# JANUS

A FACULTY JOURNAL

*The University of Montana*

Number 1 Winter 1992

IN THIS ISSUE:



DEPARTMENTS:

On behalf of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate I am pleased to wish Janus and its creators well on this, their inaugural issue. The retired and partly retired faculty members whose impetus has created Janus seek to increase communication and discussion among the members of the University of Montana faculty. Topics will range over the breadth of faculty interests. We believe this publication is compatible with the objectives, aims and finest traditions of the Faculty Senate. Best wishes and good luck!

Michael R. Brown
Chair, Faculty Senate

JANUS is the work of a small group of partly retired and retired faculty designed to provide, each term, a continuing forum to all faculty for thoughtful discussion of University of Montana topics. The editorial board discusses and solicits manuscripts on specific issues but unsolicited manuscripts are very welcome. To take advantage of low cost reproduction techniques, which will make this journal effort economically feasible, we ask that all manuscripts be limited to 10 pages single spaced and be camera ready without pagination. Manuscripts ready by May 8th should be sent to MA 303. For further information, please call one or other of the following on campus or at home: W. Ballard, M. Chessin, J. Cox, D. Hampton, T. Payne, H. Reinhardt, R. Solberg, R. Smith. JANUS is funded with the help of the University of Montana Faculty Senate.

# WHERE HAVE ALL THE STANDARDS GONE?: A View from a 5th-Quartile University[1]

Fred W. Reed, William H. McBroom, and Stewart Justman

With increasing frequency students tell us, "I'm paying tuition here and I will decide when I come to class, what I want to learn, and how I approach this experience." We have come to call this stance the K-Mart approach to education. Student consumerism and the slack academic performance associated with it are not new. They are part of a national trend--and national trends always hit UM well after they are first discerned.

Moreover, student disregard for academic standards is not uncaused. As part of a national trend, what we see here doubtless has the same constellation of causes as manifestations elsewhere. We can list the wooing of students by universities desperate for customers; the collapse of standards at the secondary level (although it is universities like ours that train teachers in the first place); the outmoding of traditional literacy in a "post-literate" society;[2] the growing practice of awarding university credit for remedial work; the misguided permissiveness of professors who may believe they are still in the 1960s; the inculcating of "self-esteem" in courses of dubious academic merit; and the assault on the very concept of academic merit in the name of political correctness.

But while the crisis we confront in the classroom may have large-scale and long-term causes, faculty can still apply rigorous standards and students can adjust to them. Some do so grudgingly when a single professor demands it. They would do so as a matter of course if most professors insisted.

Consider the example of student writing skills. Everyone laments the sorry level of student writing at UM, and everyone is convinced things were not like that in their day. Such claims may be correct; it used to be that a full year of Freshman English was required. Presently faculty listen with mock politeness when their colleagues in English claim that they can't handle the load and that "Besides, it's everyone's job to teach writing." The former may be true; the latter certainly is. You may recall that a few years ago an exit exam in writing was on the books at UM; students would have to certify their literacy in order to graduate. Many

---

[1]The illogical possibility of five quartiles derives from an article in *U.S. News and World Report* (September 30, 1991; pp. 77-108) in which America's best universities were identified and the rest ranked in quartiles. UM made the bottom quartile.

[2]Corcoran, Paul. *Political Language and Rhetoric.* 1979. Austin: University of Texas Press.

would have failed that exam (as even administrators conceded at the time), at least until its standards were lowered to the point where the original purpose of the exercise was defeated. But in a university where literate expression was required in virtually all classes, no such exam would ever have to be given. No one would become a senior who stood to fail an exit exam in writing. What is the response of UM to the scandal of student illiteracy? None. Rather than stand in the way of students who "have to graduate," UM graduates them literate or not.

Students have poor writing skills because such displays are generally tolerated when writing is required at all. In a course two of us teach on alternate quarters there are frequent tests, each including an item that requires a paragraph response. When students discover they can get no better than half credit if they use a sentence fragment, sentence fragments disappear in short order. Mechanical problems clear up with similar rapidity. All we have to do is make it clear that we take writing seriously and grade it accordingly--we need only make writing consequential for students. To be sure, some offer occasional hostile remarks like "This isn't an English class." We respond with "No, but English is the medium of instruction" or "Why do you think English is required--to be used only in English courses?" When a graduate student objecting to having his thesis edited complained to Prof. Gerald Doty of the Music Department, "You are supposed to teach music, not English," Gerry retorted, "That's where you're wrong. I'm teaching **YOU**!"

We find that while students initially resent having their writing made consequential, they generally adapt quickly and well. To our knowledge, none have dropped our courses because we demanded literacy. Some may have gone to the dean to complain, but none sought relief through the student complaint procedure. To the contrary, many later dropped by to thank us.

Do most UM faculty demand competent writing? No. Many assign no written work, and those who do, routinely approve sub-literate efforts and make skimpy comments if any. If 5% of a student's classes have a "W" designation, as is the case, faculty in the other 95% can and will excuse themselves from teaching writing. What more eloquent indictment of academic standards at UM than these numbers? Why don't more faculty demand competent performance from their students? For some it would be too much work, but it is a larger group, those who suffer from demoralization, that especially concerns us here. These faculty have given up. They have withdrawn into the silence of bystander apathy. We believe that many faculty members at UM are privately disconsolate at the steep decline in standards--a decline abetted by their own passivity and a complicit administration.

In offering this essay we make a sociological argument. The orientation of sociology is to look to characteristics of social settings (both proximal and distal) in the attempt to explain observed social behavior. Thus, we do not suggest that faculty

performance and morale are wholly the result of individual traits or defects of character. Indeed, a variety of non-rational and self-defeating behavior is known to result from the social conditions we describe. We claim that not only the decline of standards but also the behavior of faculty and administrators are importantly the result of structural conditions. Individually, none of these conditions is particularly formidable; in combination they are devastating.

**EROSION OF RESOURCES**

One such condition is the continuing erosion of resources. Not only have many faculty lost hope, they have become meek in order not to draw attention to themselves or to their departments as targets for the next round of retrenchment. Few trust the process by which cuts are made, and with reason. During Faculty Senate discussion of the last retrenchment plan, perhaps in unintended imitation of Kafka, one professor said, "Don't ask how you get on the list; what matters is what happens once you get there." Retrenchment intimidates. When President Koch reneged on his own retrenchment plan after pledging to make "real" cuts in athletics, he presumably knew this faculty would let him get away with it. He was right.

When faculty, trying desperately to be inconspicuous, suffer or observe violations of academic freedom, they typically withdraw in embarrassment--not unlike rape victims--contributing to a conspiracy of silence. This climate of shame produces a state of "pluralistic ignorance" where many imagine themselves to be unique in their problems. One consequence of the pluralistic ignorance among UM faculty is that administrators have been emboldened to savage traditions of academic freedom in the interest of power, convenience and other inappropriate goals. Students, perceiving the disarray, imagine themselves to be the winners and gorge on increasingly debased honors.

In the era of retrenchment the UM line is "We're excellent now, but if cuts are made we'll be excellent no longer." Each repetition of this refrain contradicts the last.

**RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION**

One seemingly reasonable response to the loss of resources was the adoption of a recruitment-and-retention mode. But this has had its costs. Professing concern for students, administrators engage in such dubious practices as signing late petitions over the objections of faculty and such unethical ones as signing retroactive drops for delinquent students. In cases amounting to academic thuggery, deans browbeat faculty to raise grades. There is even one documented instance of wholesale surreptitious doctoring of grades by deans. While these violations of academic freedom are alarming, the faculty's inability to respond with indignation is more alarming yet. We contend that such pervasive passivity, such a culture of complicity and silence, would be absent at a distinguished university. There a group of senior professors would make a visit to inform the offending dean that

they no longer had confidence in him or her. The next day, the office would be under new management. Indeed, not that many years ago on this campus a President was sent packing after the Senate voted no confidence, arguably the last significant act that body has taken.

**GOAL DISPLACEMENT**

Another factor abetting the decline in standards at UM is goal displacement. Goals may be upset by changes in the power systems of organizations, in the types and number of personnel, and in the environment. It is common for primary goals to be eclipsed by secondary or lower-order goals if resources are insufficient to reach the former or if lesser goals are easier to meet (or if meeting lesser goals reflects favorably on those influencing the allocation of resources). An organization with multiple goals, like a university with its emphasis on teaching, research and service--an organization with powerful external constituencies, like a public university beholden to a state legislature--is particularly vulnerable to goal displacement.

At one time, academic excellence might have been the goal towards which collective faculty energies were directed. As resources have been strained over the past fifteen years, administrators have focussed the faculty on less worthy ends. Starting in 1977 faculty participated in a two-year long program review under President Bowers; faculty were then asked to engage in President Bucklew's planning process with its forms A and B; with President Koch there were aspirations of becoming **THE** University of Montana by placing communication links throughout the State; and the current administration apparently desires to ingratiate the University to the State by encouraging students to perform community service. At this point UM's primary goal seems to be to fill the campus with large numbers of paying customers, on whom the institution's funding depends, as we are constantly reminded in emphatic terms.

**FACULTY EVALUATION WITH LITTLE ACCOUNTABILITY**

Still another condition contributing to the general decline is the process of faculty evaluation under the collective bargaining agreement (C.B.A.). This places an undue, virtually exclusive, reliance on unit standards. In practice, the faculty of each unit, regardless of how commendable or deplorable their collective performance, set the standards by which they reward themselves. Thus, late in the fall merits are distributed like Christmas candy. Administrators are complicit.

The absence of insistence on the standards of the academy allows administrators to divert the evaluation process to other purposes. Prompting a retirement with a "going-away" merit, championing the concept of "years-in-rank" merit, and rewarding "good citizens" (presumably, those who don't break the code of silence) are examples. Such acts contradict the idea of an academy.

The Standards Committee takes the narrowest possible definition of its charge--to see that the unit's standards are applied procedurally, not substantively. The Appeals Committee is precluded by contract from "substituting" its judgment for that of the unit. A new judgment from a higher court is exactly what an appellant wants. Without the power to deliver a judgment, these external committees are little more than certifiers of any unit's majority opinion, however just or unjust. Under these conditions most acquiesce to their department colleagues. If there is little prospect of reversing an F.E.C recommendation, why fight when you can be denied a merit next time around and when compliance is rewarded? The doling out of rewards and punishments is done with an unctuous show of procedural decorum, of course. The tyranny of an academic majority wears a velvet glove.

**TWO LINES OF AUTHORITY**

Hierarchical organizations have some undesirable features, but there is rarely doubt as to who is in charge. The more lines of authority, the more likely confusion will result. Just such confusion bedevils what is called faculty governance, or shared governance, at UM. When two sources of responsibility exist for something as nebulous as faculty governance, conditions favor inaction. At UM we have both a Faculty Senate and a collective bargaining agent (the University Teachers Union, or U.T.U.). While the C.B.A. and the Articles and By-laws of the Senate may set up clear and separate functions, in practice clarity is rarely achieved. As each party hopes or assumes the other will handle a given matter, responsibility diffuses and disappears. Neglect is normalized. "It's not my job."

Consider the recent case of deans secretively changing grades assigned by one of the authors. The U.T.U. agreed to file a grievance on the grounds that academic freedom had been violated, but fixated on activating the student complaint procedure, outlined in an unrelated part of the C.B.A. and compromised by the dean, not the faculty member, to begin with. By analogy with goal displacement, the original purpose of the grievance was forgotten.

To date the Faculty Senate has refused to consider the urgent issues raised by this case, perhaps out of a misplaced sense of deference. Since the U.T.U.'s primary interest has become the student complaint procedure, and since the Senate has kept mum, the academic questions raised by this affair go undiscussed, lost in a fog.

**CO-OPTATION**

The concept of co-optation refers to the inclusion of new persons into an organization's decision-making structure in an attempt to avert or minimize threats to the organization. We submit that both the Faculty Senate and the U.T.U. have been co-opted by the administration. We propose no conspiracy theory. Given the experience of UM over the last decade or more, organizational theory would lead one to expect co-optation to have taken place; organizations shift as pressure is brought to bear.

The Faculty Senate (on which each of the writers has served) has withered into a ceremonial body that hears reports about the latest Yellow Bay retreat by the Executive Committee of the Senate (E.C.O.S.); reacts to initiatives of a growing number of administrators; and approves routine matters mandated by the Board of Regents. Over the bargaining table (two of us having served on the U.T.U. team) there is an affectation of adversarial style. Yet several U.T.U. officials, including Presidents, have passed into UM administration--presumptive evidence of co-optation. There is something too cozy about relations between the U.T.U. leadership and UM administration. The U.T.U. provides evidence of being co-opted when it insists on the rights of students denied access to the complaint procedure by an administrator--in effect, sweeping up after the misconduct of that official--rather than insisting on the academic freedom of a member of the bargaining unit.

When co-optation takes place the new members become, perhaps without full awareness, spokespersons for the administration. Again we offer the example of the Senate. Usually E.C.O.S. places "welfare of the University" last on the agenda, virtually guaranteeing its exclusion, even though this topic is the only one specifically mandated by Senate rules and offers the only opportunity for persons other than serving senators to have the floor. The great bulk of the Senate's time is reserved for announcements by virtually anyone who wants to speak to "the faculty," with commensurately little time devoted to actionable issues or issues of philosophical import to the academy.

To summarize our argument to this point, recent years have brought changes for the worse to UM. The relationship between students and professors has come to resemble that between purchasers and merchants. There has been a steep drop of academic standards (accompanied by ever-louder proclamations of our own "excellence"). And academic governance has withered, with many faculty worrying in quiet desperation over violations of their freedom. We do not propose that these changes are due to ineducable students; nor do we allege that the personalities of administrators are worse than ever before. Rather, we submit that the changes result largely from the structural conditions just discussed.

In our experience many students, officially advised only by other students, grab courses like sweaters from the discount table only to discard them when the challenge of mastery defies easy success. Students are permitted, even over faculty objections, to drop courses even years after having taken them in order to sanitize their academic histories. Sadly, one of the authors' recent experiences has resulted in a large number of other faculty reporting that they have been abused, bullied, cursed and threatened when they presumed to insist on their grading authority rather than cozying up to students. When the funding of the University depends directly on enrollment--when a student lost is a dollar lost--conditions favor the attitude that the customer is right. When the threat of retrenchment and rewards of conformity

are such that cowardice is encouraged in faculty, administrators will overstep their authority with no apprehension over breaking the rules.

We do not suppose the Faculty Senate will become more than a puppet government, at least not until the faculty demands it. Nor do we imagine that administrators will stop sloganizing about excellence and start taking words seriously. We suppose they are comfortable with the dilution of academic values. Recall that many recent national searches for administrative positions at UM have produced the startling result that the best candidate in the country was on this campus from the start. Such persons are too much in equilibrium with UM to be agents of positive change.

If present trends continue, what are the prospects for the year 2000? They are not bright. We submit that many faculty are merely hanging on until retirement at about that time. Some may entertain the hope that new, more energetic, more recently trained faculty will step in to save the day. Such a rescue is unlikely in the extreme. New hires, lacking the protection of tenure, either fit in or leave. To hope that UM will improve without the senior faculty having to do anything is vain.

A more likely outcome is that apathy will merely accelerate the faculty's own de-skilling. With the decay of academic standards and academic freedom, there is little to distinguish UM faculty from junior college teachers who do piece-rate work. Indeed, frequently UM hires just this sort of person.

If you were an administrator with two open faculty lines, you could choose to merge the lines to lure some hot young prospect. But how long would this prospect stay or, in this environment, stay hot? You might instead take the lines and create three or four part-time positions wholly or partially exempt from the conditions of the C.B.A. Administrators like being unencumbered by contractual restrictions. A good many Humanities sections are taught by piece-rate instructors already, and the total of part-time instructors at UM is rumored to number 100 or more. There are more than 30 adjunct faculty, some of whom already serve on and even chair faculty committees. Many adjunct and part-time faculty do not have the terminal degree; all presumably are eager to teach. They sense there is little difference between them and the tenure-track faculty. In view of the faculty's level of performance, they may be right.

If sociology has anything to offer, and we believe it does, then our argument about the state of academic values and practice at UM should suggest corrective measures. Social structures, after all, are merely the patterns formed by routine interactions--standardized ways of doing things. It follows that if ways of doing things at UM are modified, the structures within which we all work will change and by reciprocal influence so will we. Certainly no actions taken at UM will reverse national trends. At the same time, social causation is not apocalyptic determinism. It is

possible to make changes, important and worthwhile changes, within the limits imposed by the national and local environments.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE

What is to be done? The key is to recognize that academic standards and freedom concern all faculty--every one of us. It is folly for faculty to retreat into their shells in the manner of so many during the McCarthy era.

Those who think the McCarthy analogy inapt ought to look into the recent history of contempt for the rights of the accused at UM, a matter one of the authors learned about through years of grievance work for the U.T.U. In one instance a UM administrator issued a warning to a faculty member after receiving complaints from students. He did not look into the charges but accepted them at face value; in fact, he avowed to the face of the faculty member and to the Grievance Officer representing him that he saw no need to verify the charges and was under no obligation to do so. The exact words he used were "Where there's smoke there's fire." Clearly this official had no sense that he was saying something morally repugnant. Nor was he known for malevolence. He did what the ordinary climate of ethical neglect at UM both normalizes and disposed him to do. He, too, was in equilibrium with the institution.

There have been cases where students were recruited to smear a professor; in which a professor was summoned to a kangaroo court; in which accused faculty were not so much as informed that charges had been lodged against them; in which accused faculty were not permitted to see letters of complaint accepted as fact by administration. Bear in mind too that the stated belief of UM's Equal Opportunity officer is that a student who feels abused has been abused--a policy that does away with the presumption of innocence. (In UM pronouncements on sexual harassment, when are the rights of the accused even mentioned?) On such a campus it is vital for faculty to reaffirm academic values in the highest sense. Academic standards and freedom are not the responsibility of some other person. They are our responsibility--ours collectively and singly.

**Reaffirm teaching standards:** Resist the pressure to ingratiate yourself to students. Stand up for the controversial colleague. Resist academic fads. Avoid the complacency fostered by public talk of our own "excellence." Relate to a colleague something about one of your classes that you would like to improve. Ask how he or she handles such matters. Even better, take your syllabus, a class assignment, or a copy of an exam to a colleague. Tell what you are trying to accomplish in the course. Ask him or her to mark up your work and get it back to you. By trial and error you will be able to find someone who will respond with more than a "that's nice," and this colleague does not have to have the same training or disciplinary interests. In some respects, disciplinary lines are no more than bureaucratic conveniences.

**Reaffirm your commitment to faculty governance:** Attend Senate meetings. In recent years barely enough senators have been present to make a quorum, the last typically wandering in well past the scheduled meeting time. If your Senators are not there when you are, ask them why. Members of the administration are more conscientious about attendance and even participation. If the meeting room (LA 11, at 3:10 PM the third Thursday of every month) were full to capacity, your interest in faculty governance would not be lost on senators or administrators. During normal Senate meetings only serving senators and E.C.O.S. invitees may speak. As mentioned above, during the once-a-quarter "welfare of the University" meeting, anyone may have the floor. Come to one of those meetings and speak your mind. In Senate elections do not allow your vote to be dictated.

**Lobby to have the structure changed:** The C.B.A. defines much of what happens on campus. It can be changed. Questions of due process, promotion standards, grievability--all are up for negotiation. At the start of each round of bargaining, suggestions are solicited by the U.T.U. Make yours known. Seek support from others. A union unresponsive to its constituency will soon be decertified. An acquiescent faculty provides no reason for a union to be responsive.

**Reaffirm scholarly values:** Publicize only genuine achievements; avoid all puffery. When you see that a colleague has published something of note, send the writer a letter; call to congratulate; better yet, take the writer for coffee and learn about his or her work. Though seemingly trivial, such rituals make for solidarity, and just such shared commitment is sorely lacking in a demoralized faculty that has retreated into silence. Durkheim's theory of social rituals predicts that when people with shared values meet and reaffirm those commitments, a powerful moral force is created.

**Reaffirm academic freedom:** Refuse to be a party to the blackballing of colleagues who speak up, a practice nourished by fear and apathy that rule the UM campus.

In refusing to honor the UM code of silence, the authors of this paper will appear pushy, boorish and unsporting to some. We suspect that the same people who use these proletarian epithets will dismiss us as "elitist." We also expect that our statement will evoke expressions of displeasure. Let us anticipate the arguments of our critics.

1) WHO ARE YOU TO SAY THESE THINGS?: Who do we have to be? We are UM faculty members; vitas are available on request. We believe the standards we espouse are those of the academy and apply to our several disciplines.

2) YOU ARE ADVOCATING ELITISM: Locally, the charge of elitism has come to be used to cast faculty who espouse rigorous standards as students' enemies, a shabby tactic. "Elite" refers to

the choice or best part--to excellence. If UM gives the elite grade of A, it had better have the standards to back the grade up. Surely students with excellent-looking transcripts ought to be capable of excellent performances. One of the writers has been rebuked for assigning Chaucer in the original Middle English rather than in translation--at the 400 level. Middle English "intimidates" students, he was informed. If this is elitism, then so be it.

3) WE ARE A FAMILY: This attempt to cast critics as sowers of dissension, as spoilers of fun, illustrates the problem; it shows that standards have already been abandoned for social reasons. "We need to trust one another" has become code for "If you don't challenge my claims, then I won't challenge yours." True trust is earned trust. While cordial relations are in themselves generally desirable, at times conflict and discord are not only inescapable, but vital. At UM collegiality too readily reduces to groupthink and mutual backslapping. To imply that collegiality in this sense is the primary value at UM is evidence of an abandonment of the academy. Those who view dissent as a disease lag well behind Albania.

4) THIS IS THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA, AFTER ALL: This argument is not just an apology for inferiority but a declaration of it. A popular fiction is that specially low standards befit UM. We hold that even UM faculty belong to the academy, like it or not. However one may wish to weaken them, academic standards have a certain obduracy. External reviews and reports of teams who make site visits here confirm this point. All look for publications in journals where blind, anonymous peer review is the standard. In an academic world where "networking" and the buddy system are increasingly the rule, where unprincipled publishers will market anything for a consideration, blind review is perhaps the most important ethical check remaining.

Not only standards, but students, too, are abused. "Superior" students leave us thinking they are going 100 miles an hour only to discover that they are marginal students in some other university's graduate program. Such students may like us while they are here, but they bitterly resent us when they discover the academy for which we have willfully failed to prepare them. Our mentors provided us with rigorous training and a sense of awe and affection for the academy. Should we do less for our students?

5) THERE THEY GO, ON THE ATTACK AGAIN: For those persuaded by *ad hominem* arguments, we recommend a course in logic. For those who know better but use such arguments anyway, a course in ethics is in order.

# Faculty Abroad

## A Valuable Life in Missoula

Nobuchika Urata
Visiting Exchange Fellow from Toyo University, Tokyo
The School of Journalism

A few weeks after starting my stay in Missoula at the end of March last year, I felt like my basic view of life was shaken. In a strange state of mind, I noticed that I was affected a great deal by life in this small town during a very short period of time. Even my long year experiences in European big cities and New York had never made such a strong and deep impact on me as Missoula did.

In the meantime, I read a book and found in it Kittredge's words, citing Thomas More's Utopia: the ideal community size, diversity and networking -- a mixture of a small town and a city -- make a Utopia, and make Missoula. He says "I can't think of a better place to live." With the help of his words, I clearly realized that not the quantities of big cities but the quality of life here, which I was already feeling, had impressed me so much.

I had been leading a busy life for long years and thought little of the quality of life. Hard work was my second nature and one of my dreams was to have more time. But, as a matter of fact, I didn't know what I would be doing in the spare time, if I managed to have it. I was almost ignorant of valuable life.

Detailed discussions may be possible on the quality of life, but setting aside them for a while, I see in this place of Montana many things we have lost in Japan's urbanization and economization. Our people, who had lived close to nature, are gradually getting far from it. I love, most of all about being here, the easy access to the wilderness and wildlife in this town and its surrounding areas.

How wonderful is a combination of a sophisticated university institution with white-tailed deer in the mountain just behind it! How I was scared at, excited by and enjoyed a mother black bear and her two cubs which I came across in a summer evening while I was bicycling alone in the Kim Williams Nature Area! In the later part of June last year at the foot of University Mountain, a sudden hailstorm with violent thunderbolts stunned me so badly I, seeking shelter under a tree, wondered if I would survive them.

But the nicest of all the quality of life in Missoula are people I encounter. I always see in them something of fairness, honesty, humanity and braveness, all the virtues shared by great Montanans such as Jeannette Rankin and Mike Mansfield. And I also see in them a bit of defiant spirit to established authority and I love it.

One of my most excellent experiences in this town was a visit to the city cemetery, where around fifty Japanese railroad workers have been buried since the turn of the century, and I knew their tombstones were well looked after by Missoulians even during the last war. My wife and I gave prayers to the dead and couldn't keep back our tears, thinking about the bitter memories of the past.

Back in Japan, what I will be missing most after a year stay in Missoula? I say, for sure, that is plenty of time I am enjoying in Montana. "Here my one day is twenty-seven hours instead of twenty-four," I often tell to myself. For the most part, the extra is made because of far less commuting time I need than in the huge city of Tokyo and its suburbs. But even if I have plenty of time there, I will be missing a valuable life in Missoula and the nice Missoulians whom I can talk to.

# Return to the Village called Bountiful

Frank and Susanne Bessac

Twenty five years ago I had lived in this landlord house in central Taiwan, built in 1919 by a prosperous rice merchant-tax collector and sometimes village mayor whose ancestors had come from Fujian province on the mainland. He had observed careful symmetry in laying out the compound to assure absolutely equal shares to his two sons. The ancestor tablets on the right end of the altar table, the lesser side, the god figures occupy the left side, define the center of the north wing, the main wing of the house. The rooms along the eastern side of the brick paved courtyard, the dragon wing, belong to the senior line, those along the west, the tiger wing,belong to the junior line.

In 1989 we came back to live again in the same old rooms in the tiger wing that I had lived in before. The widow who had rented them to me then had died quite suddenly only months before our return. Through the medium of divining blocks, she had let it be known that even though her spirit had not yet passed to the land of shades she welcomed us to live there as her guests as long as we did not move her furniture around and make her feel a stranger in her old home. We lived in her study and bedroom. Her presence occupied the next room where her family had placed a large photograph on an altar table and carefully changed fruit offerings and flower arrangements as they came to communicate with her spirit or to introduce new members of her family, a new son-in-law from Japan, a grandchild.

Every morning the caretaker, a member of the senior branch who lived in rooms across the courtyard, bowed low before the shrine to the God of Heaven in the courtyard gate post, lighted an incense stick, he placed it in the censer before the god's name. Then he attended to the needs of the ancestors in the main room and finally unlocked our landlady's door to let the morning sun shine on her altar. The fragrance of newly lit incense floated through the cracks to awaken us pleasantly as we slept in the large carved bed with its canopy of blue mosquito netting embellished with stars.

Soon the widow of the recently deceased head of the family emerged to sweep the courtyard with a sturdy, short broom (the traditional exercise of housebound Chinese women) until her brother, driving his motorcycle with great clatter into the courtyard brought her groceries.

We shared use of the large, high vaulted kitchen, the rafters black with smoke, with a young man who inhabited the tiger wing with us. Each section of the family should have its own kitchen once the family no longer operates as a joint family. A large, brick stove stood unused in one corner. We had our own gas stove next to that of the young man's. On weekends his girlfriend came to entertain and cook for him. It does not promote harmony for women of different families to use the same stove. The Kitchen God, uneasy

with these new arrangements, had withdrawn from his niche above the old stove to a god scroll above the ancestral altar. It is said that the smell of gas burning offends him. He favors wood smoke.

Water was available from a tap in the spartan bathhouse in back of the kitchen. The village has laid in a water supply which was clean enough, but it was still thought prudent to boil the drinking water. By carefully attaching a long garden hose to the bathhouse faucet it was possible to use a little washing machine on the veranda next to the ancestral altar which washed clothes surprisingly clean. The clothes were then threaded on bamboo poles and dried in the courtyard.

The toilet, so odiferous in the past, had been rebuilt by the main gate, a modern W.C. and wash basin. Originally, the gate had been in the southeast corner of the compound as is proper, but it had been moved on the advice of the gods to avert threatened disaster to the family. To reach these facilities we traversed the courtyard, passed twin li-chee trees and walked around the muddy pond which completed the geomantic balance of "wind and water" for the house. Our hosts worried about us and arranged a large garden light over the courtyard gate fearing that we might walk into the muddy depths of the pond some moonless night.

How different it all had been twenty five years ago! Then the compound throbbed with life. At the mid-autumn festival when the daughters of the house return to their natal home, while the old grandmother with bound feet attended the large incense burner before the altar room, all the family, aunts, uncles,cousins and many children, gathered in the courtyard, eating pommellos, to watch the honey colored, harvest moon rise over the paddy fields as the village exploded with firecrackers. Now everybody had moved away to new prosperity in the city. A few may return for special occasions driving their Mercedes Benz or Jaguars up to the gate, but not to spend the night. Soon, when the widow of the head of the family has completed her mourning duties she too will move away. Then the old house will not be a home any more, but it will have become an ancestor temple.

The village has become almost a suburb of the little cross-roads town that consisted of only a few stores years ago. The rice fields of the former tenants lie interspersed with the little factories they own. The village road throbs with trucks and motor cycles. Stores in newly built high rises line the old village path and the main channel of the irrigation ditch, once rich with the night soil affluent from fertilized fields, now runs grey or red depending on the industrial pollutants. But children still play along its banks and grandmothers wearing stylish pant suits and high heeled shoes ride on the backs of their daughter-in-laws' motor bikes along the levee on their way to the village Earth God shrine to announce births and deaths and ask for blessings. And the younger village women use the space in front of the shrine to practice their precision dances which they hope to perform at the annual sports day of the community grammar school.

## Semester Transition: Faculty Governance?

Lee N. Von Kuster

When universities first began the faculty was the university. There was no administrative structure as we know it today. Students studied under the guidance of a professor or professors until they proved themselves. As the universities evolved the present administrative structure also evolved. But throughout this evolution the right to control the curriculum was retained by the faculty.

With the institution of a Collective Bargaining Agreement at The University of Montana several years ago provision was made that the faculty, through a faculty senate would retain partial governance of the curriculum.

> "The UTU, as the elected bargaining agent, retains exclusive right to negotiate and reach agreement on all matters pertaining to salaries, benefits, and terms of employment. Without waiving this right, the UTU and the Board recognize the desirability of a democratic governance system for faculty in areas of academic concern. Such a governance system shall be implemented through a democratically elected and representative Faculty Senate.
>
> The matters which shall be reviewed and recommended by the Senate, in accordance with regulations of the Board, shall include: 4. development, curtailment, discontinuance, or reorganization of academic programs."

Faculty decisions about academic matters are only possible so long as they **meet the regulations of the Board of Regents.** Hence it becomes quite clear that curriculum matters are no longer the exclusive concern of the faculty. But in fact it is abundantly evident that the Board has almost exclusive control of curriculum matters by the regulations they implement or do not implement. Of course we must remember that this is the most conspicuous example of a trend toward disenfranchisement of faculty governance.

The University of Montana along with three other units of the university systems as well as three community colleges and five vocational technical schools felt the impact of this control a few years ago when the Board of Regents, with no input from faculty members, decided to move all twelve schools from a quarter program to a semester program.

Conceding that the Board has the legal right under the State of Montana Constitution to developed whatever regulations it deems to be in the best interests of higher education in Montana the semester move decision doesn't meet the spirit of "a democratic governance system . . . in areas of academic concern." The faculty members of the affected institutions were not consulted about the

move to semesters **prior** to a final decision being made.

The University Teachers Union sought for faculty involvement but were told that employers have the right to schedule work times for the employees and that the entire issue of semester conversion is not a negotiable matter. Where is the spirit of cooperation, the sense of fairness, the involvement that faculty members have taken for granted for many decades?

Over the next several years many requests were made to the Board of Regents for open hearings to be held so that all constituencies could air their concerns. The public must be given the opportunity for input. No such broad based public hearings were ever held. After much pleading the Board did allow some faculty members to speak about possible ramifications of the switch to semesters. The majority of these faculty members left that meeting with the intuitive feeling that their concerns hadn't really been heard though, at that time, the various faculties were very knowledgeable having given untold hours to the conversion process.

As the conversion process moved on it became very clear that many courses were going to be dropped, consolidated or significantly changed. Many five credit quarter courses were made into three credit semester course. Many three credit quarter courses were converted to three credit semester courses but certainly by no means all of them were so converted. It was more than likely that two three credit quarter courses were consolidated to one three credit semester course. For some departments or some programs all of this worked very nicely. For those departments and/or programs that are controlled by state and/or national certifying and accrediting agencies the conversion was by no means as simple as multiplying by two thirds and then writing down the new numbers.

The process went on. As it did more and more department chairs and faculty members at all institutions became aware of new problems. Many of these problems were compounded by increased enrollment, less faculty, fewer teaching assistants and a continued short fall of money. It also became painfully evident that future majors in many programs would not receive the diversity of experiences of previous students. Too many courses were dropped and/or consolidated, in spite of the fact that our UM faculty had just completed a laborious, **Regent-mandated** study and expansion of general education requirements.

As chairman of one program where this was the scenario I wrote a letter dated March 13, 1990 to each member of the Board of Regents, the Commissioner of Higher Education, former President of The University of Montana, Dr. James Koch and others, stating

> "I am asking you and the Board of Regents to provide an open forum where the issues I have raised can be discussed. I believe we are at a very serious crossroad

in Montana and it is time for these and other issues to be heard and debated. Please give us, teachers, a chance to tell you of our problems and to share with you our deep concern about the loss of quality our programs will face under the semester system."

I have never received a response to this letter in spite of the following statement in The University of Montana Kaimin of April 27, 1990.

> "William Mathers, Chairman of the Board of Regents, said in a phone interview, 'I believe we're too far into the game' to turn back now. But he added he would listen to any opposition."

In a public hearing before the Education Committee of the House of Representatives on February 22, 1991 it was stated that the faculty had been included in every aspect of the semester move. This is true except for one. The most important one. The **decision** to switch to semesters. It is hard to believe that this is a display of democratic leadership.

Such reflections always bring back things forgotten. Names like Jeff Morrison, Dennis Lind, Elsie Redlin, Carroll Krause, Jack Noble, James Koch, Don Habbe, Don Spencer and others. Where are they now? Left for "greener" pastures I guess. Meanwhile the faculty is left to assist anxious students as they endeavor to figure out the mess that exists.

Among the several issues that helped motivate the move to semesters were three that seemed to pique the interest of the members of the Board of Regents. The issues as stated by then Commissioner of Higher Education Carroll Krause were: cost/benefit analysis, transferability and depth of subject matter. Each of these issues should have been publicly debated. Looking only at the cost/benefit analysis it is stated on page 58 of Chapter 9 of the report to the Board of Regents that the following benefits would be forth coming by changing to a semester program.

| Campus | Initial Cost | Annual Benefit |
|---|---|---|
| NMC | $30,000 | $ -0- |
| EMC | $36,000 | $21,400 |
| MSU | $57,500 | $39,100 |
| UM | $40,000 | $28,000 |

Where are the savings? Where's the beef?

In the past 75 years no educational changes have so significantly impacted all students in Montana as the two that have taken place within the past 5 years. The first of these was Project Excellence. This project was undertaken by the Board of Public Education. The breath and depth of the entire K-12 curriculum was reviewed. Over several weeks nine regional, public meetings were held across the state. These meetings were held

after nine action groups, representing all segments of the educational community, had spent hundreds of hours refining all of the input from various constituencies. The input from these nine regional meetings helped to further refine the final recommendations to the Board of Public Education. Everyone had the opportunity to participate to whatever extent they desired.

The second change was the one **decreed** by the Board of Regents. Twelve institutions were to move from a quarter program to a semester program. No faculty input. No student input. No public input. No tax payer involvement. Thou shalt. Even worse there was no seeming willingness on the part of the Board of Regents to respond to any of a number of serious questions raised by students and faculty. What a contrast in handling these two extremely important educational changes. What a contrast in the way business is conducted. What a contrast in fairness. What a contrast!!

Of course, at this point one can say all this is water under the bridge. But the nagging questions remain:

1. What are the monetary savings?
2. What was the total cost including faculty, staff and administrative time spent in revamping all programs?
3. How long will it take to recover these expenses?
4. What impact does this switch have on students seeking summer employment?
5. How many valuable courses were lost in the conversion process?
6. How has this move affected class size?
7. Are classrooms, laboratories, computer rooms and other facilities large enough or in sufficient quantity for the new demands or will new construction be necessary?
8. Are there sufficient numbers of faculty members to handle the number of increased sections?
9. What are the alleged five major academic advantages of semesters?
10. What impact has the whole process had on the morale of the faculty, staff and administration throughout higher education in Montana? Does it matter to anyone except those affected?
11. What impact does this move have on interdisciplinary programs that share faculty members with other programs?
12. What effect does this move have on course availability?
13. What will be the impact on co-op programs, internships and student teaching?
14. How much outside money could the University system now have if the faculty had used their time to write grants instead of changing the entire curriculum?
15. What effect will this change have on the lives of students, the majority of whom are over 25 years of age, many place bound with a family? Does anyone care?

# Reflections

As we reflect upon our experiences in life, we often recall the people who impacted those experiences more than the experiences themselves. In "Reflections," voices from the past share with us their wisdom, insight and integrity through letters, transcripts and oral histories. One voice from the past is Dr. Edmund Freeman, an English professor who taught at UM from 1919-1961. Though he retired in 1962, Freeman remained active both on campus and in the community. In a November 1, 1962 letter to John H. Toole, a well-known businessman with whom he shared common civic interests, Dr. Freeman wrote about one of his experiences:

"I must tell you of a sentimental moment I experienced tonight as I walked across the new bridge to the Mansfield dinner downtown. It was just dusk enough that all the clutter vanished, the downtown lights were shining but the landscape and the river were still veiled in semi-daylight. All kinds of things and feelings came flooding into my consciousness, all making up something like an image of the city beautiful--and I thought of your part in it all. My memory swept back to my first years in Missoula when I lived in your grandmother's home and I knew the four Toole sons and Alexander Dean and I played with the four Weisel children. And I saw new people in the future driving the roadways that will lie close along the river through the city. It all came together: the past and the future, the natural and the man-made, the academic and the commercial, and it was good."

"This someway was your bridge more than anybody else's and I found myself reflecting, as I have many times before, that not enough of the past stays in our communal consciousness, not enough family name-stuff remains in the story of our towns and small cities of modern America--but your names and story always come up to make the qualification. It is often the only family name that does come to mind to afford the sense of generous tradition that I wish filled our local and state history."

"Well, I did not think of writing to you as I walked over the bridge, only of you as part of the rather mystical whole that I sensed for that moment or two. I can imagine out of my different place, if not kind, of experience how thwarted or unaided your efforts have often seemed to you, but also how much more satisfaction you have had from what you have been able to do and have had to do just because you are John Toole." [1]

The years go by, changes occur, people move on, the voices become echoes, but it's the reflections which keep the past alive.

---

[1] From Edmund Freeman's papers in the Mansfield Library Archives. Used by permission of Patricia Freeman Dunkum.

# The Demise of Botany

Meyer Chessin

## Introduction

Recently I attended a virology conference in Lucknow, India. Although plant, animal, and microbial virologists were all represented, the meetings were held at The National Botanical Research Institute and Botanical Gardens. A tour of the University also indicated the strength and important status of their Botany Department. Admittedly, one could expect that a basically agricultural country like India would place strong emphasis on the plant sciences. But is it not ironic that India is in such a strong position now to contribute to the solution of such global problems as species extinction and environmental degradation?

Perhaps there is additional irony when considering the history of Botany at The University of Montana. In 1910, the first course in forestry was initiated in the Botany Department by Dr. Joseph E. Kirkwod. One of the founders of the Wildlife program in 1936 was botany Professor Joseph W. Severy who also retained long-term chairmanship of the Botany Department. How times have changed!

## The Story

Somewhat over one decade ago, the Botany Department was declared "A Center of Excellence" by the board of Regents. Today, the remnants comprise 3 1/2 teaching faculty with full-time appointments, versus 11 of the "glory days".

The effects of this decline have been disastrous, and a student must be unusually well-motivated to undertake either undergrad or graduate work in this discipline.

There are many reasons for this demise, among which may be listed the following:

1. A sharp enrollment decline in the School of Forestry generated by the Reagan hiring freeze.

2. A concomitant drop in enrollment in Botany's Forestry service courses.

3. The excision by the School of Forestry of previously required Botany courses and a replacement of some by their own courses.

4. A long-time failure to establish a productive working relationship between the two disciplines.

5. A failure of Botany to deal with enrollment declines by creating attractive course alternatives.

6. During this period 3 faculty members left campus, and 3 others went on 1/3 time post-retirement contracts. For all these, one tenure-track position was replaced.

Particularly hard hit was the Botany Department herbarium, an invaluable resource for the study of vegetation of the Northern Rockies. A part-time curator, Kathleen Ahlenslager, maintained the herbarium in commendable fashion, but her departure for a full-time position has left a huge gap, and herbarium use has plummeted. In fact, it would appear that the former Herbarium Oversight Committee needs to be re-established. Among other things, it could serve to evaluate whether the herbarium is receiving appropriate care.

We were also fortunate that perhaps in response to what was happening on campus, a group arose in Missoula which has kept the spirit of Botany alive.

Together with others who were mainly off campus, Kathleen Ahlenslager, Peter Lesica and Virginia Vincent formed the Missoula Native Plant Society in 1987. By means of monthly meetings, "herbarium nights," and field trips, they have stressed an understanding and appreciation of the natural vegetation of the Northern Rockies as well as of flora native to other parts of the world. In recent years they have taken on the task of the maintenance and enhancement of the native plant garden around the U of M Botany departmental greenhouse.

It wasn't long before the idea caught on. It is now called the Montana Native Plant Society, with other chapters in Kalispell, Bozeman, and Helena, and includes members from 14 other states and Canada. Several times a year they publish the newsletter "Kelseya". The Society has been a godsend during this low period in the life of botany on campus.

How did The University of Montana deal with the problem of "de-Botanization"? At first, no official response was forthcoming. After several frustrating years, I was joined by fellow 1/3 time retiree, Mark Behan, in a special appearance before the Faculty Senate on April 12, 1990. Most of our colleagues seemed unaware of the "silent retrenchment" which had occurred in the biological sciences, and especially in Botany.

Administrative response to that appearance was cool, to say the least. However, the support provided by the newly formed Division of Biological Sciences, coupled with similar concerns expressed off-campus, eventually bore fruit.

An example of such concern was a major article in the Harvard Magazine for September/October 1990 prophetically, I hope, entitled "The Coming Rejuvenation of Botany." This dealt with the downgrading of classical (including environmental) Botany and emphasized the need for greatly enhanced support for systematic and environmental botany in the face of new global problems.

An interesting local case involved a letter from John Mumma, then Regional Forester, of the U.S. Forest Service Region No. 1, to the Division of Biological Sciences, concerning a faculty opening. In it he urged that consideration be given to hiring a plant scientist who could interact with a newly-established Botany and Sensitive Plant Program which had been established by his office in 1988. To my knowledge, such a specific outside request had not been made previously.

In any event, the wheels finally started to roll and an ad hoc committee was established on campus to consider the problem of the plant sciences. This broadly-based group met on numerous occasions between November 29, 1990 and January 4, 1991.

On January 10, 1991, in their report to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the committee called for the minimal bolstering of the plant science effort to reach a "critical mass" for a fully operational program; this would include a plant systematist, a plant population ecologist, and a plant ecophysiologist.

I would add my personal recommendation for a mycologist, as well. It amazes me that we have allowed this specialty to fall by the wayside, despite its obvious importance to a full program, and especially considering its role in the study of tree diseases in our forested region.

I realize that enrollments in the department's long-standing course in forest pathology had plummeted during the "freeze" years. But some well-placed administrative and faculty concern could rectify the situation.

In any case, during the spring quarter of 1991 Dean Flightner of the CAS authorized the search for 2 new positions in the plant sciences. A divisional Committee has recommended that the 2 be in the areas of plant ecology, and physiology-developmental biology. Actually since our plant ecologist, James Habeck, will retire soon, this really represents only a single long-term addition.

Also, the ad for the additional physiologist/developmental biologist, as it appeared in SCIENCE asks for a candidate familiar with modern molecular techniques. Judging from the composition of the selection committee for this position, and from their early rankings of the applicants to date, the position will be filled by a biochemist or molecular geneticist. There is already a plethora of such individuals on campus. Meanwhile, the breadth of subjects in organismic botany required for the education of students will continue to be denied them. That is, we will still lack the botanical counterparts of zoology professors Dial, Foresman, Greene, Hutto, Jenni, Sheldon, and Tibbs - on campus - and Hauer, Spencer and Stanford at the Biological Station. For 4 organismic zoologists on "soft money" - Drs. Boggs, Bromenshenk, Henderson, and Kukuk, botany can offer only one - Peter Rice. And the particular questions of plant systematics and herbarium curation remain unresolved.

This modest start represents some of the good news on the subject. Recent actions on the part of the Wildlife Biology program, however, illustrate that the general problem will not go away that easily.

For example, most of the enrollees in our plant physiology course used to be Forestry majors in timber management. However, during the period we are discussing, they were no longer required to take it. Majors in wildlife biology then became the majority in this course. This year, however, starting with the new semester system, this subject will no longer be required of wildlife majors. In addition, other botany courses will be cut from their program. In view of the overriding importance of a knowledge of plants in successful wildlife management, how can such actions be justified?

Another recent problem concerns scheduling conflicts which prevent students from enrolling in the full range of botany courses still offered. This, however, should be readily remediable.

So the problem remains, and the future of plant biology at The University of Montana remains uncertain.

# Opinion

For each issue JANUS invites response to a specific question and publishes interesting answers.

Q. MANY BELIEVE THAT THE ROLE OF UM FACULTY IN POLICY DISCUSSION AND SHARED GOVERNANCE HAS BEEN DIMINISHED OVER THE LAST DECADES. IF THIS IS TRUE, WHEN, HOW AND WHY DO YOU THINK THIS HAS OCCURRED?

A.

It's not true that this faculty has less say in governance but it's possible that we are headed in that direction. I suggest that the perception of loss comes from a faulty memory of the "good old days". I came to the campus in 1965 and served off and on in the Senate , on ECOS, on other Senate committees, and on the Executive Committee of the UTU throughout the last 27 years. I recall particularly the decision in 1971 when the Budget and Policy Committee of the Senate, in frustration with having absolutely no say in budgetary matters and little to say concerning Policy, boldly changed its name to ECOS. Real progress in having an influence on budgetary questions came with collective bargaining, and that first (truly well done) contract also assured the Senate that its traditional role of control over curriculum would continue. -----The dark cloud approaching faculty governance is the trend in unit standards toward a downgrading of faculty service. Both the Senate and the UTU always need new people and the ideas they bring. We have not lost shared governance, but if we lose all incentives for new people to join in the task, we may lose it in the future.

Ron Erickson

A.

Sometime in the 1970s, a "We vs. Them" mentality supplanted a sense of community as the dominant force in faculty-administration relations. In this competitive and divisive environment, the balance shifted in favor of Main Hall, and previously influential agencies like the Faculty Senate, ECOS and the salary review and appeals committees lost their clout. Administrators and the regents found that they could ignore the faculty with impunity on issues ranging from retrenchment decisions to the academic calendar to the location, financing and naming of Washington-Grizzly Stadium. Among the factors that contributed to the faculty's loss of influence were public antipathy to the peace movement on campus during the Vietnam war, the 1973 energy crisis, the chronic money crunch, worsening salaries, the coming of the UTU, a cumbersome collective-bargaining agreement, a Byzantine system of faculty advancement, deteriorating facilities, a burgeoning bureaucracy, an explosion of dispiriting procedural rules and paperwork demands in almost all aspects of university life, retrenchment (with its insult to the conscientious Perrin committee), highly political commissioners, arbitrary and anti-intellectual regents, hostile governors, indifferent legislatures, a detached public, autocratic presidents and general faculty malaise.

Bob McGiffert

# I Have A Dream

E.W. Pfeiffer
Professor Emeritus of Zoology
Environmental Studies Program

Every summer I look at our sparsely populated campus and wonder what's wrong. Yes, it's The University of Montana, perfectly located for easy trips to two of the nation's most spectacular national parks which are visited by millions of people each year, and yet the campus is practically empty. For example, according to the authorities that I've talked with, the total possible occupancy of our residence halls, that is our dormitories and high rise buildings, is 2,044 people. During the summer of 1991, only 450 of these living spaces were occupied. With respect to family housing, that is the xx's, and the villages for married couples, the total number of units is 392 and they are occupied by at least one student all the time. Last summer, in comparison to the 10,000 students during winter quarter, we had 638 FTEs and part-time students numbered 2,061.

What did these students study? As far as I could determine from looking at the summer school schedule, there wasn't a single course that these students could not have taken in the middle of Manhattan Island at New York University without ever having to leave Manhattan Island. In fact, to my amazement, I was told that there was not a single biology course offered on the Missoula campus in the summer of 1991. The Biological Station at Yellow Bay appears to offer a summer program similar to that suggested here, but the enrollment is very limited.

What could be done to remedy this deplorable situation? My dream is simple. Exploit the unique natural resources of Western Montana by bringing in thousands of students from eastern metropolitan centers and give them college credit courses in geology, various aspects of biology, forestry, and range management. As a young person raised in the middle of Manhattan Island and nearby suburbs, I remember dreaming of opportunities to go West and learn about our wonderful Rocky Mountains, that I had read about as a child in many different books. I am certain that there are many thousands of young people in high schools, prep schools, and colleges and universities who would pay considerable money to spend a summer on our campus and learn about the wonders of our local environment. This program would begin as a pilot program, perhaps a few hundred students for an 8- to 10-week session with a goal of using all the available dormitory space for students. They would, as I indicated, take courses taught by our professors in geology, biology and forestry, as well as other subjects. These courses would use extensively the environmental resources needed to make the courses successful. There would be field trips, of course, to Glacier and Yellowstone, as well as to the magnificent Missouri Breaks, the Beaverhead region

with all of its incredible geological formations, and trips to Central and Eastern Montana to learn about the life of the northern plains. There would be concentrated visits to Native American reservations to get their views on matters of ecology.

This program would be presided over by a specially selected director chosen from off campus and whose full-time duties would be to organize and direct this massive summer program. I suggest that during the winter one of our best professors in the sciences be assigned a job assembling a slide show on the wonders of Montana and develop a lecture that would be delivered at selected schools in the East. I believe we should target the wealthy prep schools, Exeter, Groton, Andover, etc. and all the Ivy league colleges, of course, and other institutions of higher learning as well as selected high schools concentrating on big population centers such as New York City, Boston, etc. The lecture would explain the program in detail, as well as extol the beauty of life in Montana in the summer. The talk would include the sort of recreational activities that could occur during the weekends, rafting down the Clark Fork, canoeing the Blackfoot, fishing, backpacking, etc.

I would recommend that the tuition for such a course be sufficient to make a small profit on each student and I would think that, if it is successful, the program would ultimately bring in a sizeable revenue to the University. I also point out that it would be of great service to the community as a whole in terms of increasing, rather substantially, the number of summer jobs. For instance, on the campus there would have to be a great increase in the number of dormitory housekeepers, and food service workers; and teaching assistants would be necessary to assist the professors. In town, food suppliers would have a greatly increased demand. This would trickle down to the trucking business. Bus companies would be utilized heavily in carrying out these courses, and hopefully, outfitters would be used on lots of field trips. Rafters and other people engaged in the recreation business in the area would have a greatly increased clientele.

Altogether, I believe it is high time that somebody or some group, either the faculty or the administration or both, show some imagination and get out there and maximize the incredible resources we have to share with our less fortunate colleagues in the cluttered East.

# Whatever Happened To—?

This column will hopefully be a continuing space dedicated to tracking down retired members of our university community. Its success will derive from contributions of our readers, so "keep those cards and letters coming in" with short sketches of retirees you know about.

As a start, here are a few things that come to mind.

Bob Coonrod, former Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, is now the resident curator of the National Museum of Chiropractic in Sarasota, Florida.

Former UM President Bob Pantzer and wife Ann moved back to Beverly Avenue after many years of post-retirement-living in Santa Rosa, California.

Keith Osterheld, former chairman extraordinaire of the Chemistry Department, is now a full-time rancher in the Bitterroot Valley.

Jim Nakamura, retired Professor of Microbiology, is spending a great amount of time as a visiting distinguished professor in Hungarian universities.

Reuben Diettert, former chairman of the Botany Department, celebrated his 80th birthday and remains especially active in civic affairs. If you attend Grizzly basketball games, you will see him ushering people to their seats in his Exchange Club jacket.

Former Dean of Business Administration, Paul Blomgren, lives on Flathead Lake but is frequently seen in Missoula at University events.

Eugene Andrie, retired Professor of Music and founding director of the Missoula Symphony, lives in Oregon. However, when the ice leaves Georgetown Lake he can be found there, fly rod in hand and a creel full of "keepers."

Earl Lory, former Professor of Chemistry, defies description. After many years as a central figure on campus, he now is a central figure in civic affairs and State legislature responsibilities. He continues to reside in Missoula when he can get away from Helena.

Dick Solberg

We wish to acknowledge our appreciation to Kathy Lynch, who teaches art in Missoula School District 1, for her contribution of the design of the JANUS logo and the calligraphy used in the publication.

Thanks also to Annie Pontrelli, Centennial Coordinator, for help in our continuing series on UM Reflections from her oral history project.

HOWARD E REINHARDT

MATHEMATICS