

Lester M. Wolfson
Chancellor
Indiana University at South Bend

NOW HERE'S MY PLAN

(Delivered at the Fall Faculty Meeting, September 1, 1976)

In my remarks at graduation last May I said that though we were not yet through our country's bicentennial year I guessed most of us would agree that we had suffered from so much limp and bombastic rhetoric that any speaker would be well advised to proceed very carefully. Two national conventions later, the task of saying something trained sensibilities (as opposed to partisan loyalists) might enjoy hearing is certainly no easier.

Now, in making my own contribution to re-cycling I am going to presume that the retrospect-inducing occasion of this 200th birthday year warrants my trying to make this day's task easier for us all by reaching back to various things said in various of the twelve previous fall talks I have been privileged to give at IUSB. I hope the result will be more mosaic than pastiche, but I am mindful now--as I was in 1967--that administrators in their annual addresses are viewed to be about as useful as the harmless hobbyist who gets his picture in a magazine by spending seven years building a miniature Statue of Liberty with 7,946 pieces of burnt toast. Nonetheless--in commenting on three inter-related topics: space, system, and substance --here goes.

If the listed title of these remarks faintly stirs the memory of those who have been here since 1966, let me cite some lines from my talk of that year: "... we may recall the humorous cartoon which shows two tattered, bearded, manacled prisoners chained to a blank granite wall. Overhead, fifty feet above, is a tiny grate. One prisoner is speaking to the other. The caption reads, 'Now here's my plan.'

"If we have felt constricted in the past, I think we have now gotten out of

those manacles, scaled at least half the wall, and will eventually manage to slip through the grate. Six thousand or more students in the 1970's will receive quality education at an increasingly major Indiana University Campus in South Bend. At least that is the way all the signs point now."

Ten years later we are approaching 6,000 students, and if all the ambitious plans we had--and have--for serving them well have not yet been fully realized, we at least, at last, are getting the physical space to give both formal and informal learning a proper habitation. Our first permanent building--Northside Hall--is only fifteen years old, and one hope we have seen fulfilled can be recalled in the language of my reports to you over the years. As examples, recall those thrilling words of yesteryear: in 1965, "...we continue to be deeply concerned about budgetary limitations that have prevented us from providing... the crucial space that any institution needs to work more effectively. With the renovation of the old Huckins building--which some of us are unofficially thinking of as Greenlawn Hall--and with the conversion of certain houses we now own into faculty offices, the space situation... should be much alleviated by next year." And, again from 1965: "The next warm season will see our main building air-conditioned."

The next year (1966) it went like this: "Do I over-inform when I say we need more space. We now have two major buildings, fourteen houses, and a hold on, though not actual possession of, the notorious Boat Club. But this is not enough. Within a few months, the University will probably make a decision about either moving to a new site altogether or reaffirming its earlier feeling that we can secure sufficient land contiguous to our present site. Questions of cost, engineering efficiency, pedagogic advantage, aesthetic harmony, and public response all arise, and none is easy to answer. Obviously, none can be answered at all apart from considerations of what the size, scope, and essential thrust of our program is to be five, ten, and twenty years hence."

In 1967, the questions in our mind were these: "When will offices be ready, and why aren't they ready now? Why hasn't some one--or at least the anonymous Generalized Other--solved the parking problem? Why, during the first week of classes, is the voice of the airhammer heard in our land?" I was able to report that "while at the moment we are scrambling for space, just earlier this week some of us sat down with architects and landscape architects to discuss systematic building and site planning for the next ten and more years."

In 1969, a catalogue hardly reminiscent of Shakespeare, Milton, or even Whitman, unfolded thusly: "Northside Hall was it, physically, in 1964. Since 1966 we have also been in Greenlawn, and before the snow falls we hope to be in Riverside Hall. We now own, or soon will, some 20 houses--but I don't wish to dwell any longer on the melancholy present fact of our space problems. It is better to think of spring when there will be visible progress on the \$8,000,000 first building in our long-range plan to have 10 or 12 major academic structures by the end of the 1970's...."

In 1970, I was able to say that "some things which were foretold have come to pass. If you need assurance, look out the windows of the gallery hall on the second floor of Northside to see the concrete columns--our Pelion on Ossa--reaching to the sky of our spatial need. When that structure is completed in a year and a half or so, we will have gained room nearly equal to Northside, Greenlawn, and Riverside combined. Among other capital items, we are asking the 1971 General Assembly for a direct appropriation to build a free-standing library, and bonding authority to build a student union. All of this is in keeping with an effort to stay up with expanding enrollments and to realize in an evenly graduated way an excellent space norm over a series of four or five biennia."

On August 28, 1974, I reported: "... the long-sought solution to our need for added functional and aesthetic space is highly probable, indeed imminent.

Negotiations between the University and the Associates are reaching final stages. If a transaction can be consummated, IUSB will gain excellently built and engineered facilities at a fraction of the cost to citizens and students of comparable new construction. Moreover, after years of uncertainty, the total outline of our campus site will assume final form as we look to the remainder of this century. If we acquire these extensive properties, proposed assignment and adaptation of space will need our collective serious attention in the months and years before occupancy is secured. Compromises may have to be worked out as to the ideal shape of things, but I hope the consensus will be that this route promises far more for the strength of IUSB than any feasible alternative. If Wallace Stevens could find thirteen ways of looking at a blackbird, we might find one true notion of truth in the jingle:

Truth ever lies in mean compromise
Said Sam Butler:
What could be subtler
Than the thought of Sam Butler?"

As you all know by now, the transaction was consummated, the final papers being signed on February 6, 1975. The terms provided for the front two buildings to come into our possession not later than August, 1978, and the back two not later than the end of January, 1982. In preparation for the move, with your help I appointed a Committee composed of faculty, students, and administrators to make recommendations about use of the new space and the disposition of space which would be vacated in our present holdings. That Committee, under Walt Collins's chairmanship, did a splendid piece of work, reporting its findings in a document we shared immediately with all faculty and officers who were here last year.

To the hyperbolic temper, it might not be far amiss to say the report came just in the nick of time since it develops that Associates is thinking of moving up its time-table (for at least the front two buildings) by nearly two years, so

that 133,000 gross square feet could be available to us perhaps as early as next month. Our opportunity is also our problem: where do we obtain the more than two hundred thousand dollars possession for nine months of this fiscal year would entail? We have asked for the necessary funds for next year in our Trustee-approved request for the year beginning July 1, 1977, and as we continue to work at the immediate pleasant dilemma, you will be kept fully informed of every significant development. In time we will be using all 270,000 gross square feet of the Associates buildings, but if past history gives any sign even all that room might turn out to be like Fibber McGee's closet.

In this brief rehearsal of our physical growth over the past decade, you have perhaps inferred the continuous presence of Indiana University system services--real estate, architectural, legal, accounting, and engineering. Those cost-saving, highly professionalized central administrative functions are almost all that remains of the network of dependencies and interdependencies which marked nearly every aspect of our operation until 1974. Since the dissolution of Regional Campus Administration in that year, most personnel and program decisions, subject to necessary all-University and legislative reviews, are essentially ours to make. We can make them with confident strength because our development over the 36 years of our organized existence as an Indiana University campus, and our nine years of degree-granting status, has been persistently and pervasively guided by the intangible idea which constitutes any strong University, an idea now 156 years old in its manifestation in I.U. Nearly every fall, I have tried to state variants of that notion in ways I dare presume we all feel in our most flourishing moments.

So, in 1964: "Since the end of World War II, Indiana University has grown in distinction until it is beyond question one of the most eminent universities in our country. The South Bend Campus is an integral and inseparable part of Indiana University. Given the obvious difference in scope, everything that is wished for

and expected of our largest campus is wished for and expected of our South Bend Campus.... Our single purpose...is to invest every detail of our appointed tasks with the thoroughness, the care, and the excellence that is represented by Indiana University as a whole. There is enough in the world at large that is shoddy, haphazard, and mean without our adding anything to that dismal store." In 1965, when we were first authorized to grant degrees: "The energetic participation of our faculty in addressing itself to the whole gamut of our concerns at this crucial evolutionary stage of our development--instruction, research, student affairs, cultural events, academic standards--bids fair to make the South Bend Campus preeminent among all the regional campuses, and in a reasonably short time a major campus of a major university with all the strength and quality thereby connoted."

In 1968, when our name officially became Indiana University at South Bend and the title of Chancellor was established in preparation for the self-determination of 1974, speaking of our early predecessors of extension days who sometimes with fond irreverence referred to each of the old centers individually as "The Stench," I went on to comment: "Despite this, in those first days, the crucial character of the I. U. branches was being shaped by continuous resolution on the part of University and Divisional administrative officers that, ill-favored as we in some respects were, all Indiana University programs throughout the state would have the integrity connoted by the Indiana University name. To that end, the established comprehensive departments and schools at Bloomington have always been involved in the appointment, retention, promotion, and related professional decisions affecting the state-wide faculty. The extent of in-put from Bloomington has varied from department to department, and even within the same department from era to era, but the over-all relationship has established a pattern of expectation and perquisite which provides us with a sound base for making the ever more autonomous decisions we will be called upon to make in the years immediately

to come."

Perhaps enough has now been said to indicate that current programs which stand basically alone are rooted in a long nurturing tradition--the same kind of tradition now building in the University's newer state-wide programs (public and environmental affairs, general and technical studies, continuing studies, allied health sciences). Partly for reasons of public advocacy, those programs presently have strong system linkings not unique in the productive history of our University, and while questions about seeming managerial ambiguities are appropriate, the value of these programs depends on what is delivered and not upon restricted notions of what is administratively tidy.

Here and there throughout these mainly retrospective remarks about space and system I have implied what many of us take to be the substance of Indiana University--of any worthy university. That substance, as stated in 1964, is the engagement of faculty with their academic disciplines in the faculty's "unremitting devotion to the honorable task of accumulating, refining, and transmitting all the knowledge of mind, sense, and heart accessible to human comprehension. Whether our particular interest leads us to deal primarily with words, gestures, formulas, lines, colors, musical notes, or ritual enactments, we should all be concerned that our students have as complete a grasp as possible of the methods, presuppositions, limitations, prospects, and leading achievements in all the disciplines that lend themselves to intellectual and imaginative understanding.

"If this is our task, it is equally, and concomitantly, our joy. I wish it were possible to prove that there is an inevitable connection between intelligence and character, between formal knowledge and human endeavor. Some of the ancient Greeks seemed to believe that there was, but experience offers too many examples of the bright and the beautiful who were also the demonic. Whether we view Satan

literally or symbolically, it is awesome to remember that the devil was once Lucifer, the brightest of the angels."

In the dozen years since 1964, the full-time faculty and professional staff at IUSB serving our good ends has grown from 24 to 190. In that time, with the rest of our country, we have weathered much of the rancor caused by campus and city disruption, a rending war, and a national administration distrustful of its own people. Rightly suspicious of the kind of intellect that divorces formal knowledge (often mis-knowledge) from human endeavor, and knowing on more solid ground than ever before that students who are stress-ridden have difficulty in learning, we have attempted many ways to reduce anxiety in schools at all levels. Apart from the aura of genuine respect and concern the teacher shows for the student, some approaches have included abolition of the failing or even the average grade, use of learning contracts incorporating specific performance based criteria, and use of structured exercises in which the student validates his own experience. A usual outcome of these practices is to leave a record difficult to interpret as an indicator of what qualitative level of mastery or competence has been achieved. In itself, this may not be a bad thing but it does raise, among others, the question of whether any school--including IUSB--wishes in some institutional way to re-define the meaning of an "A," "Honors," "Distinction," and the like. Particularly disquieting in this regard is the progressive recent decline in verbal and mathematical SAT scores, and though it may have been quixotic, the decision last year of the Phi Beta Kappa chapter at Bloomington not to elect any students to membership since it could no longer detect measures indicating superior performance. I bring this issue before you for your particular consideration during the coming year because last spring I concurred with the minority votes in the all-campus Promotion, Tenure, and Renewal Committee in recommending against promotion

in some cases where these considerations were pertinent factors. My action raised understandable concern, some of it so vigorous that I was reminded of Dr. Johnson's observation that if a man knows he is to hang in a fortnight, it remarkably focuses the attention. We have talked over the years, probably too sporadically, about academic quality, standards, and evaluation. With consciousness now raised, I understand that at least one faculty group is already addressing itself formally to these matters and that Dean Harriman proposes to arrange a series of similar inter-faculty conversations.

I trust that as the potential strengths and weaknesses of affective approaches are discussed, the student's sometimes too-casual use of "I feel" as an alleged mark of insight will be considered. Keats once observed that even a proverb is no proverb until experience has proved it on one's pulses, but his whole life and work implied a taxonomy of feelings shaped by wide reference and deep cognitive understanding. To what degree are feelings appropriate not only to the external objects which inspire them but to the broad and subtle aspects of interpersonal interaction? C. S. Lewis once indicated that "Coleridge agreed with the tourist who called the cataract sublime and disagreed with the one who called it pretty because he believed inanimate nature to be such that certain responses could be more "just" or "ordinate" or "appropriate" to it than others.... the man who called the cataract sublime was not intending simply to describe his own emotions about it: he was also claiming that the object was one which merited those emotions."

As any teacher of any subject attempts to develop the student's sense of intellectual order, to what degree should he suggest that "certain attitudes are really true, and others really false, to the kind of thing the universe is and the kinds of things we are...?"

I am sure that the discussions to take place will redound to our benefit, and that we will find ground on which to make assessments that will inspire shared confidence in the integrity of our 1976-77 endeavor as a campus of Indiana University.

May we all have a good year.