

"... THERE IS NO EDUCATION WITHOUT INTELLECTUAL AND
EMOTIONAL CHANGE ..."

REPORT
on the
PROPOSALS AND ACTIVITIES
of the
GAUDINO COMMITTEE
and
GAUDINO SCHOLAR

1984-1987

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and addresses of the members of the committee.

2. The second part is a list of the names of the members of the committee.

3. The third part is a list of the names of the members of the committee.

4. The fourth part is a list of the names of the members of the committee.

5. The fifth part is a list of the names of the members of the committee.

6. The sixth part is a list of the names of the members of the committee.

7. The seventh part is a list of the names of the members of the committee.

8. The eighth part is a list of the names of the members of the committee.

9. The ninth part is a list of the names of the members of the committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	v
Introduction.....	1
I. The Gaudino Committee Proposals.....	6
1. Pedagogical Premisses.....	6
2. Changes in the Classroom.....	10
i. Independent Study.....	11
ii. Contract Major.....	12
iii. Student-Initiated Courses.....	15
iv. Group Focus Courses.....	15
v. Related Course Listings.....	17
vi. Work Groups.....	19
vii. Pedagogy Seminar.....	20
3. Residential Changes.....	20
i. Freshman Residential Seminars.....	21
ii. Freshman Living/Learning Groupings.....	23
iii. House/Entry Partnership.....	25
iv. Interest Houses.....	26
4. Changes at the Community Level.....	29
i. Student Activities Director.....	29
ii. Campus Dialogue Evenings.....	31
iii. Arts and Sciences Fair.....	35
iv. International Culture Festival.....	36
5. Other Changes.....	37
i. Office of Graduate School Counseling.....	37
ii. Graduate School Advising in Departments.....	45
iii. Teaching Assistants.....	45
iv. Summer Project Stipend.....	47
v. Summer Learning Experiences at Williams.....	49
6. Conclusion.....	51

II. The Gaudino Scholar's Activities..... 55

 1. Pedagogical Premises..... 55

 2. Experiential Education..... 61

 i. Williams-in-Williamstown..... 61

 ii. Social Service, Social Change..... 64

 3. "Strange Encounters" Internships..... 68

 4. Film Presentations/Discussions..... 69

 5. Educational Experiments..... 71

 i. Gaudino Roundtables..... 72

 ii. St. Lawrence University Conferences..... 73

 iii. The Gaudino Project for Student Leadership and
 Non-violent Alternatives..... 74

 iv. WSP 1988: "Pedagogy for Empowerment"..... 77

 6. Conclusion..... 78

Appendices..... 80

 A. Members of the Gaudino Committee..... 80

 B. Timeline of Proposals and Activities..... 82

 I. Proposals of the Gaudino Committee..... 82

 II. Activities of the Gaudino Scholar..... 83

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It would require a far more detailed report than the present to convey the extraordinary degree to which the activities, initiatives, proposals and educational experiments chronicled in the following pages were the result of collaboration among a very large number of people at and outside of Williams College. To every one of them I extend my heartfelt thanks, even though their very number precludes my mentioning them by name. Naturally, I am most particularly grateful to my faculty and student colleagues on the Gaudino Committee whose names appear in Appendix A, to the faculty members, Teaching Assistants, Junior Advisors and administrators associated with the Freshman Residential Seminars, and to the College's administrative officers, from the President on down, who have always listened patiently, often sympathetically, and sometimes even agreed with what we were trying to do.

However, none has a greater claim on my gratitude than Edward D. Stein '87. Among the liveliest, most acute and imaginative members of the Gaudino Committee since 1984, Ed spent untold hours this summer shaping the scores of documents generated by that committee over the past three years into a coherent statement of its pedagogical premisses and into the conceptually organized account of its proposals that is before you. Without Ed Stein's dedication, loyalty and resourcefulness this report could not have appeared at this time.

Kurt P. Tauber
Gaudino Scholar

Williamstown
August 1987

INTRODUCTION

Somewhere close to the center of Gaudino's educational vision the following set of interlocking propositions occurs: there is no education without intellectual and emotional change; one vital kind of change occurs when a student openly encounters what is at first foreign, another kind occurs when the familiar is made "foreign" by seeing it in a new light; this encounter can often be a painful or unsettling experience; the College should therefore actively promote a range of experiences that have the creative potential to unsettle and disturb.

Such experiences might range from a single discussion on campus to a structured program of experience and study arranged for a semester or a year off campus. The experiences should not only unsettle and disturb but also serve as material for self-reflection that at the same time enhances one's ability to see other people more clearly. Whether on or off campus, short or long, academic or experiential, the programs supported by the Gaudino Fund should challenge both academic and life assumptions, values, perceptions. Students should, for example, not only learn about public authority or public institutions or such inarticulate values and forces as race, class, occupation, age, geographic location, education, and religion; they should also begin to learn about their own education and learning. The process of learning becomes an experience that is a subject for disciplined reflection.

By encouraging Williams students and faculty to explore new paths of understanding not already available in the existing curricular offerings, the Fund will be used primarily to foster curricular innovation. Certain aspects of the Gaudino legacy will be looked for in any such program, e.g., an element of personal confrontation elicited by an intrusive pedagogical style; active involvement of students as partners in any learning experience; direct engagement of students with other individuals, institutions and complexities; careful preparation in advance of the unsettling experience so as to make it fully accessible to the student; intellectual rigor in the constant attempt to articulate perceived differences and complexities; follow-up discussion to integrate new learning with the old.

To that end, the Fund will be used to secure released time for a Gaudino Scholar whose principal function will be to invent and support ways of keeping the Gaudino legacy alive on campus. The scholar's role is to be a facilitator, to bring to bear on the curriculum and the extra-curriculum the Gaudino pedagogy. The Scholar will discuss with other faculty members any related projects they may wish to undertake. He or she will organize a lively program of panels, lectures, discussions and perhaps a retreat centering on "unsettling experiences" and possibly involving Gaudino alumni. In the spirit of Gaudino's holistic view of education, the Scholar will take a special interest in the problem of integrating curricular and extra-curricular activities and in the transformation of current campus issues . . . into occasions for genuine learning. Although supported and encouraged by the Administration, the Gaudino Scholar is expected to be an independent and critical voice, working for the good of the whole community in the mode of a Socratic gadfly. ("The Robert L. Gaudino Memorial Fund," Faculty Meeting, February 19, 1983)

. . . Students in FRS [the Freshman Residential Seminar] were forced to live and contend with . . . constant moral self-inspection. Since I knew my classmates in many other contexts besides a purely academic one, I couldn't "write off" their feelings and ideas as simple manifestations of a stereotype I roughly assessed them to fit into. So often, during my other classes, intellectual argument was easy to participate in, yet very unchallenging. I took my "side", my classmates took theirs -- we rarely tried to understand each other. This was logical; we didn't understand the possible complexities of each other's thought processes. In FRS class, there were many things to be considered when a classmate made a comment in opposition to my own. Often this person was not only a classmate, but also an entrymate, a roommate and, very possibly, a close friend. The content of the classes themselves encouraged us to evaluate and reevaluate ideas that we would otherwise be tempted to simplify and subsequently misjudge. . . . People's ways of thinking about issues (and the issues themselves!) are not black and white; FRS students confronted this within the classroom from the subject matter that was presented, and then were forced to recognize the reality of this concept when we dealt with each other both in and out of the classroom. (Jane Penner, "FRS: An Exercise in Moral Consciousness," May 19, 1987, paper for Prof. R. Tong's FRS 102, *Public, Private and Professional Morality*)

Robert L. Gaudino, arguably the greatest Williams College educator of the twentieth century, died in 1974. He left behind a legacy that is strongly felt by those who knew him and even by many who did not. The power of Gaudino's vision led his students to establish a fund in his memory. Created in 1975, it has been used in the past several years to support a large number of diverse activities, initiated by the Gaudino Scholar, a member of the Williams faculty who devotes some of his time to advancing ideas that stem from Gaudino's vision. In June of 1984, Kurt P. Tauber was appointed Gaudino Scholar, to succeed Professor Raymond W. Baker, the first to hold the position (from 1982 to 1984). In September of 1984, Tauber created a committee of students and faculty to work with him to examine aspects of Williams College from the standpoint of Gaudino's pedagogical conceptions. Not a standing committee of the College, nor, indeed, a formal body provided by the basic documents of the Robert L. Gaudino Memorial Fund, the Gaudino Committee, as it came to be known, has no operational mandate, let alone legislative authority. Its sole mission is to make constructive proposals for curricular, paracurricular and administrative changes and see to it that its recommendations receive serious consideration. One of this report's two purposes is to present the Gaudino Committee's proposals in a conceptually coherent manner and to make evident their consistent grounding in the Committee's pedagogical convictions and in its analysis of existing shortcomings at Williams.

But the Gaudino Scholar's task is not merely to help generate proposals to strengthen the impact on students of a Liberal Arts education *in the spirit* of Robert Gaudino; he is also responsible for

maintaining and extending concrete aspects of the Gaudino pedagogy in a narrower or more specific sense. Hence, Tauber's concern with experiential education, with learning arising out of an existential confrontation with the strange or unfamiliar and other aspects of Gaudino's educational legacy. The Gaudino Scholar carried on these activities parallel to his work with the Committee but not directly connected with it. Thus the second purpose of this report is to give a brief account of these other activities of the Gaudino Scholar.

This report, therefore, falls into two quite different and unequal parts. The first and longer part presents a detailed examination of the various recommendations which the Gaudino Committee presented to the College community between 1984 and 1987. This examination includes both a review of proposals that have already been adopted or submitted for consideration as well as some proposals of the Committee which are publicly presented here for the first time. The second part is an account of the Gaudino Scholar's collateral activities over the past three years. Some of these activities (such as, the experiential courses in 1984 and 1985 or the preparation for conferences and the presentation of a film series) called for extensive personal involvement, in other cases Tauber merely played the role of a facilitator, a sponsor, or financial supporter. This is not in the least to downgrade the significance of some of the things that have been and are being done by others with the active help of the Gaudino Scholar. Indeed, some of these "Gaudinesque" efforts and experiments may eventually have a very considerable impact on the Williams curriculum, such as, for instance, the Gaudino Project for Student Leadership and Non-violent

Alternatives. But that is speculation about the future and not the subject of a retrospective account.

Given the two-fold nature of this report, it addresses itself to two overlapping audiences, one wider, the other, more limited. The examination of the Gaudino Committee's proposals should engage the interest of the entire Williams community: the students, the faculty, the Administration, the Trustees and those alumni/ae who have maintained a concern for their *alma mater*. After all, all of these recommendations point toward the future, meriting the kind of serious deliberation which must precede change for a yet more effective education at Williams College. By contrast, only one or two of the Gaudino Scholar's collateral activities were future-oriented. Hence the report's second section is in greatest part a retrospective account of his activities. By its very nature, then, the second section will be of interest mainly to the Trustees of the Robert L. Gaudino Memorial Fund, the President and Trustees of Williams College and to the Dean of the Faculty, to all of whom the Gaudino Scholar owes an accounting.

I. THE GAUDINO COMMITTEE PROPOSALS

1. Pedagogical Premises

Although much of the observations and recommendations of the Gaudino Committee are in line with the thinking of Robert Gaudino, it is important to distinguish between the two. The Gaudino Committee began its work in 1984 by asking the question "What factors detract from an optimal liberal arts education at Williams and what can be done to improve it?" Bob Gaudino might not have answered this question in the ways that we have over the past three years, and he may not have agreed with some or many of our proposals. However, the ultimate goal of the person and the Committee is basically the same -- to improve the education of students at Williams College by enlarging and enriching their liberal arts experience.

With this goal in mind, the Gaudino Committee spent its first semester attempting to formulate exactly what we thought was missing at Williams. To be complete, a liberal arts education must aim to engage all aspects of personality. At Williams, we are particularly good at developing the "academic" aspect of the personality. Our students work hard and perform well in the classroom. But this alone is not enough. A liberal arts education needs to produce more than a student versed in a set of facts and cognitive skills -- it needs to produce a whole person. Our concern as a committee has been that Williams is not doing enough to achieve this central aim of a liberal arts education.

Over the past three years, we have focused on what is missing from a Williams education in a variety of manners. We have talked about the problems of compartmentalization, passivity and dysfunctional socialization. These three problems permeate a Williams education and the proposals of the Gaudino Committee are meant to address them. For now, a brief discussion of these problems will suffice.

One barrier to educating the entire person is the way in which many students at Williams tend to divide their lives into various unrelated spheres. The academic, social, cultural and extracurricular realms are separated and insulated from one another, with each sphere having its own distinct purposes. This compartmentalization distorts the educational process by preventing connections between, say, what is going on in the classroom and what is going on in one's social life; the richness and relevance of the materials studied in class get lost as students become caught up in the stressful race to read a certain number of pages in order to write a certain number of pages in order to get a certain grade. Furthermore, in this context, social life comes to be seen as a refuge from the "oppressive" workload. While a certain amount of "blowing off steam" is inevitable and healthy, many Williams students have gone too far in this regard. The desire to insulate "classwork" often becomes so dominant that it precludes any exchange of ideas in the non-academic realms. Reversely, it also associates the labor of reflection, the exploration of intellectual possibilities and their relevance to one's life, with the "classroom", thus tending to relegate them as "academic" concerns from the personal sphere and from the sphere of the public persona.

In short, compartmentalization, preventing any real interaction between the divided spheres that it creates, militates against the education of the whole person.

Another closely related barrier to the achievement of a true liberal arts education is the tendency of students to consider education as an essentially passive experience in which the motivation comes mainly from faculty and academic requirements rather than from students themselves. This passive view of education involves playing it safe, apathy, and regurgitation, while it discounts risk-taking, passion, and active or creative thought. Professors are expected to present the material for ingestion by the students; education for many Williams students is thus consumed rather than truly lived.

There seem to be two main causes of this passive "educational consumerism." One is the "lesson" learned from twelve years of elementary and secondary schooling -- the lesson that appropriate response to positive and negative inducements for a set of academic requirements produce academic "success." Students are conditioned to identify learning with fulfilling various set requirements and to identify education in general with meeting the formal expectations of their teachers. Under these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that many students here have difficulty shouldering the burden of self-motivated intellectual activity. The other factor that contributes to the general reluctance of Williams students to view education as an active process of engagement, to take intellectual risks, or to pursue lines of inquiry or artistic endeavor consonant with their most deeply felt passions, is their all too frequent preoccupation with

professional or career objectives. The uncertainties of the shifting labor market make the well-known "market value" of a Williams degree all the more significant and powerfully contribute to the confusion between obtaining academic credentials and obtaining a liberal arts education. Of course, the garnering of these credentials for the job market is precisely the fulfillment of structured requirements and expectations to which students have been conditioned.

The third related problem is that of adverse socialization. Students arriving at Williams are promptly taught how to behave: "standard" social and academic attitudes are passed on to freshmen often subtly, but always quickly. A freshman writes, "Being okay at Williams often entails being reasonably smart, but also being athletic, consuming alcohol, and being seen with the right people."¹ This image of what is "cool" and what is not is conveyed to incoming students with astounding clarity and speed. To study, to initiate non-trivial discussion, to be passionate about intellectual, cultural or artistic matters, to take academic risks, etc. is *not* "cool" -- only "geeks" and "nerds" do those sorts of things. A variety of internal factors causes this socialization of Williams students -- socialization which plays a causal role in the passivity and compartmentalization which Williams students adopt.

The proposals of the Gaudino Committee are meant to address these three problems by helping to turn a Williams education into an intergrated, active, and personal one. For the purposes of

¹Derek Cressman, "It's Who We Are That Matters", May 19, 1987, paper for Prof. R. Tong's FRS 102, *Public, Private and Professional Morality*

presentation, the various proposals of the committee have been divided into four groups: those that attempt to improve education through (a) changes in the classroom, (b) residential changes, (c) changes at the community level, and (d) going beyond the traditional time frame of a Williams education. Some of these proposals do not clearly fit into a single group. For example, the Freshman Residential Seminars (see below, pp. 21-24) involve both residential and classroom changes. Despite this sort of overlap, for simplicity's sake, each proposal has been placed in a single group. We will begin with the classroom.

2. Changes in the Classroom

Perhaps the place where the College has the most power to make significant changes is in the classroom. The classroom experience needs to be an active and engaging one. Students must be encouraged to take a central role in their own education. Also, students must be helped to see each other as resources, as collaborators in the shared experience of education. And students must be brought to see that what they learn in the classroom has much to do with their lives and the world in which they live.

The first five proposals in this section (independent study, contract majors, student initiated courses, group focus courses and related course listings) are designed to get students to play more active roles in their own education and to alert them to opportunities for pursuing courses of inquiry that reflect their deepest interests and concerns. They do so by opening up a variety of options that

allow the development of interests outside the immediate academic requirements yet within the traditional academic program.

i. Independent Study

Independent study is an invaluable curricular option currently offered by all departments. Not only does independent study allow students to "pursue the study of a subject not covered by the normal course offering of the college," but it enables students to express greater autonomy and initiative in shaping their own education. Yet, while all departments offer independent study, only about thirty of the approximately 1900 resident students actually take an independent study course. In other words, only about one and a half percent of the students arrange for independent study and less than one half of one percent of the courses taken during a given semester are independent study courses. We believe that these numbers are too low, since this option provides an excellent opportunity for an active and involved education.

A partial reason for the low number of students taking independent study courses may be that some of the few requests to do independent studies are denied because faculty members find themselves unable to add an independent study to their already full teaching loads. We suggest that, in order to increase the viability of the independent study option, faculty members be given some sort of "credit" for supervising independent study projects in a way deemed consonant with the present system (FTE) of evaluating course load. The institution of tutorials is likely to help popularize this option since once students have had the opportunity for more

independent work, they are likely to want to take advantage of a similar opportunity in the future. This potential for increased popularity of independent study demands the adoption of some such "credit" system.

Another reason for the current underutilization of the independent study option is wide-spread unawareness of its availability. In fact, informal evidence suggests that quite a few students do not "discover" the possibility of independent study until their senior year. We therefore suggest better publicity for the independent study option, particularly within departments. For example, departments should keep lists of independent study projects that have been done in previous years and of students who have done them.² The *Bulletin* descriptions of Independent Study (numbers 397, 398; 497, 498) should be amended to include a reference to these lists. This would give a student who is considering this option an opportunity to see what has been done before and to talk to some students who have done similar projects. In short, we recommend the adoption of policies that will positively present this valuable option to students who could benefit from it.

ii. Contract Major

To encourage students to take a more active role in their own education, we propose to promote and improve the neglected

²Currently, all independent study projects require departmental approval. In most departments, departmental approval has become a rubber stamp, if it is observed at all. While we do not think that departmental approval should be required, we do think that the faculty sponsor of an independent study project should be required to notify the department chairperson of the topic of the project so that an appropriate list can be kept.

contract major. To this end, the twelve-person limit, a relic from the days when the contract major was first initiated, should be removed. A numerical limit should not be placed on an option that is designed to promote original thinking. In any case, the difficulty of creating, getting approved, and fulfilling a contract major is enough to ensure that only those committed to academic rigor can successfully complete this program. Further, the college should take a more active role in encouraging students to pursue contract majors. With this goal in mind, we propose the institution of the following specific policies.

First, the description of the contract major in the *Bulletin* should be revised to remove phrases which are designed to scare away contract majors, replacing them with more encouraging words. Second, lists of past contract major programs should be made available to all interested students in order to give them an idea of what makes a good contract major. Third, beginning in the freshman year, students should be exposed to the possibility of a contract major through their freshman advisors. Fourth, in the registration packet for sophomore year, the college should include both a letter re-introducing the contract major option and a detailed guide to the contract major. Fifth, during the sophomore year and after the distribution of the aforementioned guide to the contract major, students should be invited to an information session on the contract major given by the person in charge of contract majors (the chairperson of IPECS -- see below), just as Dean Spear holds information sessions for students considering study abroad. Sixth, special attention should be given to the contract major option during

the time when departments hold open houses for prospective majors. Seventh, those students pursuing contract majors would be affiliated with the new experimental and cross-disciplinary studies program. Although contract majors would remain in close contact with the departments of their two advisors, the chairperson of the Interdepartmental Program for Experimental and Cross-Disciplinary Studies (IPECS) would act as their department chair for informational, bureaucratic, social, and advising purposes. This would ensure that students doing contract majors are talking to a faculty member who has extensive experience with such programs of study and who is devoted to experimental and cross-disciplinary work. Finally, the responsibility for approving contract majors should be moved from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and placed with a new committee organized by the chairperson of IPECS. The CEP is overburdened and is not able to give the increasing number of contract majors the necessary attention. Also, the CEP is not uniquely qualified to make judgements on contract majors; the committee created by the IPECS Chair should be chosen so that it consists of faculty and student members with experience in independent and interdisciplinary projects, especially with contract majors. This committee should frequently consult with knowledgeable people for opinions on suggested contract majors.

All of these suggestions are procedural and none of them implies in any way a lowering of the college's standards for the contract major. These policies are exclusively designed to publicize and encourage the unique opportunity for active student participation in education provided by the contract major.

iii. Student-Initiated Courses

One of the most potentially rewarding educational experiences "on the books" at Williams is the option for student-initiated courses. There is currently one such course regularly offered, "Nonviolence and Social Change", which has met with great success over the past five years. We believe that this option provides a singular chance for student autonomy and self-education to be combined with intellectual curiosity; it should therefore be publicized and supported. As a prelude to a higher profile for this alternative, the Gaudino Fund is a co-sponsor of a year long, nation-wide fact-finding trip by a group of recent Williams graduates and Gaudino Interns. The Gaudino Project for Student Leadership and Nonviolent Alternatives is currently gathering an inventory of experiences with student-initiated, self-education courses and developing a comprehensive, coherent pedagogy of student-student education. They will return to Williams in the fall of 1987 to present their findings to the Committee and the campus at large. Two of the Gaudino Interns will also offer a WSP course sponsored by the Gaudino Scholar and based on their work with student empowerment and innovative pedagogy. (See below, pp. 77-78.)

iv. Group Focus Course

This proposal aims at increasing student options and autonomy, encouraging a higher degree of intellectual imagination in that process and giving concrete institutional expression to the conviction that genuine learning presupposes students' intellectual needs.

interests, desires, or passions. Also, it aims at more institutionally visible and enhanced roles for peers in the process of mutual and self-education. The proposal involves the following procedure. A number of students who share a topical, thematic or interdisciplinary interest will form a "focus group" and choose as sponsor a faculty member who has some familiarity with or interest in the group topic. The students will each choose a regularly offered course (possibly -- but not necessarily -- from the greatly expanded listings of related courses, see below pp. 17-19) whose description suggests that it will be able to make a considerable contribution to the agreed-upon group topic or concern. The group will meet weekly for a two-hour discussion to which each member will contribute the insights provided by the course in which he or she has enrolled. Under exceptional circumstances, the faculty sponsor and focus-group members may approve the inclusion of a student who has taken courses relevant to the focus in the past but is not currently enrolled in any such courses.

The weekly discussion topics might be decided by the group itself on an *ad hoc* basis or else might be arrived at after consultation with the faculty sponsor. It would also be a matter of group decision what role -- if any -- term (and other) papers, projects or exercises submitted in the graded, cognate courses, should play in the discussion group "syllabus".

At the beginning of the term the faculty sponsor and the students would agree on general guidelines concerning the number of discussions, level of participation, criteria of performance evaluation, and eventual modes of evaluation that will enable the sponsor, at

semester's end, formally to notify the Registrar which members of the group had met the agreed performance criteria. Upon receipt of that certification, the Registrar would enter on each student's transcript the title of the group inquiry as a "no credit" exercise.

At the end of the semester the focus group will be expected to turn in to the faculty sponsor a chronological list of topics covered by the discussions along with a short description of the focus of the group inquiry, and a list of the cognate courses, taken by the participants. These will be passed on to appropriate offices (including the IPECS chairperson) as possible models or catalysts for future curricular planning by students and faculty.

v. Related Course Listings

Currently, in the Williams College Course Catalog, there are two listings of related courses in disciplines in which there are no formal programs, but in which quite a number of related courses are offered. The two such listings are for Medieval Studies and Political and Economic Philosophy. The practice of developing and publishing such listings is an excellent idea for a variety of educational reasons. We believe that many additional listings should be designed and publicized, particularly in areas where contract majors have been developed in the past.

The current departmental structure discourages students from designing a program of studies which fits their own intellectual goals. In many cases, students have interests which lie between departments or in two or more departments. Students with such interests often find it hard to decide which courses in various

departments are relevant, which courses have material that overlaps, and in what order courses from different departments should be taken. By grouping together courses which focus on related topics from a variety of departments, related course listings provide students with some minimal guidance in choosing courses they wish to take. Such listings could also note courses that overlap, suggest possible sequences, and list faculty members from the various departments who might be able to help students in selecting and organizing a program of related courses.

An increased number of listings of related courses would also aid students who wish to do contract majors or concentrations. In order to facilitate the design of a contract major within one listing and to prevent too many listings of four or five related courses from cluttering the course catalog, a listing of related courses should have enough courses to allow a student to design a contract major within the listing with some leeway for choice of courses. In other words, a good listing should have at least twelve courses. Courses from at least three departments should be included in a list, with no single department providing a large majority of the courses.³

Some listings which might be appropriate include Cognitive Science, Medical and Biological Ethics, Neuroscience, Peace

³There may seem to be a contradiction between, on the one hand, arguing for the importance of educational autonomy, and, on the other hand, calling for a variety of lists and other aids for contract majors and other students who wish to experiment with their education. We do not see this as a contradiction since such lists (such as the list of past independent study projects, Group Focus courses, and the related course listings) are not designed for students to copy, but are rather designed to serve as general models as to what can be done, how it can be done, etc., thus encouraging explorations off the beaten path.

Studies, and Linguistics. If a large number of such listings is to appear in the course catalog, it might be better to put all of the listings at the end of the catalog, after the department listings, rather than to intersperse the interdepartmental listings with the departmental course listings and descriptions.

vi. Work Groups

One aspect of the compartmentalization and the resulting fragmentation that impoverishes the educational experiences of too many Williams students is their reluctance to engage each other in sustained intellectual dialogue and debate on significant issues concerning their thoughts, feelings, and values. To combat this problem, we urge the wider use of the teaching device of organizing classes into small work groups, a device which has proven quite effective for the few Williams professors who have employed it.

The immediate task of these groups of three or four students is to meet informally outside of class to discuss the assigned readings and issues stemming from them. Besides clarifying and deepening the understanding of the material, work group discussions tend to broaden into considerations of wider cognitive, affective, and evaluative issues that are personally important to the group members. We believe that these wide ranging discussions provide a unique, low-pressure opportunity for peer engagement and self-activity. Work groups help to make students an active force in their own, more integrated, education.

vii. Pedagogy Seminar

In order to discuss various teaching techniques (for example, the use of work groups), we suggest the formation of a seminar dedicated to pedagogy. This would involve a continuous, informal discussion group in which faculty (and perhaps interested students) could share educational ideas and practices as well as review with each other the relevant literature in the field. The model used by the Center for Humanities and Social Sciences's discussion groups such as "The Nature of a Discipline" could be followed. This seminar would provide a forum for the discussion of teaching styles and techniques. It is not meant to replace in any way the recently initiated program for second year professors. The second-year-professor program provides a formal opportunity for a select group of faculty to learn about and discuss a Williams education. In contrast, this seminar would be less formal, self-sustaining and open to all faculty. However, the pedagogy seminar does share some of the same goals as the second-year-professor program -- both hope to introject more reflection about teaching into an institution which, though it greatly values teaching, too rarely discusses it in a sustained manner.

3. Residential Changes

Much of what goes on at Williams happens outside of the classroom in the residences of Williams students. The potential exists within the freshman entries and the upperclass residential houses to stimulate cultural and intellectual activities and to meld

them with social life and academics. Our proposals in this section attempt to bring out that potential. The first three proposals deal with the freshman year. We have found that the freshman year serves as a crucially important introduction to Williams life; the impressions students receive during this time (especially the first part of the freshman year) tell them what to expect of Williams and what Williams will expect of them. If freshmen are presented with the experience of education as self-activity and discovery and with opportunities for creative intellectual inquiry, they will relish it and demand it during their upperclass years.

i. Freshman Residential Seminars

The system of freshman housing provides a closely knit and supportive group at a time when it is most needed. Furthermore, the freshman entry provides a natural forum for intellectual discussion and interaction -- twenty-five people living together, becoming friends, and sharing the new experiences and challenges of college life. Far too often, however, the full potential of the freshman entry goes unfulfilled because of the compartmentalization discussed earlier. The entry becomes a vehicle purely for socializing, and socializing comes to imply the exclusion of intellectual discourse. We have looked for ways to short-circuit this compartmentalization in the freshmen year by attempting to build on the framework of the entry system so as to integrate the various arenas of freshman life. Perhaps the most successful of these plans has been the Freshman Residential Seminar (FRS).

The FRS was put in place on a two-year experimental basis, starting in the academic year 1986-87. The FRS was organized around two freshman entries. All freshmen in these entries took as one of their four courses in each of the two semesters an interdisciplinary course taught by faculty from different departments. These faculty members also performed advisory functions for some of the students in the FRS. The remaining students were advised by additional faculty members who expressed interest in participating in the experiment. These faculty members were joined by four regularly selected Junior Advisors who volunteered for the FRS and four student Teaching Assistants who were chosen by the professors. Student participation in the FRS was voluntary; the Dean of Freshmen sent out materials explaining the purposes and limits of the program and asking for volunteers. As the number of volunteers exceeded the number of positions available, the 23 male and 22 female participants were chosen by a random selection process.

The FRS was designed to set the stage for the integration of the academic and the social, as well as the injection of intellectual inquiry into both. In addition, encountering interdisciplinary courses in the freshman year was to present students with a working model of how to integrate their learning experiences in the various academic domains. These ends were to be achieved in a number of ways.

In particular, students who live together feel more comfortable speaking up in front of each other in class and are more willing and even eager to go out on intellectual limbs; thus, the FRS would create

the potential for energetic, searching, and broad-based class discussions. These discussions would be further facilitated by the increased familiarity the students would have with their professors, since these faculty members would also be their advisors.

Furthermore, in order to take advantage of the potential offered by the FRS, the advisory roles could be expanded to include interaction with the FRS as a whole as well as particular students; the faculty members could work with the freshmen and their Junior Advisors (JA's) to plan discussions, lectures, films, field trips, and other events which would be coordinated with the seminar; these events would both enrich the seminar experience for students in the FRS and allow other students to learn about the seminar topic. Finally, as well as directly increasing the scope of intellectual life at Williams, this link of the academic and the social spheres would be likely to spark spontaneous discussions about serious issues among freshmen, at first perhaps centered solely on the topics of their seminars but then gradually expanding to many other issues.

Although there has been no formal evaluation of the FRS program after its first year, informal reports suggest that many of the goals of this program were effectively addressed and that the program was quite successful. Dean Stephen Fix has been named to chair an *ad hoc* evaluation committee which is scheduled to report formally at the end of the experiment's second year.

ii. Freshman Living/Learning Groupings

Besides the FRS, the committee considered another proposal for addressing the problems which concern us. This proposal stems from

an experiment conducted in 1973 by Professors George Marcus, William Boone, and Joseph Beatty and a 1984 proposal which came from Professor Stephen Fix of the English Department. Both the Marcus experiment and the Fix proposal involve having freshmen who live together in an entry being placed in the same section of various courses. The Marcus experiment achieved the necessary groupings of students in the same entry and the same class section by coordinating housing assignments from the start in order to maximize this sort of grouping. The Fix proposal worked by taking the freshman entry arrangements as given and then, where possible, assigning freshmen in the same entries to the same sections of courses that they share.

The advantages of this proposal, whichever way the groupings are in fact achieved, are quite similar to those of the FRS. Classmates who live together would make for better class discussions and common classes would provide a stage for discussion in the entry. Students involved would also begin to treat each other as peers in an active educational process. Naturally, these advantages would be all the more pronounced if the link between class and entry were consciously used and strengthened in class. It would also be desirable to have professors of the classes be advisors for the students in the affected entries.

The success of the FRS and the success of the Marcus experiment in 1973 have been supplemented by an experiment tried with three English 101 professors in 1985-86. Although the results of the experiment varied among the three instructors involved, one professor in particular found the experiment to be very successful in

activating students in the classroom. The students in the class with many students from the same entry were more passionate and involved and more student-student learning and interaction took place. The other instructors did not notice such a dramatic improvement, though they did notice some differences. In light of the success of the FRS in combining living and learning, we suggest that some version of the living/learning grouping be tried again on a somewhat larger scale, and, if successful, that placing students into sections of some of their classes on the basis of where they live be made common practice.

iii. House/Entry Partnership

The experience of the freshman year is widely recognized as having a powerful influence on new students at Williams, on their openness to new ideas and challenges, on their ways of integrating or isolating academic, intellectual and social concerns, on the development of their intellectual, aesthetic and moral self-consciousness and on their understanding of their own role in the pursuit of higher education. In an effort to strengthen and broaden that influence, we proposed that each semester, every residential house establish each semester a cultural and social partnership with one half of two freshman entries. Specifically, the freshmen from the two entries would be systematically invited to participate in the cultural and social affairs of a house, such as musical events, special dinners, cook-outs, poetry readings, sporting events, museum visits or events involving faculty members.

As freshman entries do not have cultural funds, such a relationship with a residential house would enlarge the cultural opportunities of freshmen and enable them to meet more upperclass students in a variety of stimulating settings. By getting to know well at least two houses in the course of their first year at Williams, freshmen would meet their older peers earlier than is currently the case and in circumstances that would make it more likely that these encounters would be meaningful for both parties. Moreover, such a relationship between a residential house and two freshman entries would increase and make more realistic freshman awareness of housing options. Finally, this kind of arrangement would promote increased contacts among freshmen from different entries.

The first semester partnership could begin in mid- to late September and the second semester partnership could begin with Winter Study. Aside from certain constraints, the match-up process would be random. Constraints would include ensuring that none of the partnerships would involve residential houses with which the JA's of the two entries are affiliated, that the two entries assigned to each house come from different locations on the campus, that the entry pairing be different each semester, and that entries not be associated with houses that are in their immediate vicinity.

iv. Interest Houses

Another proposal designed to bring together the different spheres of Williams life and to promote intellectual interaction is by introducing Interest (or "theme") Houses to Williams. We have in mind setting aside two or three living areas in which groups of

students who share a common intellectual or cultural interest could live together for a year and pursue that interest in a variety of ways. Students would live with, and thus become friends with, peers who would challenge and enrich them in an area of their lives about which they care deeply.

Participation in the program would be entirely voluntary. Some time before housing assignments are made, the College would invite students to submit proposals for specific Interest House topics for the following year; each proposal would have to be accompanied by the name of at least one faculty sponsor. Themes might involve a particular intellectual discipline, the culture of a particular region or ethnic group, a specific social, political or ecological concern, a particular art form, a foreign language, or any of countless other possibilities. The proposals would go through a preliminary screening by a faculty-student panel: those found worthy of consideration would be made public to allow other students who are interested to sign up with a particular Interest House. Final selection would then be made by the same committee on the basis of thoughtfulness, creativity, and merit of the proposal, the amount of student interest, and the willingness of those involved to devote the needed time and energy to the Interest House.

We believe that an Interest House would work best in a single house, much like a co-op house, although preferably *without* the latter's board autonomy. Another option would be to locate Interest Houses in sections of larger buildings. However, this alternative is clearly an inferior one in our minds; while a theme group might be

made to work as part of another house, it would be much harder to do so, and we strongly prefer the use of separate houses.

We think that Interest Houses would work well in concert with the residential housing system, not in competition with it. Because of their size and diversity, the residential houses are ill-equipped to approach any given issue in depth and with great intensity; they are much better used as platforms for smaller scale discussion ranging over a variety of issues. The Interest Houses would fill this gap and thus complement and supplement the residential houses, especially since students who had spent time in the former would be continually coming back to their residential houses as more active and enthusiastic house members.

We also believe that Interest Houses would enrich the life of the whole campus through what we call the "multiplier effect." The Interest Houses would sponsor lectures, films, discussions, and other types of events related to their theme or topic, thus introducing the community to the richness and complexity of it. Possibly, specific ideas for this type of outreach might be required as part of the original Interest House proposal.

Finally, we believe that participating in an Interest House would be a stimulating experience for the students involved. Even though every student living in such a house would share the interest which brought the house together, the participants could be expected to bring with them many different viewpoints and perspectives on the topic or theme, especially since all Interest House proposals would be made public for additional sign-ons before final adoption. Indeed, if desired, the screening committee could explicitly look for diversity of

perspective when evaluating such proposals. We feel that a deep, serious, and passionate involvement with a particular issue is an invigorating experience which makes a student a better community member and allows for fuller intellectual development.

Although the Interest House proposal has met with the necessary administrative approval, its implementation has been hampered by a real estate problem. There are few college-owned houses that would suit an Interest House, and these houses are a precious commodity as they are used both for student co-op and faculty housing.

4. Changes at the Community Level

While much can be done in the classroom and in the residence, it is also important to enliven the community as a whole. There are many exciting activities going on at Williams, yet they are often limited to small cliques or lost in the busy schedule of a regular week. The proposals in this section are designed to draw attention to the variety of interests at Williams, to minimize conflicts between various activities, and to create some special events which have the potential to bring the community together in new and engaging ways.

i. Student Activities Director

In our report of 1984-85, we recommended the creation of a Student Activities Intern, whose job was to facilitate coordination among the many organizations which provide opportunities for a wide variety of exciting activities on campus and to promote serious

engagement on campus beyond the spheres of athletic or social recreation. Since that time, we became increasingly aware of the need for the coordination of activities on campus, and we came to recognize that at least a full-time staff position is necessary to address this problem. While we hope that the Student Activities Director will be able to act as catalyst for new groups and activities, we believe that the top priority for him or her is to begin to bring some order to the chaotic scheduling situation at Williams.

Currently, Williams hosts a variety of very interesting activities such as lectures, concerts, films, sporting events and discussions, to name only a few. Unfortunately, little attempt is made to coordinate these events so as to avoid major conflicts. Anyone who has been involved in planning a public activity has probably experienced the frustration of having his or her event scheduled on the same day as an event that appeals to a similar audience. Also, the most interesting happenings seem inevitably to be scheduled for the same week while other weeks are relatively barren. We believe that a Student Activities Director could work to avoid these sorts of problems.

With this proposal, we are not suggesting the creation of an "activities czar" with the power to cancel events, select speakers, and dictate the student activities; rather we are suggesting the establishment of an aggressive clearinghouse and a resource for people who are involved in the planning and execution of campus activities. In addition to this clearinghouse role, we see the Student Activities Director as getting involved in a variety of other ways to improve the quality of intellectual life on campus through various

student activities. For example, the Student Activities Director would be in an ideal position to assist in the planning and implementing of the Campus Dialogue Evenings (see below, pp. 32-35). The director would act to generate occasions for the exchange of ideas by, for instance, encouraging and facilitating discussions following appropriate events on campus. Further, the director would work to nurture the development of the discussion into regular discussion groups to investigate more extensively topics that interest them. The director would also seek to integrate, when appropriate, the activities of various existing groups which shared an interest in a particular set of issues. Also, the director would work with members of the faculty to stimulate outside the classroom discussion.

We believe the creation of a Student Activities Director would be a positive step towards improving the intellectual dialogue on campus by bringing together and deploying more effectively the many resources that Williams already has available to it. Creating a formal administrative position would be a significant symbolic as well as a concrete step towards improving the reception of activities at Williams.

ii. Campus Dialogue Evenings

In order to improve a particular aspect of intellectual life at Williams, we propose that an all-campus lecture with a series of post-lecture discussions be held three times a year. Specifically, we suggest that a student-faculty committee, in conjunction with the Lecture Committee, decide on three provocative and widely recognized experts, each to speak on a different topic chosen from

the gamut of political, scientific, artistic, moral, and other intellectual concerns, and subsequently, invite each to present his or her views to a Chapin Hall audience. Following the lecture, members of the audience (which would include all interested members of the Williams community) would go to one of several locations around campus for discussions of the topic. The Dialogue Evenings would be held once each semester and once during Winter Study. So that they would not interfere with events that have been scheduled far in advance on fixed dates, the Campus Dialogue Evenings would be carefully scheduled and well publicized among organizers of other, potentially conflicting, activities. This task would be made much easier if Williams had a Student Activities Director (see above, pp. 30-31).

The significance of the proposed Campus Dialogue Evenings can be appreciated against the background of a number of currently existing difficulties. First, there is a general lack of discussion of controversial topics. What discussion does occur, tends to do so sporadically and among small groups of students and small groups of faculty. Second, although there are many lectures that could serve as catalysts for large-scale, serious debate, most of these suffer from problems of inadequate publicity, inadequate attendance, and a disappointing lack of follow-up discussion. Third, people tend to go to lectures given by speakers who come from their academic discipline or who share their views on the topic. This results in a lack of the sort of confrontation that leads to intellectual development as well as in a lack of insights that transcend the boundaries of academic disciplines. Fourth, as mentioned in the

proposal for a Student Activities Director, lectures tend to conflict with other public events, both intellectual and otherwise, exacerbating the aforementioned problems. Fifth, the only occasions hitherto when a significant part of the whole Williams community has come together are ritualistic (such as Commencement, Convocation or memorial services) or social (Homecoming, Winter Carnival, etc.). Until now there has been no occasion when a large part of the college community would be mobilized -- by contrast -- around an activity genuinely at the core of the institution's mission. Sixth, because the Lecture Committee is passive, only addressing funding requests that are brought before it by departments and groups, very few "big names" that might speak on broader issues are ever brought to Williams. Overall, the effects on the intellectual climate resulting from the admittedly numerous guest lectures at Williams are disappointingly passive, ephemeral, and, thus, relatively insignificant.

In order to address these problems, this proposal draws on various present and past experiences. Specifically, the Freshman Assembly demonstrates that it is possible for a large scale event to succeed. The broad, long-term discussion which followed the well attended lecture by Phyllis Schlafly (in 1983-84) illustrates that it is possible for a controversial speaker to inspire the sort of existentially challenging atmosphere which is too often absent at Williams. Further, Winter Carnival shows that it is possible to avoid scheduling conflicts for a campus happening that involves a large portion of the campus by planning well in advance of the actual event.

The overall time frame for the Campus Dialogue Evenings would be as follows:

1. Three dates would be chosen for the Campus Dialogue Evenings in order to avoid long term scheduling conflicts.
2. Campus Dialogue Committee, in conjunction with the Lecture Committee, would select topics and invite speakers.
3. At the beginning of each year, all three of the year's Campus Dialogue events would be widely publicized.
4. Two weeks before each lecture, the upcoming event would again be publicized.
5. All students and faculty as well as others who indicate interest would receive some sort of reading relating to the topic of the upcoming lecture.
6. The lecture would take place in Chapin Hall.
7. Immediately after the lecture, the audience would split up into small groups and go to various lounges, living rooms and classrooms for discussions and refreshments. In each designated room, there will be a facilitator whose job will be to get the discussion started. This facilitator could be anyone with an interest in the topic and the ability to lead a discussion.

We believe that this proposal could have a significant impact on the intellectual life of the campus. Due to the "multiplier effect", the Campus Dialogue Evening could have positive results which extend beyond the three evenings explicitly involved. Namely, successful implementation would have the effect of encouraging attendance at other lectures, as well as encouraging serious debate and intellectual interaction throughout the college community. Additionally, this

proposal would fill a gap that currently exists at Williams by creating a body that will actively seek to bring important well-known speakers to campus.

iii. Arts and Sciences Fair

The aim of the Arts and Sciences Fair is to enliven the artistic and intellectual environment of Williams College by enhancing the opportunity of students to admire and to be inspired and encouraged by each others' "non-graded" accomplishments. It will also enable faculty and staff to discover what the students are doing. (The problem of the students having no idea what the faculty do is a separate one, but might also be addressed by the Fair.) The first and last time Williams college students, as a body, are praised for their diverse talents is in their letter of admission. Once on this campus, the notorious bee-keeper disappears, never to be seen again. This Fair proposes to provide a forum which would transform that mildly amusing public-relations gimmick into a powerful reality with salutary impact on perceptions, self-perceptions and motivations in our community.

This proposal calls for a three-day fair (a Friday, Saturday and Sunday), in late April, roughly two weeks after the end of Spring vacation, preferably on "Spring Weekend." The fair would involve student art, photography, theater design, science exhibits, environmental studies projects, etc. Space would be provided for these sorts of displays. Similarly, poetry and creative writing would be read and music, theater, and dance would be performed.

This past year, a small scale version of the Arts and Sciences Fair was held on Baxter Lawn under a large tent. The co-presidents of the Purple Key organized the fair, with the Gaudino Fund providing financial support. The fair was very successful, exceeding the expectations of all involved. Plans are already underway for next year's Arts and Sciences Fair. Purple Key will again provide the organizational support. Since this proposal has already been implemented, we need only add the further recommendation that the school strongly encourage and support the Arts and Sciences Fair in the future.

iv. International Culture Festival

The Gaudino Committee proposes an annual International Culture Festival to increase awareness on the campus of the cultural and ethnic heterogeneity of our community and of the position of the American college in a heterogenous world. Such a Festival will bring together all foreign students, the CDE Fellows, the seniors who had spent all or part of their junior year abroad, such groups as ASiA, the BSU, the Jewish Association, the International Club, the Palestinian Rights Committee, as well as many Americans who -- though not connected with any of these groups -- have a sense of their cultural heritage.

The International Festival would be designed on a model similar to the Arts and Sciences Fair. There would be exhibits, performances, readings, films, etc., designed to share the large variety of international culture that is represented at Williams. Since the two fairs are similar, the International Culture Festival should be

designed based on the experience that is gained from the planning and execution of the Arts and Sciences Fair.

5. Other Changes

If a Williams education is to address the whole person, then it is a mistake to limit this education merely to the traditional time frame of the academic year and to the location of the Williams campus. The proposals in this section are designed to carry the educational experience beyond its usual parameters. The first two proposals are designed to encourage students to continue their education beyond Williams; too often, Williams produces people who learn well, but who then "put their education on the shelf," where it is ignored while they pursue their lives. The second two proposals are designed to encourage and assist students to continue their education in a variety of ways in between academic years at Williams. Learning should not stop after the last final exam has been taken and then start up again as the leaves begin to fall. The fifth proposal deals with experiential learning, an alternative to the traditional classroom learning situation. This proposal is designed to reinforce the notion that learning does not exclusively take place in the classroom.

i. Office of Graduate School Counseling

Education does not and should not stop at the completion of a student's last final exam as a Williams College senior. Perhaps the most straightforward way to continue one's education after the receipt of a Williams diploma is to attend some sort of academic (that

is, not pre-professional) graduate school. Currently, Williams sends relatively few students on to graduate schools of arts and sciences. As the following table shows, compared to nine similar institutions, Williams has the lowest percentage of recent alumni/ae who ultimately receive Ph.D.'s. Few of even our most talented students are deciding to continue their formal academic education, or to prepare for scholarly pursuits.

College	percentage of students to receive Ph.D.'s*
1. Reed	25.3
2. Swarthmore	20.9
3. Haverford	18.8
4. Oberlin	17.8
5. Amherst	13.7
6. Pomona	13.7
7. Carlton	13.7
8. Wesleyan	12.4
9. Antioch	11.0
10. Williams	9.8

*from Carol H. Fuller, "An Analysis of Leading Undergraduate Sources of Ph.D.'s Adjusted for Institutional Size", (Ann Arbor, MI: Great Lakes College Association, 1985)

While this historical pattern is unsettling itself, given Williams' commitment to excellence, it is part and parcel of a far larger and more critical problem. There is a serious national shortage of educators, as can be seen by a survey of national data. The data indicate that over the last twenty years, there has been an 85 percent drop in the proportion of freshmen interested in an academic career and a more than 80 percent decline in freshmen anticipating a

career in secondary education.⁴ Ominous as these quantitative trends are, their qualitative aspects are even more disastrous. Comparative data show that aspiring teachers constitute the most poorly prepared career goal group of them all. In short, our schools, our colleges and universities and the nation's talent pool of highly trained scholars are rapidly approaching a state of crisis. Clearly, a high-quality college like Williams has a very special responsibility in this critical national situation. So far we have not met that responsibility adequately. Not only have we traditionally produced far fewer Ph.D.'s than the schools with which we like to compare ourselves, we have also traditionally produced far higher proportions of short-term private school teachers than permanent public school teachers. An urgent need exists to reverse these trends.

The present situation at Williams College with regard to these problems is not encouraging. For example, information and advice about academic graduate schools are dispersed among a variety of offices, persons and locations. Relevant catalogues (often not up-to-date) are kept in the O.C.C., the several departments and the library; financial aid forms for graduate schools are available from the Financial Aid Office and the O.C.C.; fellowship information can be gleaned on departmental bulletin boards, some of it can be obtained from the Dean of the Faculty, some from the Associate Dean in charge of Study Abroad, the Director of Financial Aid, the Associate Dean for Financial Aid, and from Professors Apter and Hill. For substantive

⁴ See Alexander W. Astin and Kenneth C. Green, "The American Freshman: Twenty Year Trends, 1966-1985," in A.W. Astin, K.C. Green and W.S. Korn, *The American Freshman: Twenty Year Trends*, Los Angeles: The Higher Education Research Institute, Graduate School of Education, University of California at Los Angeles, January 1987)

information concerning the relative merits of graduate programs in a particular discipline, the corresponding department is responsible, though, in many cases, no particularly designated member of the department. Moreover, departments vary widely in the assiduousness with which they perform this crucial advising function, quite apart from the fact that no department is particularly equipped to supply information on M.A.T. programs and that we do not have departments in such academic fields as, for instance, linguistics, cognitive science, and neuroscience.

The consequences of such dispersion of functions and information are all detrimental to the objective of raising the awareness of our best students to the attractiveness and importance of the option for a career commitment to scholarship and teaching. In the first place, the extreme decentralization makes it difficult, time-consuming, and often confusing even for interested students to obtain the necessary information, requisite forms, etc. Many get discouraged, especially when they contrast their difficulties with the ease of their classmates whose interest in the more traditional "Williams careers" receives the powerful and highly professional support of our effective O.C.C. staff. Secondly, for every one of the offices and officers currently dispensing graduate school information and matriculation documents, that task is peripheral and thus, inevitably, receives less attention than it deserves and demands, particularly if we are to stem and reverse an "historical" pattern. Thirdly, none of these offices and individuals is charged with the responsibility of keeping abreast of changes and new opportunities in the academic and teaching professions. Consequently, it is merely a matter of good luck if a

student receives up-to-date information and if it goes beyond an anecdotal level. Finally, in the current situation, academic career counselling and, even more so, persistent advocacy for the academic and teaching professions is not perceived as a central task by any of the various offices, staff and faculty.

Another side to this problem is that for a decade and until recently there had been a shortage of positions available in teaching. As a result, many professors -- themselves often negatively affected by the surplus of educators -- discouraged even their most talented students from pursuing academic careers. Since the job market has shifted dramatically, old habits must be changed and the institutional barriers to academic careers need to be torn down.

The most insidious aspect of the apparent disinterest of Williams students to continue their formal academic education is, we think, centrally linked to the three main problems that we are addressing in this report: passivity, compartmentalization, and adverse socialization. Because students view their classes passively, and because they normally separate their academic work from the rest of their lives, they do not usually think that there can be connections between them. Thus, there is a frequent separation of what the students do at Williams from what they hope to do after Williams. This has historically led even the most intellectually talented among them to give little serious thought to the possibility of pursuing an academic career, let alone a career of teaching on the secondary level. Further, through the socialization process, students implicitly learn that it is "uncool" to pursue a scholarly graduate education and to become a professor. Instead, many Williams students are

socialized into becoming business professionals of various sorts. The skewed "environmental" signals are even reflected in "The Lephlet", a weekly O.C.C. publication, which announces all of the events and interviews: mostly they relate to business careers; only three or four times a year does the notion of scholarly graduate work get communicated to the student body as a whole, and never as strongly as careers in business.

In order to overcome these national and institutional problems and combat their causes, new and more persistent ways will have to be found to encourage our intellectually liveliest and most imaginative students -- and quite especially women and minority members -- to continue their academic education with a view to making academic research and teaching their careers. As a partial -- but not negligible -- contribution to that endeavor, we are proposing to expand, concentrate and deepen the expertise of academic and teaching career counseling and graduate school advising, and to raise their visibility on the campus. We believe that this proposal would work well in concert with the other proposals in this report. As the intellectual climate at Williams improves, we hope that this proposal will have a greater impact.

The O.C.C., already under pressure for placements in the non-academic professional and business fields, understandably finds that it can place relatively little emphasis on scholarly graduate studies or public school teaching compared to the massive effort devoted to the traditional "mainstream" careers. It would be both unfair and unrealistic to ask the already overburdened O.C.C. staff to shoulder the additional responsibility for a major upgrading of academic and

teaching career counseling and graduate school advisement. We, therefore, suggest the creation of an Office of Graduate School Counseling (O.G.S.C.). Ideally, that office would be directed by a person with extensive experience in the Admissions Office of a major graduate school and be staffed with experts in minority issues and public school teaching. The O.G.S.C. would be expected not only to make available a large quantity of well-organized information on the gamut of academic graduate programs, to publicize fellowship opportunities (especially for minority and female candidates) and to supply details on admissions criteria and standards, but also to provide expert assistance in such matters as application forms, appropriate essays, and interview techniques.

Being generalists, rather than disciplinary specialists, the staff of the O.G.S.C. would be expected to request briefings from faculty on new developments and opportunities in their several fields and to maintain contact with new, young faculty who are an invaluable source of recent information on and critical assessment of their own graduate schools and programs. In addition, the O.G.S.C. would be fully conversant with studies, analyses, and projections of the A.A.U.P. and similar professional academic organizations on such matters as academic and teachers' salaries and benefits, the "academic marketplace," trends in minority and female participation in Ph.D. and M.A.T. programs, academic freedom issues, promotion patterns among women and minority faculty, etc. In that latter function the O.G.S.C. would also serve as an important resource for the faculty, especially its non-tenured members, and supplement the data-gathering efforts of the Assistant to the President. Finally,

along with the established program of practice teaching at Mt. Greylock Regional High School, the O.G.S.C. would be the logical agency through which a program of summer project stipends could be administered (see below, pp. 47-49). After all, the students who are included in the summer program to pursue independent scholarly or artistic projects, would be among those whose interest in future academic and teaching careers it would be the mission of the O.G.S.C. to nurture.

While the recent creation of a position for an assistant dean in charge of fellowships and graduate studies is a sign that the problems that this proposal addresses are also on the minds of others, we believe that this step is far too small. The causes of these problems are too many and the task at hand is too great to be handled successfully with the limited amount of time and resources that a part-time dean will be able to provide. Much broader and far reaching action must be taken if Williams is going to begin to reverse a seemingly entrenched institutional pattern and resist a national trend effectively.

We believe that the proposed O.G.S.C. provides a significant and concrete way for Williams to respond to critical national and college needs that have been repeatedly and publicly acknowledged by our chief administrative officers. The swift implementation of this proposal can make an important contribution toward meeting these needs.

ii. Graduate School Advising in Departments

While we think that much can be done to centralize some of the graduate school advising that Williams should provide, a significant portion of the advice and information that a student considering graduate studies needs should be provided at the departmental level. To supplement the O.G.S.C. proposal, we urge that each department and program designate a graduate school advisor. The faculty member so designated would be the contact person for those students interested in pursuing graduate studies. This advisor would be in contact with the O.G.S.C. and would be familiar with the services that it provides. He or she would also be familiar with the specialties and backgrounds of the various members of his/her department and the faculty in general in order to be able to refer students with particular subfield interests. Also, the departmental graduate school advisor would organize informational sessions to publicize opportunities in graduate studies. Much can and must be done at the departmental level if the current problems are to be overcome.

iii. Teaching Assistants

For many years, Williams College has provided funds that enable professors to hire students as teaching assistants (TAs). Full-time TAs are paid \$500 per semester, part-time TAs, \$250. The amount and the type of work these students do differ significantly depending on the department and the professor involved. TAs may grade a small percentage (not more than ten percent) of the coursework done by the students, assist students with their writing by going over drafts of papers, lead discussions or hold review sessions before

exams, have "office hours" to help students with homework, act as tutors for students who are having problems, or serve as laboratory aides. Some TAs attend every class session of the class they are associated with but many do not. Some TAs work closely with the faculty member but many do not. This wide range of roles that a TA can play reflects the wide variety of needs that professors have for such assistance.

We feel that while having TAs is generally a good idea, there is much that can be done to improve the way TAs are dealt with at Williams and that such changes could have a significant impact on encouraging these talented students to consider careers in research and teaching. Specifically, and most importantly, we believe that teaching assistants need to be seen as apprentices -- students that are being trained to become teachers; improved academic graduate school advising will do little good if students are not taught to appreciate the challenges and pleasures of teaching. TAs need to be viewed not as means to relieve professors of some of the less rewarding pedagogical tasks but rather as integral parts of a complex teaching situation that can provide the TAs with exceptionally vivid learning experiences. In order to promote this view towards teaching assistants, the Gaudino Committee urges the benefits of frequent conferences between the TA and the professor to discuss all aspects of their class. Discussion of the pedagogical difficulties of certain topics, the progress of the class, the choice of paper topics or laboratory experiments and the like all involve teaching assistants in the teaching process in a -- for them -- productive and valuable way (and will also probably benefit the professor involved who will be

provided with a valuable opinion on the course). The Committee also discussed the possibility of having regular meetings of TAs in a department or division. At such meetings, teaching assistants would have the opportunity to discuss with each other their tasks, problems, and reactions, thus enriching their learning experiences. They would also develop a sense of community among their fellow TAs which does not currently exist at all but which could have a considerable impact on what students get out of being TAs, as well as on their perception of teaching as a crucially significant and profoundly rewarding calling.

Improving the role of the teaching assistants has a further desirable result: the students in the class with a teaching assistant will learn to view their peers as educational resources. Seeing another student involved in assisting a professor will further expose students to the possibility of getting more actively involved in the educational process and will encourage students to discuss academic issues outside the classroom -- after all, a teaching assistant can be called late at night or asked a question in the dining hall. Given these possibilities, we recommend that more comprehensive and deeper thought be given to ways that teaching assistants can be better utilized and taken more seriously.

iv. Summer Project Stipend

Extending its concern over the rigid separation between the classroom and the rest of the student's intellectual and social life during the academic year, the Gaudino Committee also seeks ways to narrow the gap between the academic year and the three months

when the College is not "in session." Moreover, as a serious educational institution, Williams College is committed to education in the broad sense of nourishing the intellectual and artistic passions of the students.

We therefore propose that the College make stipends available to those students who may wish to spend their summer at Williams (or, on rare occasions, at another institution) to pursue a non-credit independent scholarly or artistic project. Aside from the rare N.E.H. summer stipends, interested students can currently spend their summers at Williams only if they are assisting a professor's research: they are not given the opportunity to design and institute their own program. If they wish to work on an independent project they must do so in addition to their 40-hour-a-week job, an unrealistic task by all accounts. The proposed stipend, on the other hand, would make it feasible for students to forgo a summer job and devote themselves entirely to their own major intellectual or artistic endeavors.

Applications for the stipend would be made to a review committee, preferably through the O.G.S.C. (see above, pp. 37-44). They would consist of such materials as would enable the committee to evaluate the project, its feasibility, the student's level of commitment and adequacy of preparation. The stipend would carry with it an obligation of the recipient to submit to the review committee at the end of the summer a report on what was accomplished.

The Summer Project Stipend is a practical way by which students can continue to pursue their intellectual, scholarly or artistic passions and demonstrate their commitment to them. Moreover --

and equally important -- it would help break down the rigid structure of the "academic year" and demonstrate concretely that the life of the mind and of the aesthetic senses is neither identical with, nor exhausted by, formal academic learning.

v. Summer Learning Experiences at Williams

While the number of students spending their summers in Williamstown has increased every year for at least the past four years, their presence still remains an anomaly for the Administration of the College. Rather than continuing its current practice of barely acknowledging the presence of Williams students, we propose that Williams encourage and support the various learning experiences that go on here during the summer.

One (perhaps unconscious) signal that Williams gives to its students which is counter to the aims of this report, is that learning ends when the summer begins and then begins again once the summer is over. This is clearly not the impression Williams should give if it wants its students to view education actively and to see it as part of life. This signal is given by the lack of official recognition of students' presence in Williamstown during the summer. The increasing number of students involved in work for the sciences through the Bronfman Fund and other grants has forced the college to provide more housing for students during the summer, but besides the necessities of food and housing, the school offers little formal support or encouragement and does little to increase the value of students' summer experiences in Williamstown. A full discussion of what could and should be done by Williams is beyond

the scope of this report, however, we will offer a few illustrative suggestions as to the sorts of things that can be done.

First, the Financial Aid Office should make the appropriate changes in summer earning expectations to make it possible for financial aid students to work in Williamstown in intellectually relevant jobs. Second, the College should put together a pamphlet explaining the various opportunities available for students in the summer and arrangements that the College makes for such students. Third, the College should provide some of the same sort of administrative support that it provides during the year-- a student phone directory (listing both students home and work numbers), a weekly calendar of events (including a schedule of the various groups that use the college's facilities during the summer), a list of the hours of the various facilities, the scheduling of a variety of events, such as lectures, concerts, and student-faculty gatherings, etc. Fourth, interested students should be explicitly invited to take part in the various events that take place around campus during the summer and which are not limited to an exclusive circle of participants. Fifth, the college could more directly support such summer experiences through the creation of Summer Project Stipends (see above, pp. 47-49) and the expansion of summer internships in the humanities and the social studies.

Because traditionally almost all of its students left town for the summer, Williams became involved in renting out its facilities and services to a vast array of groups during the summer. Williamstown is a beautiful place for these conferences, conventions and institutes and they have quite generally made a very positive contribution in

material and non-material terms both to Williams College and to the Northern Berkshire area. However, it seems to us that through the very success of these ventures the College may be at risk in losing sight of its main goal, which is clearly not to function as a hotel or conference center. If students and faculty can benefit from the use of Williams's facilities during the summer, and recent experience clearly demonstrates that they can, then the educational goal of the College must take priority. The commercial summer activities of the College should be curtailed to accommodate activities more centrally related to the mission of Williams College as an educational institution. There are many educational advantages to such a change -- advantages that will certainly make up for the short-term loss of revenue.

6. Conclusion

Throughout this report, we have assumed that there is a great deal more that can be done to improve the quality of a Williams education. We have focused on three main problems which we believe need to be addressed: students' passive approach to learning, the absence of useful interaction between the academic and other parts of students' lives, and the process of adverse socialization that both perpetuates and accentuates the other two difficulties. In addressing these problems, we have suggested that students should be given a more active role in their education, that more explicit links be made between the classroom and the other parts of

students' lives and that the forces of socialization be used to improve the educational experience of Williams students.

Our diagnosis of what is wrong is similar (at least on the surface) to that put forth by others who have looked at the state of higher education in America's top institutions, most notably Allan Bloom⁵ and Helen L. Horowitz⁶. Like them, the Gaudino Committee sees today's college students as lacking the intellectual energy and as missing the important connections that make a liberal arts education so valuable. However, we disagree with Bloom's explanation of the crisis and the remedy he recommends for it. Bloom prescribes a return to the "basics" and to the Great Books along with developing a strong student-teacher dichotomy (the teacher is the master who hands down the truth about the world to the ignorant student). Our prescription for improved education is significantly different in its approach. A brief exploration of the reasons behind the differences between Bloom's suggestions and those of the Gaudino Committee will help to explicate the latter.⁷

As noted above, Bloom's sketchy suggestions to "re-open" the mind of America's students seem to involve a required course in "The Greats" and return to a strong role for the teacher as the master in the learning process. Both of these suggestions would contribute to, rather than combat, the passive approach to learning which

⁵Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind*, (NY: Simon and Schuster, 1987)

⁶Helen L. Horowitz, *Campus Life*, (NY: Knopf, 1987)

⁷Our differences with Bloom entail a certain irony, as both Bloom's and Gaudino's political and educational philosophies are indelibly marked by the intellectual impact of their teacher, Leo Strauss. The solution to this puzzle will be found below, pp. 58-61, where we briefly trace Gaudino's shift away from Straussian orthodoxy.

students take today. With regards to the great books course, Bloom agrees to some of the flaws normally put forth by its critics,⁸ but he suggests that there is no other alternative to save us from the intellectual crisis that faces us. Bloom however overlooks the fact that requiring a particular course with a set syllabus encourages students to learn passively. We agree that there is much value in returning to the classics, but in order for this return to be of value, students must want to undertake this study and they must be helped to realize that the classics speak to them well beyond the classroom and can illuminate all parts of their lives. Bloom does not suggest anything to overcome the compartmentalization which gets in the way of the type of connections that he wants students to make. In fact, a strong hierarchical approach to education reinforces compartmentalization, further reducing any active role that the student might play in her own education.

In contrast, the specific suggestions of the Gaudino Committee attempt to address passivity and compartmentalization directly. For example, the Freshmen Residential Seminars have proven successful in getting students to realize that the issues which they discuss in the classroom are important to their "non-academic" lives. Contract majors and other proposals that try to give students educational autonomy can spark and channel intellectual passion by allowing students to approach questions in ways that interest them. Teaching assistants as well as various classroom and residential changes which we discuss above are designed to make positive use of the socialization process by getting students to see each other as

⁸Bloom, p. 344

educational resources and to see faculty as role models, not just as givers of facts. Our proposals attempt to improve a Williams education without blaming or insulting students, but by respecting them, challenging them, and encouraging them to help us in the educational process.

We believe that swift recognition of the concepts and adoption of the proposals put forth in this report would be a noteworthy beginning to the process of significantly enhancing the overall quality of a Williams education. Williams has the resources, both financial and human (faculty, staff and students), to make progress towards solving our problems, thereby also setting an example for other Liberal Arts Colleges in America which face similar difficulties.

II. THE GAUDINO SCHOLAR'S ACTIVITIES

1. Pedagogical Premises

As we mentioned in our discussion of the premisses underlying the proposals of the Gaudino Committee (see above, p. 6), these premisses and the notion of liberal education at Williams derived from them were not necessarily identical with Robert Gaudino's educational philosophy, though in no way incompatible with it. By contrast, many of the activities of the Gaudino Scholar himself or those he sponsored, facilitated or supported financially, clung more closely to the "Gaudino legacy" in the narrower sense.

Unfortunately it is not easy to identify clearly of what that legacy exactly consists and what it implies. Though long overdue, there still is no comprehensive account of Gaudino's educational theory. Richard Herzog's splendid beginning in his extended "Memorandum to the Gaudino Fund Advisory Committee" of April 1981 has so far not been followed up. No one has traced the development of Professor Gaudino's reflections on the teaching/learning process and on education in the Liberal Arts from his doctoral dissertation to his "preliminary draft" of "Silence is Suspect", on which he was working at the time of his death. Nor has there been any effort through systematic interviews and an examination of his courses and syllabi across the 19 years he graced the Williams Faculty to establish the development of Gaudino's educational practices. Obviously this is not the place nor is the current Gaudino Scholar in a position to supply these wants.

However, even without detailed study, it is quite clear that Gaudino's theory and practice changed considerably over time, as David Booth pointed out in his remarks during the memorial services for Bob Gaudino on December 2, 1974. We emphasize here the change because the recent popular success of a book on higher education in America by one of Gaudino's fellow Straussians, Allan Bloom, might mislead the unwary to read Bloom's dour lucubrations back into Gaudino. To be sure, in many ways Gaudino never abandoned the teachings of Leo Strauss. Strauss's notions of what it meant to read a classic text and how it is to be read and interpreted remained a part of Gaudino's views on the nature and function of political philosophy to the end of his days. So did his profound respect for the classical canon of political thought and his sense that the proper reading of "the Greats" was an essential part of a liberal education.⁹ That respect and that sense stemmed from another core element of Strauss's teachings which Gaudino accepted throughout. That element was the conviction that there was an unchanging universal "Human Nature", an enduring *conditio humana*, which assured that the most fundamental *questions* human beings must ask are always and everywhere the same. Indeed, Professor Gaudino's shift in emphasis from the earlier rigorous textual examination of

⁹ Yet even this certainty came under severe skeptical pressure toward the end of Gaudino's life. Thus, his description of the humane studies (Level 3) in his "Silence is Suspect" clearly conveyed his awareness of their parochial Eurocentricity, their class and gender specificity and their tendency to "create a casual contempt for" those not included in their charmed circle. Indeed, Gaudino had by that time become capable of writing: "The culture of Level 3 is of a disquieting kind. Growth through the means of great books and objects in literature, art, history, music. Universal in its intention, it is a culture much narrower in practice." R.L. Gaudino, "Silence Is Suspect", pp. 55 1/2 (sic) and 56. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 59.

great works to the later experiments with the experience of confronting the unfamiliar "other" as part of a liberating education, was made possible precisely because he never wavered in his conviction that central aspects of the non-material human condition are unaffected either by the passage of time or by social, cultural and geographic distance. The reading of the ancients allowed the student to discover and experience *intellectually* the unity of Human Nature and the sameness of the really fundamental questions across thousands of years, just as the confrontation with the initially strange in India or Appalachia permitted the student to discover and experience *existentially* the identity of Man's most basic questions across geographic, cultural and social space.

However, if Bob Gaudino remained convinced of the universal, transhistorical character of Man's most fundamental questions, and to that extent remained a faithful Straussian and intellectual wayfarer of Allan Bloom, he became increasingly skeptical of the *central* contention of Strauss and Bloom: namely, that the universality of Human Nature assured not only the a-historical identity of mankind's deepest *questions* but also the demonstrable existence of universal, transhistorical *answers*, in short, of a Natural Law, a realm of universal laws of Virtue, of Good and Evil, of absolute knowledge of Truth and Beauty.

This growing skepticism moved Robert Gaudino away from the arrogant dogmatism that characterizes unreconstructed Straussians like Bloom, as well as from their almost hysterical abuse of all things modern, from their elitism and contempt for the "vulgar, irrational mob", as well as from their eventual opportunistic political alliance

with Right wing defenders of plutocracy and corporate capitalism. This shift can be documented in both Gaudino's theorizing and educational practice. In the monograph left unfinished at his death, Professor Gaudino brilliantly transformed Plato's famous vertical line diagram of the four states of mind (from *eikasia* on the lower end to *noesis*, the highest form of rational intuition whose object is ultimately the Good itself) into four different modes of cognition which could also be used to distinguish "between (sic!) four kinds of education, or between four meanings of public authority, or between four expressions of sensibility or between four uses of opinion."¹⁰ In this "translation" of Plato into a "modern idiom," Gaudino pointedly omits *noesis*, cognitive transcendence, the real world of the Good. That departure from Plato is of utmost importance to the author. He leaves us in no doubt about it:

Let us not divide the line as Plato did. We really cannot. . . . We will . . . fill it in differently. We are after all modern men. That means that we will have no bright, sun-lighted, being-loving experience. No blinding fourth level. We refuse to leave the cave. We will remain with the concrete things of the world. . . . Our theory will relate concrete things not transcend them, not destroy them with being. . . . It is of necessity a statement of the line that is completely unacceptable by (sic) Plato or, perhaps, any traditional writer. Luckily we are not held to account by traditional authors. History, one might say, has progressed, has freed us from this accountability. We intend to make do with the operational theory of science as theory's highest expression. We won't go beyond. No forms, no ideas, no sunlight, no Good. . . . We will be accused of lacking imagination. We say: Guilty as charged. . . . We choose to be worldly. . . . We don't resent the loss of Levels 1 and 4. Those images of images and ideas.

¹⁰Robert L. Gaudino, "Silence is Suspect: The Divided Line, An Unauthorized Version" (preliminary draft), p. 6.

So unsteady and flickering in the air without any empirical validation. Our neglect of the illusions of thought under sunlight will not, I presume, distract the sufficiently modern reader.¹¹

Apostasy and heresy. Admittedly, they are much more apparent in Robert Gaudino's theoretical move away from Natural Law than in his educational practices. The latter steadfastly clung to the Socratic method of which he was an unrivalled master. Yet even here one could observe a slight shift: while the method appeared to remain the same, its educational focus moved. To speak in the definitional language of his "Silence is Suspect," Gaudino's emphasis began to move from Level 3 to Level 2. Level 3, the cognitive level of the humanities, unlike natural science (Level 4), is oriented toward self-knowledge, toward the growth of the student, but it is "[t]he discipline [that] determines and directs the student's insights and participation. Although he is to grow, it is by mastery of subject matter, not by articulation of what he is."¹² The role of the teacher is essential: the student's growth on that level is "directed growth. He is involved in it more than responsible for it. He is a student in the traditional sense. He is definitely taught, as well he must. He needs the teaching. And the teacher."¹³ With Level 2, the educational focus shifts from the discipline and its certified master to the student herself. It is the student's "freely accepted responsibility, of being answerable and responsive . . . that . . . makes possible the reflection that unsettles and teaches us,"¹⁴ it is no longer the authority of the

¹¹Ibid., pp. 2-5.

¹²Ibid., p. 72.

¹³Ibid., pp. 72-73

¹⁴Ibid., p. 73.

discipline and master. Yet Gaudino remained eager to distinguish the deadly serious business of education through conflict, through the open clash of opinions, sensibilities and convictions, from the pleasant, non-committal exchange of views typical of friendship groups "at home," so to speak. He continued to stress that *real* discussions that teach, that educate, that are able to "perfect and focus the disagreement into new insights and understanding"¹⁵ must establish and make effective a structure of authority. In short, discussion "does not educate if it is not directed."¹⁶ Thus, while the focus has shifted to the student as a quasi-autonomous personality, Gaudino still clung to his insistence that all levels of learning required skilled teachers or leaders. And yet with the actual practice involved in the Williams-at-Home project, Gaudino, it would appear, made a further move. He had become less insistent on the austerity of an "opinion group" as against the warm, undemanding familiarity of a "friendship group." Though the rigorous, Socratic teacher still played an important role, Professor Gaudino began to acknowledge the possibility of student-student education.

These recollections of a few aspects of the Gaudino legacy and of the movement in Gaudino's own theory and practice over time, are relevant to what follows. For some of the activities either undertaken directly or sponsored by the current Gaudino Scholar have sought to extend the educational principles and practices which Professor Gaudino seemed to have reached just prior to his untimely death.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 75.

¹⁶*Ibid.*

2. Experiential Education

"The educational process, in this view, is restricted neither to the classroom, nor to books, nor even to educational institutions, and certainly not to faculty-student interactions. The emancipatory education helps to define the self, one's loyalties, values and commitments through encounters with the values and commitments of others. . . ." ("Interim Report from the Gaudino Committee" to the Faculty at its Meeting of Dec. 12, 1984)

"This notion of seeing the world through the eyes of someone else is the constant running through Gaudino's pedagogy. His . . . experiments with experiential education carry the notion to its logical conclusion. . . . He wanted 'to go beyond the untouched abstractions and unfelt conceptions of a classroom' . . ." (Daniel D. O'Connor, "The Gaudino Legacy," *Williams Alumni Review* (Winter 1982), p. 13.)

i. Williams-in-Williamstown (Fall 1984)

Several years before he was appointed Gaudino Scholar, Kurt Tauber offered an "experiential" Winter Study course that provided students with internships in a number of social agencies and labor union locals in the Northern Berkshires. Building on that experience, a few students began in early 1984 a systematic canvass of a large number of diverse community agencies in Williamstown, North Adams, and Pittsfield to test their willingness to collaborate with Williams College in an experiment of experiential learning. The response was so encouraging that the then Gaudino Scholar, Raymond Baker, appointed two of the students Gaudino Interns to enable them to continue the project over the summer. Such was the beginning of what was to become the first regular experiential course since

Charles Baer's Williams Urban Studies Program in New York City in the spring of 1977.

Following the Gaudino model (and Baer's program), the course, officially entitled "Public Authority: Williams-in-Williamstown," was designed to extend over two semesters and the Winter Study Period. The first semester was to be devoted to reading, discussions, lectures and paper writing that aimed at providing students with theoretical perspectives on the political economy and social structures of the wider and local communities. During this "academic" phase only roughly four hours a week were to be spent in a student's host agency. Beginning in the WSP period and throughout the entire second semester the proportions of time spent on "academic" study and the internship were to be reversed.

Tauber, who taught the course, conceptualized the integration of the abstract theoretical materials with the concrete perceptions and sensibilities evoked by personal experiences in unfamiliar social environments as a linked triad -- a faint echo of Gaudino's "Line." The course would begin on the highest level of abstraction with critical materials in the political economy of the national and regional environments within which all the social agencies had to operate and survive. In the meantime, while settling into the agency or organization of each student's choice, the intern was to develop with the help of the agency head a bibliography of more specialized readings still relatively abstract, but at a lower level of generality, appropriate to the specialized mission, methods and policies of a particular agency. With this material the students were to make the transition from the familiar and emotionally remote world of

academic analysis to the immediate, sensuous world where one has to confront the unfamiliar, even the threatening or repulsive -- and, in the process, confront oneself. A privately kept journal, group discussions, individual conferences with the instructor and a series of papers were to aid and record each student/intern's intellectual and emotional capacities to deal with sustained assaults on conventionally held opinions, cherished ego-defenses and complacent pieties.

As is so often the case, the theoretical conception, the painstakingly calibrated time-table, the advance preparation of the host agencies, the fine-tuned reading assignments, the carefully selected guest speakers, the synchronized schedule of pertinent documentaries, were one thing on paper, and quite a different thing in the rough reality of practical application. The reasons were many, apart from the fundamental problem the course lacked the unique teaching skills of Robert Gaudino. Despite advance commitment, some of the host agencies proved far less hospitable to the internship notion or capable of handling a (necessarily) inexperienced intern than they had earlier indicated. The students, in turn, experienced far greater difficulty than anticipated in settling on a particular agency. Even three weeks after the term began, some of them were still "shopping around." In some instances, the intellectual capacity or the will of agency personnel proved unequal to the task of helping to develop a significant agency-specific bibliography. While irreconcilable with their leisurely manner in selecting the agency which interested them most, students asserted that their eagerness to do practical work "in the field" made them necessarily impatient

with the traditional academic materials that preponderated in the first few weeks of the course. Also, since few of them came with any background in the political and social sciences, they found the theoretical readings difficult and boring. Moreover, the disparity between the various agencies in which the students interned proved so great that it was difficult to develop a common theme for class discussion. Finally, they found the conceptually neat triadic mediation and integration of abstract objectivity and concrete subjective experience unworkable. As a consequence of these and other weaknesses and problems, it was decided to cancel the second semester. Despite this disappointing outcome, ten of the twelve participants in this course in their final papers (in preparation for which they read Richard Herzog's Memorandum on "Suitable Uses of the Gaudino Fund") insisted that the course had provided them with a significant opportunity to reflect on the nature of genuine education, on themselves and their values and commitments.

ii. Social Service, Social Change

Undaunted by the relative failure of Williams-in-Williamstown, Tauber offered another experiential course in the fall 1985, entitled "Social Service, Social Change: Society, Community and the Individual." As both experiential courses were additions to Tauber's regular courseload, and feeling that this overload may have contributed to the rocky passage of Williams-in-Williamstown, he asked Mark White (one of the two Gaudino Interns who had laid the ground work for the earlier course in the spring and summer of 1984) to join him as a Teaching Associate. Built around internships

in a more selected set of community agencies and organizations, "Social Service, Social Change" was from the start designed to extend only over the first semester and Winter Study. Moreover, the questions it meant to address were somewhat different from those animating the 1984-version. At that time the course considered the kinds of philosophical and political arguments that are relevant to judgments about a range of community issues, such as the treatment of the poor, the elderly and the disabled, the role of the community in making these judgments and the socio-political and economic contexts in which the actual community responses were formulated. The 1985-version again sought to study how Northern Berkshire communities define "social problems" and identify "social needs" but was meant to go on to inquire systematically to what extent and under what circumstances social service organizations, whose initial function is to alleviate the (preventable) suffering incident to the existing social system, can become agencies for social change, highlighting the difference between a social philosophy of "service" and one of "empowerment". As further departure from the earlier course, the 1985 model called for continuous reflection throughout on the question: what are the dynamics of experiential education as you are experiencing them? Other changes that seemed desirable in the light of what Tauber had learned in the fall of 1984 were also introduced. Thus, for instance, there was a far more rigorous schedule of papers than in the previous year and the papers and the course itself were graded "descriptively". Moreover, mindful of earlier difficulties with some of the host agencies or organizations, each student/intern submitted, by the end of September a written

"contract", worked out with the agency head, that spelled out in detail the agency's expectation in terms of time commitment, the nature of the increasingly responsible tasks the intern will be taught and expected to perform, and an agency-related bibliography.

Despite all these safeguards and improvements and Mark White's commendable efforts, the course, again, proved only a qualified success. To be sure, the integration of the students in the host agencies proceeded far more rapidly and, on the whole, more smoothly than in the previous year. This improvement, however, was counter-balanced by the generally less autonomous, more dependent, character of the student/interns. Among the 12 students who had been attracted to Williams-in-Williamstown in the fall 1984 were at least half a dozen with strong personal conviction on and commitment to feminism, gay rights, tenant rights and similar causes. Of the six participants in 1985, none had any settled or strong social or political commitments. This made them far more passive in relation to both the academic portion of the course and its internship/experience component. The former were welcomed because it prevented the kind of resistance the earlier syllabus had evoked, but, by the same token, their compliant affability made their community experience far less telling and productive of serious reflection than had been the case in the previous fall semester. However, ultimately, the relative failure of even the second experiential experiment was due to the same two main factors that had hobbled the first course, one relating to the academic component, the other, to the experiential part.

On the academic side, both courses suffered from the inability to find readings that related closely enough to the kinds of questions the course was to raise and answer, and, thus, the inability of the participants to integrate the often relatively remote texts with their practical experience in the "field." Also, in both courses, the agency-generated bibliographies proved quite incapable of helping to mediate between academic analyses and personal experience.

On the experiential side, both courses revealed the inadequacy of the "estranging" experience which they afforded the students. We have become persuaded that the affective/intellectual effect which Gaudino hypothesized and which many of his students afterwards confirmed as actually having experienced during their Indian or "at Home" "confrontations," can be obtained only through extended immersion in the foreign culture or subculture. The full educational effect cannot be obtained where exposure is superficial, where the experiential course is only one out of four the student is taking, where the student returns to the familiar and comfortable campus after two or three hours in the (foreign) "field."

Given the lesson Tauber drew from these two consecutive programs, built around a model of three tiers of interrelating but quite different approaches to a given reality, and Bob Gaudino's critical accounts of his two far more elaborate and intense experiments in experiential education, any new initiatives in this direction should not proceed before there has been some renewed, disciplined reflection about the educational aims, pedagogical means, institutional settings, special qualities in both instructor and student and the enviroing circumstances that must be present to make

experiential education a powerful instrument for intellectual, moral and emotional growth. One way to sort out some of these matters with relatively little risk is to return to the small-scale pilot-format of Tauber's first experimental foray: an experiential WSP course which at least can compensate for its extreme brevity by the possibility of undistracted immersion. But such a WSP offering should differ from others in two crucial respects. One would be that the course be conceived and taught by an alumnus of either of Gaudino's two programs who could be expected to build on his own first-hand experience and -- in following Richard Herzog's suggestion in his "Memo" of 1981 (p. 46) -- on his critical consideration of Gaudino's August 1972 report, "Williams-at-Home: A Preliminary Reckoning" and his *Indian University*. Another difference would be the organization -- coincident with the WSP course -- of a weekend of discussion that would bring together other relevant Gaudino "veterans," Charles Baer and at least one of his New York City Program alumni, as well as Mark White and some thoughtful student/interns of the 1984 and 1985 experiments. Persons thoroughly conversant with successful experiential courses in other institutions of higher learning should also be invited.

3. "Strange Encounters" Internships

"It is the encounter with things outside of and antagonistic to one's life and values that help one discover one's place and identity, one's loyalties and home." (R.L. Gaudino, "Williams-at-Home: A Preliminary Reckoning," August 1972, pp. 28-29)

". . . there is no education without intellectual and emotional change; one vital kind of change occurs

when a student openly encounters what is at first foreign . . ." (Program Statement of the R.L. Gaudino Memorial Fund, 1982)

It is one of the Gaudino Scholar's responsibilities to facilitate intellectually, aesthetically and emotionally significant student efforts to gain self-knowledge through meaningful encounters with "people and situations that the student does not ordinarily meet at home or in college."¹⁷ Over the past three years, five students have been enabled through Gaudino Memorial Fund support to do internships during WSP, during the Spring vacation or, in the most recent case, during the summer. In January 1985 two students worked in Botswana and one in China, in March/April 1987, one student produced a remarkably sensitive film in the course of following Buñuel's footsteps through the Spain of its forgotten people. During this summer, the Fund made possible a student's organizing a free hot lunch program for indigents in North Adams. In every instance, the written or cinematic record of the experience testified to its significance for the student's development.

4. Film Presentations/Discussions

" . . . another kind [of change] occurs when the familiar is made foreign by seeing it in a new light."
(Program Statement of the R.L. Gaudino Memorial Fund)

Good documentaries can be powerful media through which the familiar can be estranged and somnolescent minds and complacent

¹⁷R.L. Gaudino, "Williams-at-Home: A Preliminary Reckoning," cited in Jeff Thaler *et al.*, "Williams-at-Home," *Williams Alumni Review*, Fall 1972, p. 19.

hearts can be shaken awake, especially if the presentations are immediately followed by audience discussion. That was the format followed by the Gaudino Scholar as he presented monthly documentaries throughout 1985. The cinematic and substantive qualities of the documentaries varied between notable and superb and Tauber made every effort to provide them with publicity to match their intrinsic campus-wide importance. Despite all this, the results were disappointingly mixed.

The very first showing was also to prove the far and away most successful one. To commemorate Dr. Martin Luther King a year before January 15 became a national memorial day, Tauber (with financial support of President Chandler) brought to the campus the extraordinary, six hour long slide-show (with commentary) "American Pictures" by the young Danish film maker Jakob Holdt. That experience was so searing, the visual impressions at times so painful, that some members of the large audience simply could not return for Part II, after the lunch break. And yet, even when the six hours of film were followed by two hours of intense workshops on racism in the United States, there were still some sixty or seventy students in the various workshops.

Buoyed by such unexpected willingness on the part of so many students to engage in serious intellectual/emotional confrontations, the Gaudino Scholar followed up, over the next several months, with a series of five documentaries by Fred Wiseman, Class of '51, and arguably the foremost documentary film maker in the United States. The results were disastrous. The films, which were presented in the Bronfman Auditorium, could have been screened in a broom closet!

At no time were more than 22 or 23 people in attendance, most often between a dozen and 15! The discussions were desultory, lacking insight and emotional investment. In one or two instances Tauber even cancelled them so as to cut short the agony and embarrassment. It occurred to him how right Gaudino was who "loathed the complacent as fundamentally incompatible with thought."¹⁸

To demonstrate how even the seemingly most familiar environment can appear strange and even mildly threatening when looked at from a different perspective, the Gaudino Scholar, in the fall of 1985, organized a discussion around a documentary entitled "Labor Relations in the Northern Berkshires." Wisely shown at the Log rather than the Bronfman Auditorium, the well-done documentary attracted some two dozen students whose self-ironic comments regarding their blindness to what was happening under their very noses suggested that the film had struck home.

With the exception of "American Pictures," the results of fanning serious debate, confrontation and self-clarification through documentaries were so poor and so disproportionate to the effort required to present them, that Tauber decided that his energies could be more productively employed in other ways. He presented no further films in 1986 and 1987.

5. Educational Experiments

"By encouraging Williams students and faculty to explore new paths of understanding not available in the curricular offerings, the Fund will be used

¹⁸K.P. Tauber, "Memorial Minutes for Robert L. Gaudino," Faculty Meeting, December 18, 1974.

primarily to foster curricular innovation."
(Program Statement of the Robert L. Gaudino
Memorial Fund)

i. Gaudino Roundtables

The idea came from students and for three semesters (in spring 1985 and 1985/1986) a senior and a sophomore did virtually all the organizational work to make the Roundtables happen, roughly once a month. They involved a dinner/discussion in one of the special dining rooms (at Greylock or at Dodd) that brought together some 15-18 students who had previously signed up on a "first come, first served" basis, the Gaudino Scholar and a faculty member, appreciated for his or her provocative ideas. Around dessert time the faculty guest made a 15-minute presentation, designed to evoke maximum response. The topics, which were carefully chosen and announced on the sign-up sheet, were always such that they could be meaningfully debated without great disciplinary specialist knowledge. Indeed, the charge to the invited faculty discussion-initiator was to raise questions important to him/her as an intellectual and moral actor, not as an academic specialist. There was no formal time limit on the freely flowing discussions, although the students' and the faculty facilitator's academic commitments usually ordained a 9 p.m. conclusion.

In 1986/1987, Tauber was unable to find volunteers who were willing to do the necessary organizational leg-work and thus no Roundtables took place.

ii. St. Lawrence University Conferences

In the course of the Gaudino Committee's deliberations over ways to provide a more vibrant intellectual milieu, especially for freshmen, the Gaudino Scholar made contact with a number of colleges and universities which struggled with the same problem. Among these, St. Lawrence University stood out for the vigor and scope of its efforts in this regard, the thoughtfulness of its innovations and their apparent success. Consequently, in March 1985, he invited a delegation of faculty and administrators from St. Lawrence to come to the Williams campus for a two-day conference. The five-man St. Lawrence contingent, as well as the members of the Gaudino Committee, the CUL chairman and the Deans who participated in one or another of the proceedings, agreed that the exchange of experiences, views and educational philosophy proved most helpful.

Half a year later, the CUL chairman, Professor William Darrow, Edward Stein '87, an outstanding member of the Gaudino Committee, and the Gaudino Scholar were invited to a very elaborate conference at St. Lawrence University. The meeting involved a large number of participants from many colleges and universities, and dealt in particular with St. Lawrence's ambitious "Freshmen College" system. Apart from the opportunity to renew very pleasant personal acquaintances, the conference provided a gold-mine of stimulating ideas and the encouragement to push ahead with our proposal for Freshmen Residential Seminars.

In the following year, Tauber was asked to return to St. Lawrence University to act as an outside reviewer of the Freshmen

Colleges. Again, he was impressed by the seriousness of commitment among administrators, faculty and student leaders to use innovative curricular ideas and institutions to stimulate among a preponderantly career-oriented, fraternity-organized, student-body a sense of intellectual excitement and concern.

iii. The Gaudino Project for Student Leadership and Non-violent Alternatives

Some five years ago a group of students approached Tauber, the then chairman of the Political Science Department, with a request for assistance. In selecting courses relevant to their intellectual and moral development, the students had been struck by the plethora of offerings on warfare, nuclear policies and war fighting strategies, and the total absence of any course on the theory and practice of *non-violent* sanctions in conflict and defence. The students now proposed to initiate and run such a course on their own.

Incessantly on the look-out for precisely this kind of student initiative, intellectual commitment and educational autonomy, Tauber enthusiastically agreed to be of help. The result was a full-credit, exclusively student-run (though faculty-supervised and faculty-graded) course entitled "Non-violence and Social Change." It has continued, with growing enrollments ever since. Indeed, in 1985 an advanced course and a WSP course were added and the introductory course began to be offered in several sections.

This brief detour into "ancient history" was necessary, for three of the students who had been continually involved with the non-violence course since its inception and more recently were entirely

responsible for its development, submitted in the spring 1986 a new proposal to the Gaudino Scholar. (In the meantime one of the original founders of the course, David Yuskulka, had graduated in the class of '84 and the two others, Jacqueline Lanzarone and Dominic Kulik, were about to graduate in June 1986.)

The three now proposed a year-long tour (on bicycles!) of colleges and universities throughout the United States to both teach and learn more about the pedagogy of student-student education, peace studies and non-violent alternatives. Well-supplied with materials and experience from their four and five year involvement in the exemplary student-initiated courses at Williams, they planned to give lectures, demonstrations, workshops and seminars on educational autonomy and non-violent alternatives to war as well as to gather relevant information on experimental and innovative pedagogical models wherever they would find them. The Gaudino Scholar, aware not only of the depth of their commitment to the kind of educational ideals that constitute the Gaudino legacy, but also of their extraordinary resourcefulness and perseverance, was fully persuaded that this remarkable initiative deserved Gaudino Fund support. He appointed Yaskulka, Lanzarone and Kulik as Interns, provided a stipend that covered the start-up costs, and assumed sponsorship and financial supervision of the project. His request to the Trustees for additional funds through Gaudino Trustee contributions was turned down.

Still, "The Gaudino Project for Student Leadership and Non-violent Alternatives" was born and its original scope was expanded to include plans for the return of the Interns to the campus in mid-

October 1987. The planned events aim to provide the Interns with ample opportunity to present to the Williams community their thinking and findings on a coherent pedagogy of student-student education and on the intellectual, educational and practical substance of theories and practices of non-violent sanctions in conflict and defense. Apart from open forums and workshops with interested students, the Interns will be meeting with the Gaudino Committee, the Advisory Committee of the newly created "Interdepartmental Program for Experimental and Cross-Disciplinary Studies" and the Committee on Educational Policy to help us consider the desirability and feasibility of expanding at Williams the scope of student autonomy in the educational area and of introducing a coordinate, experimental program of "peace studies."

The Gaudino Scholar's confidence in the Interns' resourcefulness and stunning "savvy" was not misplaced. On the contrary: their performance exceeded his most sanguine expectations. Having achieved tax exempt status for the "Gaudino Project," the Interns developed an elaborate and impressive proposal for foundation support that quickly netted them a grant of \$12,000 from the New Land Foundation. (More recently, the Ploughshares Foundation came through with a "pilot" grant.) By August 1987 they had travelled (on bicycles) through 30 states, led over 40 workshops for students at 20 colleges and universities and gave dozens of briefings for community activists. Equally important, they had managed to develop an extraordinary "outreach" and "networking" capacity that put them in contact with virtually every important institute and program in the areas of experimental education,

student leadership and "world and peace studies," including the National Curriculum Resources Project of the Five College Peace and World Security Studies Program at Amherst and the Program on Nonviolent Sanctions and Defense in the Center for International Affairs at Harvard.

In short, The Gaudino Project, through the tireless efforts of David Yaskulka and Dom Kulik, has accumulated remarkable assets in the form of insights, know-how, educational and bibliographic resources and institutional contacts that should prove valuable for exploring new paths of learning and teaching at Williams College.

iv. WSP 1988: "Pedagogy for Empowerment"

Separate from but temporally following the Gaudino Interns' activities on the campus late this fall, the Gaudino Scholar is sponsoring a WSP course to be given by Mssrs. Kulik and Yaskulka in January 1988. Entitled "Pedagogy for Empowerment: Leadership, Citizenship and Non-violent Alternatives," the course will examine the role of a Liberal Arts education in preparing and empowering individuals to become citizens and political actors in a democratic society.

The syllabus of readings and discussions is divided into three sections. The first provides for the critical exploration of the students' personal histories and educational experiences in the existing educational and political systems. The second part presents case studies of and practice sessions with various innovative forms of pedagogy that address the theoretical problems, personal interests and intellectual needs that were articulated in the the course's

opening segment. The third section is devoted to studying "education as empowerment" through an examination of three broad and overlapping areas: student activism, the peace-studies movement and the development of non-violent action.

It is clear that this course not only reflects the expertise of Yaskulka and Kulik but also important elements of Gaudino's notions of education and that it, therefore, may also include important clues for the near-future work of the Gaudino Scholar, Gaudino Committee and those charged with the development of the "Interdepartmental Program of Experimental and Cross-Disciplinary Studies."

6. Conclusion

Obviously the title of this section is misleading: an account of some recent and continuing efforts to improve the quality of education at Williams cannot be concluded in any literal sense. Nor can we draw conclusive inferences or conclusions from it. Where the initiatives or efforts have been successful, they merely point to the possibility of even greater achievements, and where they failed, their failure points to the need for better educational theory and practice. In neither case does a "conclusion" imply a stopping place.

To be sure, the struggle for a genuinely liberal, i.e. liberating, education has become uncommonly difficult under the socio-political and cultural conditions that dominate currently in the United States. One need not take seriously Allan Bloom's shrill jeremiad on the failures of contemporary higher education to admit that his observations on the motivations, outlooks, expectations of today's

college students are both acute and largely correct. If it is true that "there is no education without intellectual and emotional change" and that "there is no education without passion," then it is true that it is far more difficult to educate today than it was fifteen or twenty years ago and that today fewer students leave Williams with a liberal education than before. The irony of the present situation is that it represents a reversal of that which obtained in the 60's and early 70's. Then it was the students who had an intuitive sense of what genuine education could be (*pace* Allan Bloom!) and it was the professoriat that clung to its vested power position and veiled political function by pretending to constitute a virginal community of truth seekers (the same self-serving myth that still grounds and animates Allan Bloom's denunciations). Today, by contrast, it is the group of professors in their thirties that is far more sensitive to what the intellectual and moral development of an adolescent and young adult requires and it is the students who, on the whole, show little concern for that development in their eagerness to immerse themselves in the acquisitive free-for-all of the privileged orders.

Thus, while the task of the educator is more difficult today, the human resources available for its accomplishment appear to be more plentiful. Especially at Williams, where experimentation and innovation have traditionally been more suspect than welcomed, one senses a greater openness to new suggestions -- a sense importantly conveyed by the new President. This bodes well for maintaining and enlarging the impact of the Gaudino legacy now and in the near future.

APPENDICESAppendix A

Members of the Gaudino Committee

1984-85

Brian Levy, Economics (Second Semester)

Meredith Hoppin, Classics

David L. Smith, English

Kurt Tauber, Political Science (chair)

Chris Fleming '85

Sara Gross '85

Devonya Havis '87

Larry Krasnoff '85

Brett McDonnell '85

Betsy Paine '85

Cathryn Phipps '86 (First Semester)

Edward Stein '87

Michael E. Weber '87

1985-86

Brian Levy, Economics

Meredith Hoppin, Classics

David L. Smith, English

Kurt Tauber, Political Science (chair)

Ann Bechan '87

Michael Dawson '88 (First Semester)

Nadra Franklin '86

Elaine Freedman '87 (First Semester)

Christopher R. Myers '88

Melissa Perkins '86

Christina Saylor '86

Edward Stein '87

Michael E. Weber '87

1986-87

- Kurt Tauber, Political Science (chair)
- Bill Wootters, Physics
- Kenneth April '88
- Rebecca Buchanan '90
- Sarah Lawton '87
- Robert "Joe" Osterman '89
- Dawn Powers '89
- Tom Roche '89
- Helen Rozwadowski '87
- Jocelyn Shadforth '88
- Edward Stein '87
- Eric Vincent '89 (Second Semester)