all of the visitors met the entire Monteith faculty and had the College curriculum explained to them, members of the group were encouraged to identify a particular faculty member, one whose interests dovetailed with theirs, and to remain with that faculty member for the better part of a month. A congenial group of three attached themselves to me: one (Mr. Rubin) was the only Christian in the delegation; the second (Mr. Shrinivassan) was the principal of India's only communist university; and the third (Mrs. Murthy), from Nepal, was one of only three women in the group.

The Making of a Monteith Administrator: 1969–81 and Beyond

Life as a member of the Monteith faculty proved rich and rewarding. Divisional activities were lively, and the course sequences developed and taught under the leadership of Woody Ross, who served as Chair of Humanistic Studies as well as Director of Monteith from 1962 to 1964, and Sara Leopold, who succeeded him as Chair of the Division and served in that capacity from 1964 to 1969, went well and seemed to improve as experience accrued. I enjoyed the excitement of non-stop curriculum planning and found the intellectual climate of the College stimulating. My colleagues in Humanistic Studies, a hard-working and congenial group of academics, were all fully engaged in the Monteith enterprise, as were most of the students enrolled in our courses.
Consequently, I was surprised in the spring of 1969 when Woody, now Dean of Monteith, asked me to assume the chair of Humanistic Studies starting that fall. (Despite notable success, Sara Leopold had made it abundantly clear that she wished to return to the faculty and was not interested in continuing as chair.) His request caught me by surprise. I had never thought of myself as an administrator and, when offered the opportunity to become one, was less than certain that the role suited me. Sensing my reluctance, Woody tried to persuade me by pointing out that he had consulted all of my colleagues and that I was their unanimous choice to succeed Sara. I finally agreed, but not without first expressing serious reservations. I told him that I considered myself principally a faculty member—not an administrator—and, if we ever had a serious disagreement, would not hesitate to remind him of that fact.

With such an attitude, and with the Dean on notice, I expected my administrative career to be a short one. Was I ever wrong! From the fall of 1969 until my retirement in the spring of 1994, there was never a term when I did not hold some administrative position; on a number of occasions, I even held several simultaneously. From 1969 until 1981, I served as Chair of Monteith's Division of Humanistic Studies; from the spring of 1976 until the fall of 1981, I concurrently served as Acting Dean of Monteith. I was appointed Chair of the Humanities Department (College of Liberal Arts) in the Fall of 1976—while still chair of Humanistic Studies and Acting Dean of Monteith—and held that position until 1992. (Contemplating these Pooh-Bahesque arrangements, Provost Diether Haenicke would on occasion shake his head in feigned bewilderment and wryly observe that my personnel file must surely be the oddest in the entire University. If so, it was only because he had decided that such a bizarre arrangement was the most effective way to deal with a highly unusual set of overlapping circumstances.) Serving simultaneously as division chair and dean, though, did have its amusing moments—particularly when it came to matters associated with promotion and tenure. On a number of occasions, I addressed recommendations, written as Chair of Humanistic Studies, to myself, as Acting Dean of the College, and then proceeded to write additional recommendations, that, together with the first, were forwarded to the Provost. Indeed, the only way I was able to maintain some semblance of order and sanity during those turbulent years was by keeping three separate offices, one for each of my administrative appointments, and dealing with the work of each position by moving myself from office to office. From 1984 until 1987, and again from 1992 until 1993, I served as an Associate Dean for the College of Liberal Arts. And during two academic years, AY 1987-88 and 1993-94, I served as Acting Director and Interim Director respectively of the University's Cohn-Haddow Center for Judaic Studies.

Evaluating the Monteith Program: 1960s and Early 1970s

When Monteith was established, it was agreed that a report describing and evaluating the College's operation would be submitted to Clarence Hilberry, President of Wayne State, when the funds granted by the Ford Foundation were exhausted. (The $700,000 Ford grant, matched by a like amount of University support, provided resources to fund the College for five yeans,) In December of 1963, during Monteith's fifth year of operation, a description and evaluation of the College's first four years ("Monteith College: A Report to the President") was addressed by Woodburn Ross to President Hilberry, and through him to the entire University community. The "Report," in seven chapters and two appendices, provided the basis for a debate that would decide Monteith's future: once the Ford funding ended, it remained for the University to evaluate the experiment and to decide whether the College should be continued as one of the University's regular colleges and schools, or whether it should be discontinued. The debate, conducted by the University Council—Wayne State's elected faculty assembly—took place in 1964. It was a heated debate, and many of the objections and reservations raised by the Liberal Arts Faculty Council in the late 1950s, when the principal issue was how general education might best be realized in college group requirements, were revisited with increased intensity and ferocity but not, unfortunately, with much additional light. Ultimately, the University Council voted in favor of continuing the College. President Hilberry, distinguished professor of English and steadfast friend of the College since its inception, and several of Monteith's prominent and influential faculty supporters in the College of Liberal Arts (Professors Alfred Kelly and Vera Dunham, to name but two) were in no small measure responsible for the favorable vote.

During the 1960s and early 1970s, Monteith was studied and evaluated by many individuals and agencies: some public, some private. Internal (Monteith-based) studies—several of which were funded by large federal grant—external studies, a host of research projects and a spate of publications, assessed and measured the progress of the College in a very public way.

Internal Evaluations

Three important internal studies were completed during the 1960s. The first: "Monteith College: A Report to the President" (December, 1963), has already been mentioned. It consisted of an introductory narrative, in which the College's purpose and organization were outlined, a description of the basic course sequences, some preliminary results of an elaborate Program Study initiated when Monteith was established (described below), and a summary, in which some tentative conclusions were suggested. The second, a Monteith-Library Pilot Project ("An Experiment in Coordination Between Teaching and Library Staff for Changing Student Use of University Library Resources"), was completed in August of 1964. Conducted by Patricia Knapp, a former member of the University Library staff who had been transferred to Monteith, it was funded by a grant of $79,919 from the U.S. Office of Education. A cooperative venture between Monteith and the University Library, the Project explored and developed new methods to assist students and faculty members in making optimal use of library resources. It was an important forerunner of current instructional modules dealing with how best to use the library. The third, a comprehensive Program Study

("Impact of a High-Demand College in a Large University on Working Class Youth"), was completed in August of 1968. Directed by Sally Whelan Cassidy, Chair of Monteith's Division of Science of Society, with the assistance of many faculty and staff collaborators, it was funded by a grant of $135,017 from the Office of Education (Bureau of Research), U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This huge self-study (840 pages in two volumes) assessed the impact of Monteith (referred to pseudonymously as "Hawthorn College") on the College's first two classes of students from many different perspectives—principally psychological, demographic, and sociometric. Questionnaires, interviews, participant observers, etc. were all employed to determine and validate the outcome. A number of articles based on these three studies appeared in various journals and periodicals-some scholarly and professional, some general and semi-popular.

External Evaluations

Monteith was described and assessed in many articles, several books, and at least two doctoral dissertations that appear-d in the 1960s and early 1970s. David Riesman, Joseph Gusfield, and Zelda Gamson, among others, studied the College carefully during its early years. The articles, in which the results of their research were reported, appeared in the popular press—general periodicals and newspapers—as well as scholarly journals. The books were published by trade publishers as well as university presses. For the most part, these studies evaluated the Monteith program—by itself and/or in relation to other similar programs—very favorably and concluded (almost unanimously) that the experiment had been extremely successful.

In the late 1960s, Monteith was selected as one of sixteen colleges—nation wide—to be included in an elaborate study of American undergraduate education undertaken by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley. The colleges chosen were a varied lot, a representative cross-section of then available (liberal arts) options: free-standing colleges as well as colleges located in larger institutions of higher education; colleges housed in comprehensive universities as well as colleges housed in highly-focused universities; private and parochial colleges as well as public colleges; colleges located in cities and suburban areas as well as colleges located in more bucolic settings etc, The study, based on multiple interviews, frequent visits, and detailed questionnaires, was carried out over a period of five to six years. It was a large-scale and intensive effort, the most comprehensive attempt made prior to the middle 1970s to investigate and assess the impact of such variables as institutional ethos, sources of funding, geographic setting, and student body on undergraduate education in the United States; Among its findings, the study concluded that Monteith College changed the "intellectual propensity" of its students more than any of the other fifteen institutions studied. Students entering Monteith, the data showed, were in no way different from students entering any of the country's public, urban institutions of higher education, Monteith graduates, however, functioned much like the graduates of the best Ivy League Colleges—measured principally in terms of how well they scored on the Graduate Record Examination, the Law School Aptitude Test, the Medical School Aptitude Test, etc. and how successful they were at gaining admission to prestigious graduate schools and distinguished professional programs.

The Monteith Phase-Out: Spring-Fall, 1975

The history of Monteith College was an enigmatic one. As previously noted, much of the philosophy and many of the ideas central to the Monteith program emerged from a debate about general education that took place in the College of Liberal Arts during the mid-1950s. When, however, a modest change in College Group Requirements was proposed and rejected by the faculty, proponents of more extensive reform responded by developing a comprehensive plan of general education, one that contained many of the features subsequently incorporated in the Monteith program. This plan, developed and reformulated as a proposal, was submitted to and funded by the Ford Foundation.

Faculty opinion regarding general education was so conservative and faculty opposition to Monteith so intense in the late 1950s that the very idea of a "Monteith" was repugnant to many—even after the Ford Grant had been awarded and funding was assured. Indeed, a substantial number of Wayne State faculty members and administrators remained overtly hostile to Monteith throughout its history and availed themselves of every opportunity to denigrate the "hippy" College and to cast aspersions on the "dubious" quality of its "flaky" faculty. Reasonable differences of opinion and legitimate philosophical disagreements were always welcomed; they could be discussed and debated by colleagues who espoused differing points of view. But no amount of evidence, however persuasive and conclusive, proved sufficient to counter the petty, emotionally based hostility of some. And many of the unsubstantiated charges and vicious canards leveled at Monteith in 1958 were still being repeated, unchanged, in 1975.

In the mid-1970s, the Michigan economy and (consequently) the Wayne State budget were both experiencing serious difficulty. Every effort was made—at the State and University levels—to cut spending, and President George Gullen, complying with a mandate to economize, proposed eliminating Monteith (an entire college) by merging it with the recently formed College of Lifelong Learning. By so doing, he argued, substantial savings would be realized. An initial attempt to do away with Monteith was made during June of 1975 when the President moved to implement his proposal budgetarily. But eliminating an entire college by administrative fiat, without first conducting a peer review of its academic program, was antithetical to the entire faculty—even to those who opposed Monteith. Regional and national opposition grew as details of the proposed action were circulated by the news media. Rather quickly, the administration bowed to the will of the academic community and withdrew its proposal. It did not, however, abandon its plan; it merely changed tactics by requesting the University Council (now the Academic Senate) to review Monteith with an eye to eliminating it.

The Curriculum and Instruction Committee (C&I) of the University Council, chaired by Professor Sol Rossman, was assigned the task of reviewing Monteith. During the late spring and throughout the entire summer of 1975, an ad hoc subcommittee of C&I investigated the College: vast numbers of documents were requested and produced; meetings with Monteith faculty members and administrators were scheduled; and a number of general hearings were convened. By October, the sub-committee had finished its work. It concluded that Monteith should be phased out—basically on financial grounds—and forwarded its recommendation to the Council.

The future of Monteith College was hotly debated by the University Council and the University's Board of Governors during October, November, and December of 1975. The principal (public)

argument supporting the recommendation to phase out the College was budgetary, but the savings to be realized were trivial. They were estimated—by the administration-—at about $200,000. They were estimated—by others—at considerably less. (The Monteith budget, at that time, amounted to less than one percent of the University's total budget.) Other arguments—most of them spurious or irrelevant and all considerably less germane—proved more persuasive in convincing many members of the Council to favor the proposed phase-out. The major problem was ignorance: very few Council members made a significant effort to understand what Monteith was and what Monteith did. Close behind was latent animus—largely unchanged since 1958—and widespread misinformation, some disseminated innocently but much spread maliciously.

Another issue that had something of an impact on the Monteith phase-out was the establishment of the Weekend College Program (recently renamed the Interdisciplinary Program). Several years earlier (during AY 1973–74), Professors Sara Leopold and Alfred Stern had formulated a proposal for a Monteith weekend college program. Monteith would develop the curriculum, one based on the history of ideas used as an "intellectual framework necessary to cope rationally with the complexities of modern existence"; the Division of Urban Extension (forerunner of the College of Lifelong Learning) would provide logistic support. With the endorsement of the appropriate College bodies, and supported by Dean Yates Hafner of Monteith and Dean Ben Jordan of Urban Extension, the Leopold-Stern proposal was forwarded to Ronald Haughton, Vice President for Urban Affairs. Haughton approved the proposal but imposed a number of conditions that Hafner, Stern, and Leopold felt would destroy the intellectual integrity and viability of their proposal.

Soon thereafter, Professor Otto Feinstein, also a Monteith faculty member, developed an entirely different proposal for a weekend college program, one that he took directly to Dean Jordan. The Feinstein proposal, supported by Jordan, became the basis for the Weekend College Program, a program ultimately established (1974), housed in, and controlled by the College of Lifelong Learning, not Monteith. Disagreement over the design and location of the Program, and President Gullen's perception that Monteith—at some point in the extended, overlapping, and convoluted negotiations associated with the Program's birth—had been unwilling to assume responsibility for it, may also have played an adverse role in determining the College's fate.

Be this as it may, the debate was rancorous and acrimonious. Though the quality of Monteith was never challenged—indeed, it was consistently reaffirmed—support for phasing out the College grew as the debate progressed. The Administration's fiscal argument exacted its toll, but fiction parading as fact proved far more damaging. While Monteith's cost per credit hour was indeed substantially higher than that of other undergraduate programs at the University, cynical innuendos and outright lies about the College, its faculty, and its students—all documentably false—were shamelessly paraded as fact. The College's elected representatives to the Council (Sara Leopold and Martin Herman) responded to all of these charges and refuted them one by one. Eventually, it was proposed that Monteith be permitted to continue, with the proviso that its cost per credit hour be brought into line with that of other undergraduate programs at the University. The Council failed to support this reasonable alternative and eventually voted to eliminate Monteith—despite repeated assertions by

members of the Council that the College had succeeded brilliantly in carrying out its mandate and in so doing had amassed a remarkable record of academic achievement.

In December of 1975, the Board of Governors voted to phase out Monteith. The College was permitted to recruit and admit students for AY 1976–77—but none thereafter—and was authorized to award Monteith degrees only until the spring of 1981. The possible reassignment of tenured and non-tenured members of the College's faculty and staff to other units of the University, it was agreed, would be negotiated between Monteith and the Provost's Office. Adequate budgetary support would be provided so that all students who had opted for a "Monteith education" would be given the opportunity to complete one and to earn their degrees in the College-provided they did so by the spring of 1981.

The Winter Quarter of 1976 was a tumultuous one. Members of the Monteith faculty and student body had fought hard for their College, and many felt betrayed by the University—not only because the College was to be phased out, but largely because the debate had been so brutal and caustic. Emotions ran high. Unwarranted acts were committed, and unfortunate statements were uttered by faculty members as well as students. Yates Hafner, Dean of Monteith, was particularly distraught: he felt, with justification, that the administration had misled him and that the College had not been given a fair hearing. A group of students recruited a distinguished attorney, a Monteith alumnus, to represent the College in a legal battle that they proposed to wage with the University; Faculty and students, for example, very much wanted a "dean" to head the College and to represent it during the phase-out period; the President was equally determined to appoint only an "administrator"—no one with the title of dean—to serve in that capacity. After weeks of wrangling, the administration conceded and agreed to appoint an acting dean.

Shortly before the end of the Winter Quarter, I was approached by President Gullen and asked to serve as acting dean of Monteith—probably because I was one of the few Monteithers still on speaking terms with students, faculty members, and the administration. I reluctantly accepted the position, wryly observing that being appointed the dean of an already phased-out college must certainly be the ultimate in academic terminal appointments. It was definitely a job with a negative growth potential. The acting deanship, however, was no ceremonial appointment, and two important matters kept me very busy for the next several years: (1) seeing to the futures of some thirty five or so Monteith faculty and staff members; and (2) seeing that the approximately 700 students who remained in the College received the type of undergraduate education that they had chosen.

I conclude this account of a very unhappy event with a rather odd postscript, a droll footnote describing an incident that took place almost a year later. Zelda Gamson, a professor at the University of Michigan's Center for Higher Education and an old acquaintance of mine, phoned me in October of 1976 and asked if the wounds inflicted during the "Phase-Out Battle" had healed sufficiently for me to feel comfortable describing and analyzing the phase-out of Monteith for a seminar (dealing with the administration of higher education) that she was teaching that term. She wanted her students to hear a "view from the dean's office." I owned that the scar tissue had grown quite thick and accepted her invitation.

I had known Zelda for many years. She had been a graduate student at Harvard in the early 1960s and had written her doctoral dissertation—"Social Control and Modification: A Study of Responses to Students in a Small Nonresidential College" (Harvard, 1965)—under the direction of David Riesman, the distinguished sociologist. Her research dealt, in part, with the genesis and

early years of Monteith, and I had spent many hours (during the early '60s) being interviewed by her and talking into her tape recorder. Subsequent to receiving her doctorate, she and Riesman collaborated on a book and a number of articles about Monteith. Riesman himself remained a firm supporter and staunch friend of Monteith to the end. During the phase-out debate, he wrote several letters urging the University not to discontinue the College and even offered to address the University Council and/or the Board of Governors directly if we felt that a personal appearance by him would be helpful. My visit to Zelda's seminar took place on a cold but pleasant November afternoon. As I entered the classroom, a familiar face greeted me. Marie Draper Dykes, who had been an intern in the Provost's Office during the Monteith debate, was completing a doctorate in the administration of higher education at the University of Michigan and was a student in the class. My "view from the dean's office" was, consequently, tempered by the knowledge that at least one member of the audience had close ties to the opposition.

As in the beginning, so in the end. At least two doctoral dissertations (of which I am aware) were written about the phase-out of Monteith College. Between 1976 and 1981, I spent countless days being interviewed by doctoral students (and others) interested in documenting the sad demise of a noble and noteworthy experiment in undergraduate education.

The Department of Humanities: 1958–76

The history of the Humanities Department parallels that of Monteith College in an almost eerie way. Although the two units were completely separate entities, at least until 1976, both shared several significant characteristics: an interdisciplinary and comparative approach to subject matter; a keen interest in general education; carefully-structured and coherent curricula; skillfully-developed courses; and highly-gifted faculty members, almost all of whom were versatile and effective teachers. They also shared an unhappy destiny, one brought about by institutional unwillingness to value noteworthy but non-traditional academic achievement.

History

In 1942, an interdisciplinary program in Humanities was formally established at Wayne State. The Program, housed in the College of Liberal Arts, was directed by the late Harold Basilius, then Chair of German and subsequently Director of the WSU Press. Undergraduate and graduate curricula, leading to undergraduate and graduate degrees, were developed and offered by the Program: the first undergraduate degrees were awarded in 1947, the first graduate degrees in 1949. From its inception, a number of the University's most distinguished faculty members helped shape the Program and participated in its development. James Gibb (Music), Ernst Scheyer (Art History), Herbert Schueller (Chair of English, later Director of the WSU Press), Raymond Hoekstra (Philosophy), Vera Dunham (Slavic), Jacques Salvan (French), and Bernard Goldman (Art History, later Director of the WSU Press) actively assisted in designing the Program's curricula and taught courses that served the Program's goals.

Sixteen years later (1958), the Program became a department. Its primary mission was to continue offering the innovative curricula and courses in interdisciplinary humanistic studies and comparative arts that it had provided since its inception. The Department's curricula and courses were aimed primarily at those interested in transcending the boundaries that traditionally separated the arts and humanistic disciplines from each other. Most students

who enrolled in courses offered by Humanities did so to satisfy a College Group Requirement. Quite a few, however, chose to major in Humanities—or even to seek a master's degree in Humanities—and the number of undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded by the Department between 1947 and 1975 increased steadily.

During the fall of 1974, the viability of Humanities became an issue when serious questions were raised concerning the Department's curricula and staffing practices. The Dean of Liberal Arts (Martin Steams) and the Liberal Arts Faculty Council responded by appointing an ad hoc committee of senior faculty members to investigate these matters. A lengthy review of Humanities ensued. Conducted over a two-year period, during the academic years 1974–76, the review identified curricular weaknesses and staffing deficiencies that threatened the Department's academic integrity. (The ad hoc review committee was convened in November of 1974. Its initial findings were reported to the Dean of Liberal Arts in the spring of 1975 and placed before the College's Faculty Council on October 15, 1975.) An extended and rancorous debate concerning the Department's future followed. It lasted for the better part of six months. By the late fall of 1975 and early winter of 1976, sentiment in favor of eliminating the department seemed to be growing.

Simultaneously, the debate that led to the phase-out of Monteith College (begun in the Spring of 1975 and concluded in December of 1975) was taking place elsewhere in the University. Though the two debates coincided chronologically, they were, in fact, completely separate issues, and were conducted in totally different venues: the proposed phase-out of Monteith, a University matter, was considered by the University Council and the University's Board of Governors; the review of Humanities, a College matter, was conducted by the Dean of Liberal Arts and the College's Faculty Council. Nevertheless, the phase-out of Monteith did, in fact, have a direct—albeit an unanticipated—impact on the review of Humanities: to the surprise of many, but pursuant to recommendations made by the Liberal Arts Faculty Council (January 21 and February 11, 1976), it was decided that nine full-time faculty members from Monteith College's Division of Humanistic Studies would be transferred to the Department of Humanities with a mandate to revitalize the Department's undergraduate curriculum. (Five faculty members were transferred immediately; the rest would be transferred over the next several years. Specific timetables were to be determined by coordinating the phase-out of Monteith with the revitalization of Humanities.) A detailed prescription for revising the graduate program was also provided by the Faculty Council.

In the Fall of 1976, the Department of Humanities was substantially reorganized. Its undergraduate curriculum was reshaped—as promised—to embody the philosophy that had proven so successful and effective at Monteith. **In** the process, it became more coherent and more rigorous, thus addressing two of the major issues raised by the ad hoc review committee. With the addition of nine full-time faculty members, staffing became more stable, and Humanities was no longer forced to staff an inordinate number of sections with part-time faculty members. The graduate program (Master of Arts in Humanities) had been temporarily suspended pending revisions that would incorporate the changes mandated by the Faculty Council. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, steps were taken (on three separate occasions) by several College-wide committees to craft a graduate program in Humanities and/or Comparative Arts consistent with the prescription provided by the Faculty Council. None of the proposals developed by the College (not the Department) passed muster with the Graduate Council.

Philosophy

Interdisciplinarity and comparative methodologies are the hallmarks that define both teaching and scholarly activity in Humanities. Conventional disciplines deal with materials related to a common body of subject matter. Humanities deals with the different ways in which experience underlies all of the arts and humanistic disciplines and investigates, rigorously and systematically, how the various arts and humanistic disciplines relate to each other. To do so, it draws upon materials—books, poems, paintings, musical compositions—in which expressions of human values and manifestations of the human spirit are central and explores how (by what means) experience may be embodied in such works. It identifies qualities shared by all of the arts and humanistic disciplines, and it identifies qualities unique to each—those on which traditional disciplines appropriately focus attention. History, philosophy, literature, language, and the arts provide the repository from which clusters of works are drawn, juxtaposed, and studied for the purpose of revealing connections, While the uniqueness of Humanities is rightly associated with the interdisciplinary connections to which it invites attention and the comparative links that it systematically explores, it simultaneously respects the integrity of all works studied and recognizes each as the product of a traditional discipline. Viewed from the perspective of methodology, rather than that of subject-matter, Humanities is, in fact, an ancient and venerable discipline—even a conventional one.

Curriculum

At every level of its curriculum (introductory through advanced), the primary objective of Humanities remains constant: to examine and probe possible inter-relationships among those constructs of human experience that collectively constitute the arts and humanities. Comparisons are made from topical/theoretical perspectives as well as from chronological/historical perspectives. Each course and every course sequence is designed to provide a broad and coherent overview, one consistent with the materials selected and the student population addressed: those who elect courses in Humanities to satisfy a general education requirement—by far the largest number; those who take courses in Humanities as electives; and those who choose to major in Humanities—a small but exceptionally able group of students, almost all of whom apply and are admitted to distinguished graduate programs or prestigious professional schools.

Philosophically, the Humanities curriculum is based on the belief that candidates for degrees in interdisciplinary humanistic studies and comparative arts should command three different kinds of ability and knowledge: (1) well-developed skills of analyzing, criticizing, interpreting, and evaluating primary materials drawn from several different disciplines; (2) a sophisticated understanding of the different ways in which disparate materials may be rigorously examined and systematically compared across conventional disciplinary boundaries; and (3) an adequate grounding in the subject matter and methodologies of at least one conventional discipline, a grounding that is both broadened and deepened by an understanding of how materials from that discipline relate to those drawn from its sister disciplines, Practically, the curriculum demonstrates the two most significant forms of interdisciplinary relatedness: (1) the topical and/or theoretical inter-connectedness of problems and practices common to all of the arts and humanistic disciplines; and (2) inter-connectedness associated with commonalities occurring among the arts and humanistic

disciplines of a single historical period or cultural epoch. Course work taken outside of the Department (in anyone of three stipulated options) insures adequate command of problems and inquiries associated with the subject matter of at least one specific discipline, period, or area.

The soundly-conceived and clearly-articulated undergraduate curriculum in Humanities promotes a disciplined development of the verbal, perceptual, and intellectual skills needed to assess experience, perceive the connections that link the arts and humanistic disciplines, and analyze the intellectual-imaginative products of past and present. It is philosophically consistent and suitably embodied in courses whose content, purpose, and function have been carefully considered in light of these goals. By concentrating on interdisciplinary and comparative approaches, Humanities illuminates connections rarely addressed systematically by conventional disciplines and consequently pursues areas of inquiry frequently overlooked or marginalized. And this approach is characteristic of courses designed principally for non-majors as well as those designed principally for majors.

Humanities clearly has a special interest in general education: the vast majority of students who take courses in Humanities do so to satisfy a University-wide General Education Requirement or a College-wide Group Requirement, and ten different Humanities courses have been approved for three different Group Requirements and one Competency. As a major purveyor of general education, the Humanities faculty willingly accepts the challenge of developing and teaching intellectually sound, skillfully crafted, and broadly appealing introductory-level courses. Engaging the imagination of a student population enrolled in courses that it perceives to be "required," and doing so in an academically sound and effective way, is not an easy task. That the faculty has succeeded so well is a noteworthy achievement and a tribute to its commitment. The ultimate goal of the Department/Program is a lofty one: to make the general-education courses offered by Humanities among the best available anywhere. By many accounts, notably those offered by several sets of distinguished external evaluators, the goal was reached.

The Adamany Years: 1982–95

When David Adamany arrived at Wayne State in the spring of 1982, the State of Michigan was just beginning to emerge from a serious economic recession. The University, however, was still suffering from the significant budget cuts imposed during the late '70s and early '80s. In attempting to deal with the diminished resources of those years, it had amassed a significant debt, the precise amount of which is still disputed, and its physical plant had fallen into a state of substantial disrepair. Responding to these conditions, President Adamany proved both lucky and smart: lucky in the sense that his at1ival coincided with an upturn in the state's economy; smart in that he made some astute (and daring) political endorsements—of James Blanchard, and several years later, of state legislators in the metropolitan Detroit area who faced recall votes—when prudence would have dictated restraint. Such bold and decisive actions were not soon forgotten, and the University and its President found themselves well positioned with those in political power through the remainder of the '80s and on into the early '90s.

During the first few months of his presidency, even before his inauguration had officially taken place, David Adamany articulated his goals for the University in minute detail. In a lengthy *Agenda for the University*—written and circulated in the early fall of 1982 but not widely disseminated until December—and in a series of public addresses associated with his formal inauguration, he clearly and unequivocally set forth his position on a wide range of issues facing Wayne State. From resource management to institutional organization, from general education to professional training, from physical plant and infra-structure to educational mission, he stated his views and provided a detailed list of actions that he proposed to implement. At the time, these statements and proposed actions were interpreted by many as rhetorical posturing, as the dramatic gesture of a new president intent on staking out clearly-defined positions before having to address (pragmatically) the serious problems faced by his administration. Viewed retrospectively, however, the *Agenda* and its companion pieces read like blueprints for action.

A hard-working, energetic, talented, and complex man, David Adamany has labored tirelessly on behalf of Wayne State. Facing outward, he has been extremely effective (even brilliant) in representing the University—ceremonially and professionally—to a wide range of governmental and educational constituencies: local, regional, state, and national. (He has been less effective dealing with private constituencies.) Above all, he has succeeded in articulating the University's needs, as he sees them, to the Governor and the State Legislature. Facing inward; he has been less successful. Though he has worked ceaselessly to implement his vision of Wayne State, and to reshape the institution into an urban university that reflects his philosophy, a fair number of faculty members share neither his vision nor philosophy, and many more find his style of management uncongenial and inappropriate for an institution of higher education; it is too often adversarial rather than collegial. In this atmosphere of moderate to high tension and disagreement, it is instructive to note how a carefully crafted strategy—in the related areas of governance, institutional organization, and budgetary policy—can serve the ends of a strong and dominating central authority.

Under the Adamany administration, Wayne State has moved from being a highly federated institution, one in which considerable authority and responsibility were vested in its constituent colleges and schools, to a highly centralized institution, one in which deans have relatively little autonomy and are subject to a great deal of management from above. By and large, the professional schools and vocationally-oriented programs have fared well, while the entire liberal-arts enterprise (not merely the College of Liberal Arts) has suffered. The University's "comprehensive" College of Liberal Arts (sciences, social sciences, humanities, and the arts) has been reduced-—in stages—to the current "residual" College of Liberal Arts (social sciences and humanities). In November of 1984, the President proposed a sweeping reorganization of the University, one that—in the main—would have replaced the comprehensive College of Liberal Arts with a series of small, discipline-related colleges; other changes, less comprehensive in nature, were also proposed. The President's basic premise was opposed by many members of the faculty, even by some who stood to gain by its implementation, and the proposed reorganization was hotly debated by the University Council during the winter and spring of 1985. (However literally inaccurate, the metaphor of knowledge as an undivided entity proved to be a powerful argument in favor of retaining a comprehensive College.) When the debate concluded in late spring of 1985, Liberal Arts remained largely intact, but some important changes- endorsed by the faculty--did in fact take

place: a School of Fine and Performing Arts and a College of Urban, Labor and Metropolitan Affairs were created.

The notion of establishing an independent School of Fine and Performing Arts was not a new one; the issue had been raised and discussed—many times—since the days of Clarence Hilberry's presidency. It was not until the 1985 debate over President Adamany's proposal for comprehensive institutional reorganization, however, that a School of Fine and Performing Arts actually came into being. The School became home to Art, Music, and Theatre (all relocated from Liberal Arts) and Dance (moved from Physical Education). The College of Urban, Labor, and Metropolitan Affairs was to be organized like a research center or institute: aside from several distinguished labor professorships, it was to have no tenured faculty of its own; it would, instead, borrow faculty members—as needed—from the various colleges and schools to create teams of specialists competent to deal with research projects appropriate to the College's mission. Several year's later, Speech (including Journalism) was also moved from Liberal Arts to Fine and Performing Arts, and the School was renamed College of Fine, Performing and Communication Arts. In the fall of 1992, the process of reorganization, begun in the fall of 1984, was virtually completed when the sciences (Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Communication Disorders, Computer Science, Geology, Mathematics, Nutrition and Food Sciences, Physics, and Psychology) left the College of Liberal Arts to form a newly-created College of Science. The residual College of Liberal Arts was given the option of remaining a "College of Social Sciences and Humanities" or subdividing into a "College of Social Science" and a "College of Humanities." It chose the former, retaining the name—College of Liberal Arts.

With respect to budgetary policy and resource management, a well-developed system of formula funding was instituted by President Adamany in October of 1983. (Details of the system and its philosophical justification may be found in the narrative portions of the FY 1984 budget, the first budget for which President Adamany alone was responsible.) In 1982–83, the fiscal health of the University was uncertain: the physical plant was in poor shape, and it was widely acknowledged that decisive action was needed if institutional well being was to be restored. But the method for managing resources proposed and implemented by the President at that time, one relentlessly pursued ever since, swung the pendulum too far in the opposite direction. It placed too much emphasis on credit hour targets and credit-hour production—mechanistically calculated and quantified in terms of academic-year-equated students (AYESs) and student/faculty ratios (SFRs)—and too little on qualitative measures and academic integrity. Indeed, the necessity of tempering formula funding with less quantifiable factors was acknowledged by the administration itself during the reaccreditation process conducted by the North Central Association in 1985 (1986 *Self-Study Report,* p. 94), but nothing, with the possible exception of the Enhancement Plan—proposed and implemented in FY 199G—has been done (formally) in the College of Liberal Arts to modify it.

In order to realize his objective of making Wayne State a nationally-recognized comprehensive research university of the first rank, albeit one with a special urban teaching and service mission, President Adamany adopted several different but related strategies: to favor research activities that promised to bring substantial amounts of extra-mural funding to the University; to support programs that could interact readily with the private sector (commerce and industry); and to highlight curricula (undergraduate as well as graduate) that emphasized professional and

vocational training. To achieve these objectives, it was necessary to favor some activities—science (particularly applied science) and professional training—at the expense of others: namely, the social sciences and the humanistic disciplines.

Such an approach is predicated on the belief that the President's vision for the University truly addresses the needs of its student body, undergraduate as well as graduate. Since Wayne students—largely urban, working, commuting, part-time, older, and heterogeneous—are often the first in their families exposed to higher education, and since many (perhaps most) view a university degree principally as a means for achieving upward economic mobility, it assumes that they favor curricula with direct professional/vocational application and have little patience with or need for abstract, theoretical courses of study.

To implement such a philosophy, while simultaneously maintaining the intellectual cachet of a first-rate institution of higher education, it was necessary to create and mandate a University-wide program of general education, one which would assure that all undergraduates were equipped with a range of basic academic skills and exposed—at least at an introductory level—to the liberal arts broadly defined. In this context, such an arrangement tacitly assumes that some of the traditional disciplines, notably the social sciences and humanities, will be relegated to the role of service units, albeit important service units, of the University's General Education Program. Should faculty members in the social sciences and humanities compete successfully for grants, should they succeed in developing viable curricula which were professionally oriented, should they distinguish themselves by becoming outstanding scholars, and should they manage to attract a cadre of first-rate graduate students, that was all to the good. It did not, however, negate the fact that their primary function was to provide "service courses" and to do so at the lowest possible cost, a situation that has unfortunately resulted in an ever-increasing and inordinate share of the teaching load—particularly at the undergraduate level—being assigned to and assumed by lecturers, part-time faculty members, and teaching assistants. And this at a university which for decades took particular pride in proclaiming that most of its undergraduate courses, unlike those offered at many of its sister institutions, were taught by "regular" (tenured and tenure-track) members of the faculty "

The President's Commission on General Education: 1983–85

A central feature of President Adamany's *Agenda for the University* (Fall, 1982) was a call for establishing such a general-education program, one applicable to all students earning baccalaureate degrees at Wayne State University. Until 1982, general education at Wayne State had been left to the discretion of each baccalaureate-granting college and school, and--excepting the core curricula of Monteith and the Weekend College Program—had been specified in a series of group (distribution) requirements that varied widely in both form and content from college to college. In a series of public and semi-public statements—addresses to the academic community, appearances before the University Council, meetings with college faculty councils, etc.—President Adamany expressed his displeasure with the hodge podge of distribution requirements then in effect and urged that a coherent set of University-wide general-education requirements be designed and implemented. With that objective in mind, he convened a Commission on General Education in December of 1983.

The Commission, chaired by John C. Roberts, Dean of the Law School, was asked to reexamine the various college/school group requirements and was charged with the task of

proposing (in their place) a new and comprehensive general-education program to be required of all undergraduates at Wayne State. Sixteen faculty members and administrators (I among them), drawn proportionately from the University's colleges and schools, plus staff and two student representatives were appointed to the Commission. Appended to the letter of appointment addressed to each member of the Commission was a lengthy statement from the President outlining his suggested changes. The Commission was asked to consider the President's proposed changes, conduct hearings, and invite proposals from the academic community at large (local, regional, and national), but was urged to develop a set of recommendations based on its own research.

The Commission was convened in December of 1983 and discharged in November of 1984. During those eleven months, it met frequently—in subcommittees as well as in plenary sessions. Members were called upon to digest vast amounts of information and consider various (often conflicting) points of view: reams of documents were solicited and received from the various schools and colleges; open hearings—nineteen two-hour sessions at which thirty-six separate witnesses (deans, department chairs, faculty members, students) appeared —were held over a four-month period; and extensive use was made of prior and continuing efforts at curriculum reform proposed by several University-wide task forces and the faculty councils of the various colleges and schools. Work begun by the College of Liberal Arts in the late 1970s, for the purpose of redefining and refining its distribution requirements, proved particularly helpful, and the Commission drew heavily on documents developed initially by the Liberal Arts Faculty Council—particularly in the area of Group Requirements. All of the requirements eventually proposed by the Commission, however, were—of course—reformulated and adapted to reflect the Commission's University-wide focus.

The University-wide General-Education Program, developed by the Commission and forwarded to President Adamany in November of 1984, was organized into three categories: (1) a set of fundamental competencies or basic skills that identified and specified the intellectual tools needed to address academic activity successfully; (2) a set of group requirements that defined the core subject matter with which all college graduates should be familiar'; and (3) additional requirements that did not fit neatly into either of the first two categories. The Program, endorsed—with some reservations—by Provost Walter S. Jones, was forwarded to the University Council for its consideration. The Council's Curriculum and Instruction Committee conducted a series of meetings and hearings, extending over a period of approximately six months, at which the Program was reviewed and somewhat modified. In the spring of 1986, these revised General-Education Requirements were endorsed by the University Council and, with several further modifications, adopted by the University's Board of Governors. This University-wide Program in General Education became effective for all entering first-year students in the fall of 1987. By the fall of 1991, it applied to all undergraduate students at Wayne State.

As an ardent and outspoken proponent of general education, as a member of the President's Commission on General Education, and as one who served on the first General Education Implementation Committee, I am frequently asked if the University Program is an ideal one. Of course it's not. Personally, I would have preferred a more integrated program: one that placed even greater emphasis on acquiring the basic skills of analysis, criticism, evaluation, and interpretation; and one that defined the basic body of knowledge to be mastered in a

more coherent, core-like fashion. Whenever the subject of general education is considered, however, there is one key question that must always be asked and answered before serious debate can begin: is the issue of general education to be considered apart from the budgets of those units (colleges and departments) that offer the courses? If the answer is yes, and it rarely is, then a genuinely philosophical debate can take place, and the likelihood of developing a consistent and suitable general-education program increases. If the answer is no, and it usually is, then a political process is underway, and the general-education program that emerges will, of necessity, be built on a foundation of political compromises. Now, political processes and political accommodations are not necessarily bad; like all processes, they can be well or poorly handled. At Wayne State, the general-education debate was political in nature, and the resulting requirements clearly embody a series of political compromises. Was the process well handled? Yes, I think so. I also believe that the current University-wide General-Education Requirements were the best obtainable under the conditions that prevailed when they were developed.

But general education is a perennial subject, one that resurfaces—in cyclic fashion—for periodic reconsideration. At some point, the issue will once again be joined at Wayne State. When it is, I hope that the debate will be philosophical, not political. And I hope that the participants will realize that no single general-education program can possibly meet the needs of all institutions. General-education programs, like institutional missions, vary. They must address a specific student population by tailoring a mix of competencies and distribution requirements to fit its particular needs,

The **Department of Humanities: 1982–94**

In November of 1982, a Liberal Arts Planning Committee-—appointed by Interim Dean Wallace Williams to propose "rational" ways of dealing with the serious budgetary crisis then facing the College—issued its initial report. The report was wide-ranging and contained a number of suggestions, both general and specific, regarding ways in which the College could economize and more judiciously allocate its limited and diminishing resources. The Committee's report and the Dean's response to it were released and circulated together in January of 1983. Among the actions proposed by the Committee and supported by the Dean was a "phase out" of the Humanities Department. Subsequent discussion revealed that the Dean, in supporting this proposal, had construed the Committee's recommendation to mean a departmental freeze at the then current level and not an active phasing out of Humanities. In the Dean's own words: "For the present, the department is on hold."

In December of 1991, the central administration of the University decided that the Department of Humanities was to be "phased out by attrition." (Cf. Provost's Memo to File of November 1992, the final step in the Academic Review of Humanities that had taken place during the academic year 1990–91.) Despite the laudatory assessments of the Department and its faculty made by two sets of external evaluators (Elizabeth Coleman and James Redfield in 1985, Herman Sinaiko and Nancy Struever in 1991), the central administration concluded that an innovative department dedicated to interdisciplinary humanistic studies and comparative arts, regardless of its quality, could no longer be supported at Wayne State. (Neither the Liberal Arts Faculty Council nor the Academic Senate was ever consulted about the matter, and Professors Sinaiko and Streuver were incensed to learn—only at the time of their visit—

that the decision to phase out Humanities had been made before either of them had been invited to serve as an external evaluator of the Department.) The decision to eliminate Humanities demonstrates how noteworthy, even exemplary, academic activity that is not highly valued—even if it is economically viable—can lose its budgetary support. Neither the excellence of Humanities (its curriculum and its courses) nor the calibre of its faculty (as teachers and scholars) was ever questioned or challenged, and the Department—even during periods of temporary enrollment declines—had always been a profitable (revenue-generating) unit, one that by University formula was consistently understaffed. Adding to the irony is the fact that the phase out of Humanities occurred at a time when the University's own evolving Strategic Plan called for emphasizing interdisciplinary and comparative studies.

In the fall of 1994, the Humanities Department was officially terminated by action of the University's Board of Governors, and the circle begun in 1942 was not only metaphorically completed but seemingly started all over again: a Humanities Program, offering eight or so of the Department's basic courses (all taught by members of the Humanities faculty), was created and housed in the History Department. (Both units and all participating faculty members had agreed to this merger.) Humanities ceased admitting majors and discontinued its undergraduate degree program with the understanding that all of the then enrolled Humanities majors would be given the opportunity to complete their degree requirements. Since a number of courses offered by Humanities are considered important components of the University's and College's General-Education Programs, courses in Humanities will continue to be scheduled indefinitely.

Welcome to Early Retirement: The End of a Roller-Coaster Career

By most objective measures, my thirty-two year career at Wayne State has been a successful one. As an academic, I was tenured in my third year at the University, promoted to the rank of associate professor in my fourth, and to that of professor in my seventh, For nine years, I served in the dean's office of two different colleges—five as Acting Dean of Monteith and four as an Associate Dean of Liberal Arts—and for twenty-five years, I chaired a division (Humanistic Studies in Monteith) and/or a department (Humanities in Liberal Arts). On several occasions, these administrative appointments (as chair and/or dean) overlapped. I was elected to the University Council by my Monteith colleagues for two three-year terms, and to the Faculty Council of the College of Liberal Arts by my Liberal Arts colleagues for four consecutive three-year terms. The academic programs in which my divisional and/or departmental colleagues and J invested vast amounts of time and energy (Humanistic Studies in Monteith and Humanities in Liberal Arts) were all—by any reasonable standard—academically strong. They were philosophically consistent, intellectually rigorous, and structurally sound. External evaluators and internal reviewers praised their quality, admired their elegance, and expressed high regard for the faculty members who had designed and taught them. Student evaluations consistently lauded their effectiveness and testified to the skill with which they were taught.

But objective measures can be misleading, and apparent success can mask deep-seated frustration. Today, not a single one of these programs remains intact. Despite a substantial body of data documenting their quality, and numerous evaluations (all undisputed) praising them as models of their kind, all have been phased out or are currently in the process of being

phased out. When programs of verified quality and unchallenged excellence—in the areas of interdisciplinary humanistic studies and comparative arts—are simply dismissed as insufficiently central to warrant continued support, then it might be time to reevaluate the relationship between institutional priorities and academic values. In the final analysis, time spent defending programs that needed no defense, and energy expended countering frivolous attacks, was time misspent and energy squandered. (Both time and energy would have been more productively employed implementing courses and developing teaching materials.) Repeated efforts aimed at staving off elimination proved, in the end, to be exercises in futility: the predetermined outcome was only delayed, not changed.

Not all lost battles, though, are fought in vain, and positive outcomes can help ameliorate apparent defeat. My accomplishments, such as they may be, have all been achieved while working in close collaboration with others. And it is the colleagues and friends with whom I worked, both in and out of Monteith and Humanities, who proved to be unending sources of inspiration, pleasure, and satisfaction. Well-crafted and effective interdisciplinary programs are, above all, cooperative ventures: they require the selfless commitment of like-minded people if they are to be properly designed, successfully implemented, and skillfully taught. And I was fortunate to have worked—in both Humanistic Studies and Humanities—with a cadre of superb teacher-scholars, all distinguished and highly-principled academics. (I seriously doubt whether the University administration has ever understood or appreciated the quality of those faculty members.) I have also derived a great deal of satisfaction from serving on the editorial board of the University Press (1972–89) and the Grosberg Religious Center Board (1981–94), working with Phi Beta Kappa (1962–94), assisting with the Junior Science and Humanities Symposium (1976–94), and being involved with virtually every aspect of general education—at the university, college, and department levels: the President's Commission on General Education (1983–84); the General Education Implementation Committee (1986–88), and the College of Liberal Arts/College of Science Group Requirements Committee (1989–94).

As a participant in all of these activities I was extremely peripatetic. During my thirty-two years at Wayne State, I occupied fifteen offices in seven different buildings. Only two of those buildings remain standing today. Some kind of message must be encoded in those data.

In Retrospect

The vignettes which follow constitute a series of reflective sketches or musings. They are not fully-developed statements, and the arguments that they make are not closely-reasoned. The issues discussed are, for the most part, issues already addressed. Here, however, they are revisited topically, not chronologically.

Mission, Identity, and a Proper College Education

From its inception, Wayne University State has invested a great deal of energy attempting to reconcile the two principal components of its double mission: on the one hand, evolving into a comprehensive research university with a growing national reputation for excellence; on the other, broadening its role as an urban university with a special teaching and service commitment to metropolitan Detroit. While these two facets of the University's mission are by no means mutually exclusive, neither are they synonymous; and tension, predictably, develops in the interstices, in those areas where the two objectives do not coincide, where, in fact, they seem

to be incompatible. While a limited amount of internal tension may prove useful—it can help combat institutional stagnation—too much can be demoralizing and destructive. Managing and resolving tension, in a positive and productive way, is a major responsibility of the central administration, an ongoing task that requires constant attention and vigilance. It is within the context of Wayne State's bifurcated mission, and the need to address these real and potential sources of conflict, that each unit of the University (college/school, center, department, program) must define its own specific mission. It is, to be sure, important that the missions of all be consistent with that of the University, but it is equally important that the mission of each be unit specific. Absolute conformity and total homogeneity tend to minimize the unique strengths of each unit and ultimately undermine the well being of the University. Institutional health is best served and most effectively directed when each unit, in harmony with the general mission of the University, identifies and pursues its own proper goals.

And one such goal is to define and offer an appropriate liberal-arts education for all students seeking a baccalaureate degree at Wayne State—even at a Wayne State divided into a series of small, discipline-related colleges and professional schools. In addition to providing a thoughtfully-conceived and skillfully-constructed general-education program, an authentic liberal-arts education must direct attention to the common bonds that inform and link all of its varied components. Unity within diversity, the hallmark of such an education, can only be made manifest by demonstrating how all disciplines relate to a common pattern of systematic inquiry. (Simultaneously, however, the uniqueness of each discipline—and its respective methodology—must be respected and affirmed.) Further, a proper undergraduate education must foster awareness of how thought and action are related, how, in fact, they are inseparable, It must emphasize the practicality of speculative thinking by showing how the ability to know is a function of the ability to think—systematically, rigorously, and reflectively. It must enable students to recognize how feeling and thought interact, and it must emphasize the interconnectedness of knowledge by pointing out how basic intellectual skills have applications that transcend disciplinary boundaries. Above all, the commonality of all knowledge must be demonstrated; for that is what makes a college education liberal (liberating) and humane rather than constricting and mechanistic.

The View from Several Dean's Offices:

While serving as Acting Dean of Monteith (1976–81), it was necessary for me to work closely with both the Office of the President and the Office of the Provost. During the phase-out of the College, one of my principal tasks was to negotiate the possible reassignment of Monteith faculty and staff members to other units of the University. These delicate negotiations were carried out with various department chairs and deans under the auspices of the Provost's Office. The success of this process, and it was very successful, is largely attributable to the unflagging support received from Diether Haenicke, sitting Provost during the Monteith debate and for most of the phase-out period that followed. In addition to working closely with Provost Haenicke, I conferred regularly with President George Gullen, until he left the presidency in 1979, and periodically with President Thomas Bonner, who succeeded him in 1979. (The phase-out of Monteith was a hot issue, and President Gullen had agreed to keep the Board of Governors informed about its implementation. He did so by having the Provost issue a series of progress reports, detailed accounts that were regularly

submitted to the Board over a period of several years. (So much heated publicity had been generated during the Monteith debate that presidents and provosts were reluctant to consign the College's phase-out to the "back burner" and remained personally engaged with the process for an extended period of time.) Having the title Acting Dean secured me a seat on the Council of Deans, I was, of course, specifically concerned with issues that might have an impact on the Monteith phase-out, but I also became closely attuned to all University-wide matters with which the central administration was then engaged,

In 1980, Martin Stearns retired as dean of Liberal Arts. (He had led the College of Liberal Arts for two decades.) During the ensuing six years, three interim deans (Wallace Williams, 1981¬83; Norman LeBel 1983–84; and Henry Bohm, 1984–86) steered the College through an exceedingly difficult period: enrollments declined steadily; financial difficulties mounted as Michigan. suffered through yet another severe economic recession; David Adamany succeeded Thomas Bonner as president; and two national searches failed to produce a new dean. (Both national searches, it should be remembered, identified Milton Glick, Chair of the University's Chemistry Department, as the most qualified and desirable candidate available, but neither President Bonner in 1981 nor President Adamany in 1983 was able—or willing—to meet the terms which Glick felt essential for the future well¬being of the College.) It was not until the Fall of 1986, when yet another national search identified Dalmas Taylor as the best available candidate, that the College of Liberal Arts was once again led by a full-fledged dean.

Between 1984 and 1993, I served two tours of duty as an associate dean of Liberal Arts: the first lasted from the fall of 1984 until late spring of 1987, during the two-year period when Henry Bohm was interim dean (and the College was still largely undivided) and through the first year of Dalmas Taylor's deanship; the second lasted only from the fall of 1992 through the summer of 1993, when Kathleen (Katie) McNamee served as interim dean of the College and only the social sciences and humanities remained in Liberal Arts. In the fall of 1984, soon after the first of my two tours had begun, the President proposed his plan for reorganizing the University, a plan that—among other changes—called for dividing the large, comprehensive College of Liberal Arts into four smaller, discipline-related colleges. The second tour coincided with the establishment of both the College of Science and the "residual" College of Liberal Arts, at the moment when it was yet to be decided whether Liberal Arts would remain a College of Humanities and Social Sciences or split further into a College of Humanities and a College of Social Sciences.

During my nine years as an acting dean or associate dean, it became increasingly clear that several important strategies were being systematically pursued by the central administration: words were not necessarily supported by resources—i.e. funding did not invariably follow rhetoric; formula funding could be used as a powerful and effective tool for directing academic policy—i.e. it could be invoked or ignored when it suited the administration to do so; likewise, the academic review process could be manipulated selectively—i.e. evaluations and recommendations that supported administrative priorities could be implemented while evaluations and recommendations that ran counter to administrative priorities could be ignored or denigrated; increasing the number of colleges into which the University was divided favored a highly centralized administrative structure by limiting the authority and latitude of individual deans; and the argument that "collective bargaining may also have

reinforced trends toward more centralized administration" *(Self Study,* p. 11) is something of a smokescreen. Problems associated with collective bargaining at Wayne State are, in my view, related to the personalities involved, not to the bargaining process itself.

Humanistic Studies and Comparative Arts

With regard to the humanistic disciplines in general, and interdisciplinary humanistic studies/ comparative arts in particular, several national trends are evident. Recent reports indicate that many institutions of higher education increasingly view the humanities and arts as components (albeit important components) of general-education programs and decreasingly regard them as significant, self-sufficient areas of study. Consequently, courses in the humanities and arts are seen principally as service modules that complement more "practical" curricula. While the number of students majoring or pursuing graduate degrees in one or another of the humanistic disciplines or arts is decreasing, in some cases precipitously so, the number of students taking courses (principally introductory-level and intermediate-level courses) is holding steady or even increasing, a clear indication that such courses are being used to satisfy general-education or group requirements, Concurrent1y, faculty members in the humanistic disciplines and arts are greying. As retirements follow, relatively few tenured or tenure-track appointments are being authorized.

The serious shortage of young tenured or tenure-track faculty members, nationwide, is alarming, and prospects for the future seem bleak. It suggests that many of the advanced (doctoral level) programs now in place will gradually weaken and disappear, and that strong graduate programs in the humanistic disciplines and the arts will more and more be consigned to a handful of elite institutions. By chance, or by design, most colleges and universities will find themselves teaching more and more introductory-level and intermediate-level courses in the humanistic disciplines and the arts to an increasingly large number of students. And they will do so with a shrinking corps of adequately-trained, full-time faculty members. This reduced cadre of tenured and tenure-track faculty members will have to be supplemented by large numbers of marginally-prepared instructors, lecturers, part-time faculty members, and teaching assistants.

Meanwhile, studies show that interdisciplinary programs in the humanities and comparative arts continue to survive precariously—occasionally in supportive atmospheres, more frequently in hostile environments. (Historically, many such programs—and related "experiments" that attempt to integrate the humanities and arts with their more distant disciplinary cousins in the sciences and social sciences—have been funded externally and have come and gone in cyclic fashion.) They are generally housed in small liberal-arts colleges, though a fair number may also be found in large, comprehensive universities. Their objective is to provide a "holistic" view of knowledge, an approach that their devotees claim shatters the "artificial" barriers that separate the "fragmented" and "inward-looking" traditional disciplines. Their opponents argue that these interdisciplinary experiments do nothing but promote "vague and impressionistic generalizations" that lack the "foundation" and "substance" provided by more discipline-centered studies.

While interdisciplinary courses and/or course sequences at the undergraduate level are generally associated with general-education programs and core group requirements, they are

also frequently linked to honors programs. Such courses and course sequences mayor may not be required of all students—regularly-matriculated students as well as honors students —and they may or may not be team taught. Occasionally, these broadly-based efforts extend beyond the introductory level and include quite sophisticated upper-division offelings as well. In some cases, interdisciplinary courses and course sequences are even incorporated into genuine curricula and are further legitimatized by being granted the status of "authentic" undergraduate degree programs. Graduate degree programs in interdisciplinary humanistic studies and comparative arts are extremely rare; they are found at only a handful of universities. Multi-disciplinary programs are more prevalent: while paying homage to the ideal of Interdisciplinarity, they tend to deal with disciplinary subject matter seriatim and discretely, i.e. in a far less integrated way.

These national trends clearly apply to Wayne State. Historically, this university has not been hospitable to interdisciplinary studies and comparative curricula. With rare exceptions, support for such efforts has been marginal: witness the histories of Monteith College, the Weekend College Program (now the Interdisciplinary Studies Program), the Chicano-Boricua Studies Program, etc. at the University level; Humanities, American Studies, Linguistics, Women's Studies, the Honors Program, etc. at the College level. Rhetoric aside, neither the University nor the College of Liberal Arts has ever regarded such programs as anything but peripheral to their respective missions, and they have they never provided them with adequate budgetary support. Faculty response has been equally ambivalent: it has ranged from grudging acceptance—even occasional admiration—to virulent hostility replete with invective and disdain.

With regard to Monteith and Humanities, the picture is clearly a mixed one. On a philosophical and theoretical level, courses and curricula developed by both have been viewed as innovative and academically sound—even elegant. National studies (in the case of Monteith), external evaluations (in the cases of both Monteith and Humanities), and internal evaluations (the University Council with regard to Monteith; the University's General Education Implementation Committee and several sets of Review Advisory Panels with regard to Humanities) have lauded the efforts of both and have concluded that their interdisciplinary courses, course sequences, and curricula rank with the finest available nationwide. In many quarters, both Monteith and Humanities are/were regarded as model programs of their kind.

On an emotional and pragmatic (budgetary) level, however, both have been locally viewed with reserve and/or suspicion. Repeated attempts were made to eliminate both Monteith and Humanities (and to slight their respective faculties) before the tasks were successfully accomplished. Budgetary and personnel resources were withheld from both units despite high praise for their curricula and pedagogy; and in the case of Humanities, a very favorable student-faculty ratio that, measured by formula-funding criteria, made the department a substantial budgetary asset.

In an important sense, curricular commitments represent public statements of educational values —university values, college values, department/program values. Grappling with the question of what it means to be educated in a technological society during a period of rapidly expanding knowledge is a fundamental issue that must be addressed and readdressed as universities, colleges, and departments/programs struggle to define and redefine their respective missions. Indeed, it should inform every philosophical and budgetary debate related to the allocation of resources. By implementing a "new" set of General-Education Requirements in 1987, and by

developing a Strategic Plan for the '90s and beyond, the University has rhetorically made its commitment manifest. (Both the general-education program and the strategic plan imply positions relative to such values.) Precisely how the rhetoric is to be implemented in material (budgetary) terms, however, is not at all cleat'. The phasing out of Monteith and Humanities provides evidence to suggest that the relationship between rhetoric and budget in this area is at best tenuous.

Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow

The Wayne State of 1995 is a substantially different institution than the Wayne State of 1962. (1) Physically, the University has been remarkably improved: new buildings have been added; older buildings have been renovated or restored; landscaping and pedestrian malls unite a campus once divided by major thoroughfares and city traffic. (2) Organizationally, the University has become a far more centralized and hierarchical bureaucracy. Concomitantly, relations between faculty and administration have deteriorated; they have become less collegial and more adversarial. (3) The student population—allowing for temporary fluctuations in both directions—has remained essentially constant, but the mix has changed markedly: in direct response to University policy, the number of graduate and professional students recruited and admitted has increased, while the number of undergraduates has declined; and at the undergraduate level, the proportion of transfer students has grown as the proportion of native students has shrunk. (4) The "quality" of the faculty, measured by a range of quantifiable criteria, has "improved."

President Adamany is justifiably proud of the fact that Wayne State has recently been designated a "Carnegie I" institution, a designation earned by comprehensive research universities whose faculty members generate large sums of extramural funding, a designation that places Wayne State in the top echelon of the nation's "elite" institutions of higher education. He is also rightfully proud that the University's physical plant has been dramatically upgraded, that a high degree of fiscal stability has been achieved, and that many important material improvements have been made during the years of his stewardship.

But is the Wayne State of today a better institution than the Wayne State of three decades ago? Does it more successfully serve the needs of its students? Does it more faithfully fulfill its institutional mission?

The questions are simple, but the answers are not. On the one hand, I know of no one who prefers teaching in shabby classrooms at a fiscally unstable institution on a campus with a seriously deteriorating physical plant. On the other, how does one account for so much faculty discontent in the light of such markedly improved physical and fiscal conditions?

Clearly, issues and values—differing in both kind and degree—must be considered and evaluated before reasonable answers to these questions can even be suggested: issues, in this context, relate to material matters and logistics; values to priorities and principles.

With regard to material matters and logistics, there is general—if not specific—agreement that major improvements have indeed taken place. Debates about such issues have usually centered about degree and priority—not basic objectives. With some minor changes in timing, with the implementation of a more flexible budgetary policy, and with a commitment to a less adversarial administrative posture, much of what David Adamany has accomplished in the

area of logistical and material improvement could have been accomplished collegially at a Wayne State in which faculty and president were far more mutually supportive.

With regard to values—particularly those related to academic priorities, budgetary policies, and staffing practices—disagreement is deep and profound. Increased emphasis on graduate and professional programs, the most costly type of higher education, has disproportionately siphoned limited resources from undergraduate programs. If the University is to serve the residents of metropolitan Detroit in an enlightened way, one consistent with its own mission statement, it must make a determined effort to maintain and support a maximum number of high quality programs at the undergraduate level. Limiting fields of undergraduate study and eliminating curricula at the pre-baccalaureate level (while favoring graduate-professional programs) disadvantage a large number of Wayne State students, most of whom are severely restricted geographically with respect to choice of institution at which they can realistically hope to pursue a college (undergraduate) degree, Such restrictions quickly translate into the loss of programmatic options and seriously undercut the University's claim that it provides access to a full range of high-quality undergraduate programs for promising students whose pre-college educational experience may have been weak or wanting. The narrowness and paucity of academic programs (and courses) becomes all the more regrettable in view of the diverse needs of a largely non-traditional student clientele. Options for graduate/professional studies, on the other hand, are much greater: a wide range of scholarships, fellowships, and graduate assistantships (on a national level) are available to Wayne State students who demonstrate their competence at the undergraduate level.

Responsible budgetary policies, those that maintain fiscal stability, can certainly be developed within the context of such academic priorities. Current policies, rigidly formula-based and formula-driven, seem—at times-—inimical to sound academic decisions and will remain so until modifications are introduced. (Qualitative criteria, as well as quantitative measures, must be seriously weighed,) And even the most "conservative" approach to budget making does not require that vast sums of "carry-forward" money—funds to be spent as the administration sees fit—be generated at the end of every single fiscal year.

Similarly, staffing policies and practices should reflect the values inherent in academic priorities—particularly at an institution that historically took justifiable pride in pointing out that a very high percent of its' undergraduate courses, a much higher percentage than that found in any of its sister institutions, was taught by members of the full-time faculty. Indeed, for decades, Wayne State proudly invited the Governor, the State Legislature, and the public to note that such a staffing policy clearly demonstrated the extent of its commitment to high-quality undergraduate education. How incongruous it now seems to note that fully <u>one third</u> of the faculty members currently holding full-time appointments in the humanities disciplines in the College of Liberal Arts, the college responsible for offering the vast majority of courses that satisfy the University's General-Education Program, are lecturers hired on a year-to-year basis, and that fully <u>two thirds</u> of the undergraduate course sections offered by the College are staffed—not by tenured or tenure-track members of the full-time faculty—but by lecturers, part-time faculty members, and teaching assistants.

In light of these facts and observations, it seems reasonable to reiterate the three questions posed earlier. Is the Wayne State of today a better institution than the Wayne State of three

decades ago? Does it more successfully serve the needs of its students? Does it more faithfully fulfill its institutional mission?

With regard to physical plant, there is general agreement that much improvement has taken place and that Wayne State today is clearly physically sounder and more handsome than it was three decades ago. With respect to institutional values and academic priorities, however, there is no such general agreement. Those who subscribe to the President's vision for the University's future would cite major changes—particularly in areas related to Wayne State's enhanced status as a comprehensive research university—and argue that these "improvements" herald the emergence of a more solidly-grounded and vibrant institution. Those who don't share the President's view would point to steady erosion—particularly in areas related to Wayne State's diminished role in serving the specific academic needs of its undergraduate student body—and argue that noticeable backsliding has occurred.

What the future holds remains an open question, the answer to which will emerge from efforts made to reconcile the University's bifurcated mission in some appropriate way. There is no reason why Wayne State cannot sustain its role as a first-class comprehensive research university while simultaneously maintaining its commitment to serve the specific needs of an urban undergraduate student body drawn largely from the metropolitan Detroit area. It is, to be sure, a delicate balancing act, one that requires constant and vigilant attention, but one that in my view has moved too far off center. It is important to remember that those who too ardently champion the University's comprehensive research role must guard against the danger of Wayne State becoming a third-rate University of Michigan, while those who too ardently embrace the University's urban teaching and service commitment must guard against the danger of Wayne State become a community college writ large.

Acknowledgements

A substantial potion of the text devoted to describing the concept and design of Monteith College has been adapted from numerous essays (including *Bulletin* copy) written by all who served as deans of Monteith: Woodburn Ross, Cliff Maier (Interim Dean), Yates Hafner, and Martin Herman (Acting Dean). Some of the material related to Humanities has been adapted from the Department's Self-Study written in 1990–91. Professors Ramón Betanzos, Marc Cogan, Sara Leopold, and Richard Studing all contributed generously to that effort. I am grateful to each of them,

My sincere thanks and gratitude to Marc Cogan, Yates Hafner, Sara Leopold, Linda Speck, Richard Studing, and Jay Vogelbaum, all of whom have read this essay in draft form. Their thoughtful suggestions and perceptive comments have greatly improved the final product.