

20 hours in the sixth semester! The student who achieves 40 credits and 40 quality points by the end of his sophomore year is virtually guaranteed continuance in college for his entire junior year. If he achieves 20 and 20 during the junior year for a total of 60 credits and 60 quality points for six semesters, he is similarly guaranteed a senior year. The problem is worse with seniors because the totals necessary for continuance after the eighth semester, when a student should ordinarily be graduating, are only 80 credits and 80 quality points-- only two-thirds of the total necessary for graduation.

All of this suggests a fourth inadequacy of the present rules. They permit the accumulation of a large deficit in credits and quality points which carries over into ninth and tenth semesters, a deficit difficult to make up in one or two semesters by a person who has not been able to maintain even an average rate of progress up to that point. The deficient student in the ninth and tenth semesters naturally shops around for easy courses in order to make up his deficit, because time runs out with the tenth semester. Often he enrolls in freshman-sophomore elective courses in desperate pursuit of quality points.

Still another difficulty with the requirements is that there is no definition of performance levels required of students re-admitted after a period of suspension for academic deficiencies. This problem overlaps with problems of admission: is it better to re-admit a failure or take a chance on a new student? We seem to prefer the former perhaps out of kindness. But when we re-admit a failure, what do we require him to do? Though not explicitly stated, the academic status committee usually requires that he make a C average for the first semester after his return, but the committee does not try to exercise any control over his course selections. Why not? Why shouldn't it prescribe or at least approve the re-admitted student's course of study? It should do so, though it does not.

The standards suffer also from the general drawback that the definition of an "academic" course is so broad as to include certain courses that are clearly non-academic.

To be eligible for intercollegiate and similar extracurricular activities, a student must have passed 24 semester credits during the previous year; no quality points are specified.

#### Recommendations

Normal progress toward a degree should be defined as 15 credits and 15 quality points in academic subjects (along with one credit in required physical education for each of the four first semesters) for each semester of college work. Any rate of progress below this normal rate is unsatisfactory, and the student should be told so. He should also be allowed some clear margin of deficit when he lags behind. The absolute limits of the margin should be clearly stated. A reasonable schedule is set forth herewith:

### Proposed Minimal Requirements for Continuation in College, Constituting Reasonable Progress Toward a Degree

<u>Semester</u>	<u>Semester Requirements in Academic Courses</u>		<u>Cumulative Record</u>	
	<u>Hours Passed</u>	<u>QP</u>	<u>Hours Passed</u>	<u>QP</u>
1	7	4	7	4
2	11	9	18	13
3	12	12	30	25
4	15	15	45	40
5	15	15	60	55
6	15	15	75	70
7	15	15	90	85
8	15	15	105	100
9	15	15	120	115
10	5	5	125	120

With this schedule it would be virtually impossible for a student to be enrolled for ten semesters and still fail to receive a degree because of a deficiency in over-all totals of credits or quality points.

The present rule that a student must achieve an over-all quality-point average of 1.0 for all courses for which an official grade is received in his field of concentration should be retained. A new and similar requirement for the distribution courses should be added. Admittedly the schedule outlined above requires by the end of the fifth semester a total of only 60 credits and 55 quality points, most of which would be in distribution courses, and therefore, if the 60 credits and 55 quality points were all in distribution courses, the schedule would be slightly easier than the over-all rule. This slight discrepancy is statistical, small, and probably of no great consequence.

The requirement of 20 credits and 20 quality points per session for upperclassmen should be replaced by a semester-by-semester requirement.

The term "academic courses" should be re-defined so as to exclude certain courses now included under the term. The courses so excluded should be determined by the vote of the faculty, after intensive study and recommendations by the curriculum committee. A tentative list of some of the courses to be considered for exclusion from academic courses would contain (a) all required physical education courses; (b) all secretarial science courses; (c) Education 305: Materials and Methods in the Elementary School; (d) Education 321: Children's Literature; (e) all home economics courses; (f) basic courses in military science; and (g) Speech 102: Voice and Diction. Such courses might carry credit and would appear on the transcript with the grade assigned,

but would not be taken into account in determining continuance in college or fulfillment of degree requirements.

The academic status committee should report its actions annually to the faculty in sufficient detail that the faculty can feel informed of its operation.

Some procedure of automatic review of the course selections of each student should be undertaken immediately after each registration. Those programs which fail grossly to meet the requirement of a coherent program should be rejected (by a committee such as the degrees committee). This automatic review should be especially painstaking in the case of a student who is re-admitted after a period of suspension for academic reasons.

#### Size of Class and Instructor/Student Ratios

A student enrollment is excessive not only if it strains general educational facilities such as the library but also if it results in too many students meeting in particular classes. The class-size and faculty-student ratio is probably more important than the total enrollment. The optimum size of a class depends of course upon the nature of the instructional activity which goes on in it. For this reason the proper assessment of faculty-student ratio or average class-size should not depend upon general all-college or even all-department figures but must be based upon consideration of each type of class. A study of class-size at the College is another project for an office of educational research, for the problem is a complex one.

### 3. The Academic Calendar and Schedule

#### Relations between Regular and Summer Sessions

For many years the academic program of William and Mary has been organized on the basis of two semesters in the "regular academic session" (September to June) plus a summer session (June to August). The regular session is administered by the dean of the faculty and the summer session by its own director. Aside from this administrative difference, there is no important formal distinction between the summer session and a regular semester. Most teachers in the summer session are members of the regular faculty and except for "workshops" and "institutes" the courses offered in the summer are the same courses and carry the same credits as those in the regular semesters. The same general academic requirements and standards apply and are administered by the same officers such as the student deans and the same faculty committees such as those on curriculum, degrees, and academic status. However, the director of the summer session arranges special contracts with the teachers, determines the courses to be offered, supervises the internal details of the summer session, and prepares a summer session bulletin separate from the regular college catalogue. Departmental chairmen assist him in selecting faculty and courses.

#### Calendar and Schedule of the Regular Session

The two regular semesters are planned to allow 45 class meetings in normal 3-hour courses, which meet on Monday-Wednesday-Friday or Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday schedules. The total length of a semester includes holidays and the reading and final examination periods. Semesters are usually planned so that classes end on a Thursday; Friday and the weekend constitute a reading period; and final examinations occupy most if not all of the next two weeks. In the first or fall semester Thanksgiving and Christmas pose difficult problems. Several years ago a one-day holiday at Thanksgiving was tried in order to minimize the effect of a break just before Christmas, but this proved unpopular with students and most faculty and even fairly stringent attendance regulations failed to keep down absences. Now the Thanksgiving holiday is Thursday through Sunday. Christmas vacation, which usually begins and ends to include weekends, leaves less than two full weeks available for classes before the reading and examination period. In the second or spring semester, the only major vacation, usually eight days, is scheduled if possible to include the Easter holidays. The class schedule is interrupted by Homecoming Day (a college holiday), and by three regularly scheduled convocations during the year, with the result that some classes fall short of the intended 45 meetings per semester. Athletic and social events are scheduled in relation to the academic calendar but some conflict inevitably results.

Within the weekly schedule, there has been a growing tendency to hold class meetings twice weekly for hour and a half periods or even once for three hours. In 1962, this practice became so popular that it was necessary for the dean of the faculty to restrict such scheduling to the afternoon and evening hours, since too many conflicts for rooms and for students' time developed between classes scheduled on the twice-a-week and three-times-a-week patterns. Most of the bi-weekly classes were scheduled on Tuesdays and Thursdays, although other combinations of days were also used. Proponents of the abnormal scheduling argued that longer class periods are educationally beneficial, especially in seminar courses; granting that this view may have substance, other members of the faculty suspected that the desire to avoid Saturday classes was perhaps also a motive. A committee set up to study the matter explored several possibilities, including the idea of scheduling two meetings per week on Monday-Thursday and Tuesday-Friday combinations to provide more even spacing between class meetings, but concluded that co-existing bi-weekly and tri-weekly patterns were unworkable unless the bi-weekly classes were confined to the afternoon and evening hours.

Several years ago another committee explored the possibility of shifting from the present calendar and schedule to something like the three-term three-course system at Dartmouth. The committee saw much merit in this plan, both from the point of view of the calendar and schedule and in its concentration of the student's course load. The plan combines many virtues of the semester and quarter systems while avoiding some of the faults of both. Each term would be unbroken by long vacations. In each term, a student could accomplish the equivalent of three

semester courses or, in an academic year, the equivalent of nine; thus, in four years, he would complete only four fewer courses than he does under our present system and this difference would be compensated for by the greater intensity of each individual course, by independent reading, or by minor overloads in some terms. Reluctantly, however, the committee which studied this plan came to the conclusion that limitations in library facilities and in science laboratories would make its adoption impossible at William and Mary until these inadequacies were corrected.

#### Calendar and Schedule of the Summer Session

The summer session includes a six-week session and a three-week post-session. The six-week session begins a week from the Monday following commencement. Classes meet for one and one-half hours on five days per week, including July 4. In the post-session, classes meet for three hours on five days per week. Students are limited to six semester hours in the six-week session and to three in the post-session. Semester courses in law and biology are offered only on a nine-week basis. Some continuous courses in mathematics and the introductory courses in chemistry and physics are given sequentially in nine weeks to permit students to take both semesters in order.

The post-session was instituted in the 1950's to accommodate school teachers who wanted courses in education or academic subjects but would have to return to their schools before a second six-weeks session could be completed. Many members of the faculty believe that it is impossible to compress semester courses into so short a period, especially under summer conditions, without vitiating their academic quality. Despite the director's pleas for more advanced courses in this session, most departments have refused to offer them or have offered them reluctantly and with misgivings.

Enrollment in the summer session nearly tripled from 1956 to 1962, rising from 511 to 1405 students. The proportions of men and women have remained constant at approximately half and half. The proportion of Virginia residents has also remained constant in the range 77% to 80%. But over the last three years the proportion of teachers has decreased while the number of William and Mary students has increased. In 1962, students enrolled full-time or part-time in the regular session accounted for 59% of the summer session enrollment and teachers (mostly from Virginia) accounted for 38%. Most of the summer enrollment is in the six-week session.

#### Recommendations

Whatever justification may have existed in the past for the administrative independence of the summer session exists no longer. The summer session should be placed under the dean of the faculty, by making its director responsible to him rather than to the President. There is much reason in favor of this integration of the whole academic program on the campus under a single responsible administrative officer. This recommendation does not necessarily entail any other major change.

As a separate matter, however, salaries for summer teaching should be made commensurate with those paid in the regular session. Contracts should not be contingent upon the materialization of expected enrollment, as they are now. If salaries were proportionate and guaranteed, there would be more interest in summer teaching on the part of members of the regular faculty and it would be easier to attract capable instructors from other institutions who would bring to the College a welcome variety of new ideas and experiences. An increase in tuition would be necessary to accomplish these objectives.

If the summer session is integrated into the regular academic program, the College should hold out firmly against the proposals that will inevitably be made to adopt a trimester system. A trimester system is certainly not the only way and it probably is not the best way for a college to operate on a year-round basis. Neither is the quarter system. If and when the necessary library, laboratory, and classroom facilities are made available, we think that something like the Dartmouth plan may prove to be the best arrangement for William and Mary. It would be flexible, for a student could either attend college from September to June, accomplishing in three terms what he now does in two semesters, or he could accelerate by attending one or more similar terms in the summer.

Our summer session should be reorganized now, however, to eliminate the three-week post-session. This capsulized term is educationally indefensible except perhaps for the purpose of intensive foreign language training. The summer session should run for a total of nine weeks, with regular courses scheduled for six or nine weeks as may be appropriate to the nature of the course. The nine-week schedule would make it possible to offer advanced courses without compromising their academic quality.

In our present semester schedule the times allotted for the "reading period" and final examinations need reconsideration. The "reading period" is at most three days and can in fact be little more than a "cramming period." That students protest vociferously when this period sometimes has to be cut short by a day points to something wrong in the kind of examinations we give or at least the students expect. The sub-committee of the present self-study dealing with this matter flatly recommended that there be no formal examination period; that final examinations be given within the regular class time; that final examinations were unnecessary in some courses, "for example, where a series of short quizzes and exercises has been given or where great stress is placed on a term paper"; and finally, that the reading period "should be used for additional reading, rather than for last-minute cramming." While we cannot endorse these recommendations, we do think the fact they could seriously be made indicates that the faculty is not unanimously satisfied with the traditional conception of the nature and importance of final examinations. This problem is one about which the faculty has been vaguely uneasy for a good many years; it is time the problem is faced and if possible solved. Perhaps general comprehensive examinations are a solution.

#### 4. The Undergraduate Curriculum

This section of the self-study report begins with an expository description of the present undergraduate curriculum and the procedures whereby curricular changes are brought about. It then proceeds to an evaluation of the curriculum, as a whole and in its various parts. This evaluation is the work of a special committee of the self-study for the area of educational program, which consisted of the regular curriculum committee of the faculty augmented by additional faculty and student members. As befits the topic, the report of this special committee is discursive and exploratory, ranging over the whole field of the educational program, raising many questions, suggesting various solutions to a variety of problems, and making a number of specific recommendations. The committee did not, and could not, propose a detailed new curriculum for the College, nor can the steering committee do so. That is a matter for decision by the whole faculty and the administration in the normal course of study and deliberation. Nevertheless, the report of the special committee provides a rich and broad basis for such a decision and it is therefore incorporated here substantially as submitted. The steering committee itself concludes this section of the report by outlining what are in its judgment the major steps which the College should take to revise its curriculum in such a way as to fit and implement its educational purpose and aims.

##### Description of the Present Curriculum

The present undergraduate curriculum leading to the degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science was established by the faculty in 1935. Its general framework has remained unchanged, although it has been modified in details. A degree program consists of 120 semester hours of academic work plus 4 hours in required physical education. Approximately half the academic work is in distribution or "general education" courses. A concentration in an approved field of study makes up from about one-fourth to one-third the total hours and may include some distribution credits. Elective courses account for the remainder. Courses normally carry 3 hours credit per semester; however, beginning courses in sciences carry 5 credits, beginning courses in languages 4, and certain other courses from 1 to 4 credits.

Distribution courses, except in foreign languages and mathematics, are particular specified courses intended to be broad introductions to a field of knowledge. The distribution requirements for both baccalaureate degrees are essentially the same except that those for the Bachelor of Science are more restrictive at several points. The requirements for the Bachelor of Arts demand 6 credits in English language and composition; 6 in a survey of English literature, a fine arts survey, or "humanities" (selected examples of world literature, in English); from 6 to 14 credits, depending upon preparation at entrance, in ancient or modern foreign language; 6 in mathematics or history of philosophy; 10 in biology, chemistry, geology, or physics; and 12 in principles of economics, introduction to government, European history, or general sociology (any two). Requirements for the Bachelor of Science specify

the survey of English literature, French, German, or Russian as the foreign language, and mathematics; they also call for a second course in a different science.

Concentration requirements vary from 30 to 42 semester hours, including distribution credits in the field. For the Bachelor of Arts, the approved concentrations are ancient languages, business administration, economics, education, English language and literature, fine arts, geology, government, history, mathematics, modern languages (French, German, Spanish), music, philosophy, physical education for men, psychology, sociology and anthropology, and theater and speech. For the degree of Bachelor of Science, the concentrations are biology, chemistry, geology, mathematics, physical education for men, physics, and psychology. Thus either degree may be earned through a concentration in geology, mathematics, physical education for men, or psychology. Only the Bachelor of Science is awarded for concentrations in biology, chemistry, and physics.

Requirements for concentration are stated in the catalogue. Departments differ in the ways they state their specific requirements. Some include as concentration and others exclude beginning courses in the subject. Some require, others permit, and still others do not allow courses in other departments as part of the concentration. Some specify particular courses or courses at particular levels, others only the total hours. Some (particularly business administration and education) make very general statements but then lay out several very precise programs of courses for students to follow. For these reasons, the only valid generalization is that a concentration may not exceed 42 hours in the field; but even this statement has an exception in that students in business administration preparing for the CPA examinations must exceed the limitation by one hour.

In addition to the twenty-two departmental concentrations, there are five special pre-professional concentrations. There is a pre-medical course, including four specific programs, which leads to the B.S. degree after either four years at the College or three years plus graduation from an accredited medical school. There is a concentration in pre-engineering on a combined plan formerly in association with Massachusetts Institute of Technology and now with Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and the Schools of Engineering of Columbia and Johns Hopkins Universities; after three years at the College and completion of a two-year engineering program, the student receives the B.S. from William and Mary. There is a similar pre-law combined course whereby students of this or any approved college may be awarded the B.A. after three years plus completion of the first year's work in the Marshall-Wythe School of Law. There is a combined plan for students of forestry, whereby after three years at William and Mary and the first year of a two-year program at Duke University the student may receive the B.S. from this College. Finally, the College offers a concentration in the teaching of science known as the Topical Major in Science, which requires 18 hours in each of two sciences.

The numbers of men and women who have graduated in these departmental

GRADUATING SENIORS BY FIELDS OF CONCENTRATION, 1956-63

	<u>56-57</u>	<u>57-58</u>	<u>58-59</u>	<u>59-60</u>	<u>60-61</u>	<u>61-62</u>	<u>62-63</u>
Ancient Languages							
Men	3	1	2	1	2	0	2
Women	0	0	1	1	4	4	3
Biology							
Men	5	5	10	7	9	4	17
Women	5	5	8	8	6	9	10
Business Administration							
Men	36	31	29	21	23	29	33
Women	2	3	2	9	10	5	6
Chemistry							
Men	11	8	5	7	11	12	15
Women	4	5	1	6	2	2	7
Economics							
Men	21	33	49	34	35	40	48
Women	2	4	0	8	1	2	8
Education							
Men	1	6	1	2	5	5	3
Women	43	42	50	46	41	42	61
English							
Men	15	7	11	6	10	13	11
Women	21	21	18	32	41	38	33
Fine Arts							
Men	1	18	5	7	7	10	14
Women	4	22	17	11	4	15	24
Government							
Men	18	13	18	18	14	25	17
Women	10	10	20	5	10	18	20
History							
Men	6	11	14	13	16	24	17
Women	14	15	18	17	16	16	23
Mathematics							
Men	7	10	15	5	5	18	9
Women	8	11	3	15	14	10	13
French							
Men	0	2	0	0	1	4	1
Women	4	4	7	7	10	8	13
German							
Men	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Women	0	0	0	0	0	4	5
Spanish							
Men	2	1	3	1	1	5	6
Women	1	2	7	2	2	2	5
Music							
Men	0	5	2	1	1	0	1
Women	2	5	2	2	1	3	3

GRADUATING SENIORS BY FIELDS OF CONCENTRATION, 1956-63

Continued

	<u>56-57</u>	<u>57-58</u>	<u>58-59</u>	<u>59-60</u>	<u>60-61</u>	<u>61-62</u>	<u>62-63</u>
Philosophy							
Men	1	8	2	4	7	6	11
Women	4	1	1	2	2	1	7
Physical Education							
Men	9	7	9	8	15	11	11
Physics							
Men	6	6	11	9	6	11	11
Women	2	0	0	0	1	0	0
Psychology							
Men	12	10	5	4	4	9	13
Women	6	7	5	5	10	13	12
Sociology							
Men	0	4	3	2	3	9	11
Women	9	11	9	11	5	13	8
<u>Special Programs</u>							
Pre-engineering							
Men	0	0	1	3	1	0	4
Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pre-forestry							
Men	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pre-law							
Men	11	5	2	8	2	6	1
Women	2	0	0	2	1	0	0
Topical Science							
Men	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Women	0	0	0	0	1	3	0
Total Undergraduate Degrees Conferred							
Men	170	188	218	184	185	253	282
Women	<u>143</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>169</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>190</u>	<u>212</u>	<u>262</u>
	313	351	387	374	375	465	544



HONORS CANDIDATES AND AWARDS, 1959-1963

	<u>1959</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1961</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>
Ancient Languages					
No Award		.1			
Honors		.1			.1
High Honors		.1			
Economics					.2
No Award		.1		.1	.1
Honors		.2			.1
High Honors					
English					.1
No Award		.1	.1	.2	.1
Honors		.5	.2	.2	.1
High Honors			.1		.2
Government					.1
Honors			.3	.2	.1
High Honors	.3			.2	
Highest Honors		.1			
History					.2
No Award		.3	.2		.2
Honors		.3	.2	.2	
High Honors	.2		.1	.2	
Highest Honors	.1				
Philosophy					.3
No Award				.1	.1
Honors			.1	.1	.1
High Honors				.2	
Highest Honors					
Physics					.1
High Honors					
Psychology					.1
No Award	.1		.1		.3
Honors		.1	.2	.2	
High Honors	.2	.1			
Sociology					.3
No Award				.3	.4
Honors				.1	.1
High Honors					

and pre-professional concentrations over the past seven fiscal years are shown in the accompanying table.

Independent honors work for seniors is offered by the departments of ancient languages, economics, English, government, history, philosophy, physics, psychology, and sociology and anthropology. Students may as juniors declare their intention to take honors work, but the formal program occupies the senior year. It consists of a course of reading and research supervised by a faculty member of the department, the presentation of an essay or project, and a comprehensive examination in the field of the student's major interest. Essays or projects and examinations are judged by a committee of not fewer than three members, including at least one from the major department and one from another department. The honors course carries 6 credits. To enter the honors program a student must have a quality point average of at least 2.0. A student who successfully completes the program is awarded the baccalaureate degree with "Honors," "High Honors," or "Highest Honors" as his examining committee may determine. The number of candidates and the number of awards in each category in the various departments since the honors program began in 1959 are shown in the accompanying table.

Responsibility for Changes in Curriculum

Both the by-laws of the faculty dating from 1938 and new ones approved by the Board of Visitors in 1963 recognize the responsibility of the faculty to concern itself with the educational functions of the College, to make recommendations relating thereto, and specifically to determine the academic requirements for earned degrees. The faculty exercises this responsibility through its elected curriculum committee of nine (formerly seven) members. The dean of the faculty (who is not a member of the committee but works closely with it) approves minor changes in course numbers and titles and additions and deletions of courses when no issue of fundamental policy is involved. Since it is not always clear when this condition obtains, the dean refers doubtful cases to the chairman of the curriculum committee. The chairman may refer them to the whole committee, which in turn may take the issue to the faculty. Each year most changes are unquestioned, a few are debated and resolved within the committee, and one or two may be taken to the faculty. All changes, however made, are reported to the faculty in detail and in writing at its final meeting in May so that anyone who wishes may raise a question. Whenever a major change is proposed to the curriculum committee it is studied at length, reported to the faculty in writing at least a week in advance of a meeting, and discussed and voted on by the faculty.

Although this procedure has been regularly observed in most instances, several important curricular decisions in recent years have been made without prior discussion and study by the curriculum committee and the faculty. In 1953 the faculty was informed that the Board of Visitors had decided to create a concentration in education. The details of the program were worked out by the curriculum committee and approved by the faculty, but there was no opportunity to consider the merit of the proposal itself, which many of the faculty regarded as educationally unwise. Later

a School of Education was established with authority to determine its own degree requirements; but when the potential conflict of two faculties responsible for the same degree was pointed out, the control of the School of Education was limited to the graduate degree of M.Ed. More recently decisions to create new departments of geology and of theater and speech were made without prior discussion by the whole faculty, although these decisions affected distribution requirements in the first instance and involved new concentrations in both. It has been especially disturbing to the faculty when plans have been announced in the public press and pronounced "academically feasible" before the faculty has even discussed them. These instances reflect a lack of understanding of the proper sharing of responsibilities among the Board of Visitors, the administration, and the faculty. No one questions, of course, the powers of the Board or the fact that the powers and responsibilities of the faculty are only those delegated by the Board. One may question, however, the wisdom of reaching decisions without full consultation and the advice of all those intimately concerned. What is lacking, at present, is not good will or the desire to cooperate but the knowledge and experience of what cooperative educational planning entails. The faculty itself cannot establish new schools, departments, and programs nor does it wish to obstruct their creation when they are justified; but often it may be that the faculty can suggest sounder alternative solutions to problems and it is the faculty which must fit new programs into a coherent educational system.

#### Evaluation of the Curriculum

Studies of the curriculum have gone on at William and Mary almost continuously since the late 1940's. Two major efforts deserve particular mention. A review of the curriculum as a whole was undertaken by a special committee in 1952-53 in connection with the "self-evaluation study" inaugurated by the then-president, but this study was never reported to the faculty or discussed by it. A study conducted by the curriculum committee in 1956, which was the most intensive and exhaustive investigation (particularly of the distribution program) since 1935, was discussed by the whole faculty for almost two years through many regular and special meetings. Its chief recommendations were never supported by the administration. Most recently, the curriculum committee began a general review of the curriculum in 1961. When the present self-study got underway, this study was merged with it and continued by the regular curriculum committee augmented with additional faculty and student members. An initial report was submitted to the faculty in May, 1963. This study is the chief basis for the present analysis and its conclusions are incorporated herein.

In its discussions the curriculum committee has been concerned with several general problems. One is the question of external standards arising from the requirements of professional accrediting bodies. We have this in chemistry, music, accounting, and education. We have always had a subtle or hidden form of it in the requirements of medical schools, graduate schools, and engineering schools. The extent of this influence varies in different departments. The net effect may be to rob

a college of its free intellectual atmosphere and to turn the department, and to an extent the college, into a mere staging area. A troublesome aspect of this issue arises when a college employs a professionally-minded professor with an implicit or explicit guarantee that he will be permitted, or indeed required, to bring his department "up to standard" as judged by, say, the National Association of Schools of Music, or the American Chemical Society, or the State Department of Education. At first the external standards may seem reasonable but later they may take a direction inimical to the college's own interests. Curriculum change, then, is all but impossible except on the dictates of the external standard. At some point in history, college presidents are going to have to decide whether they or the outsiders are in control.

Another very difficult problem which the curriculum committee, as well as the administration, has often complained about is course proliferation and overlapping, and yet very little ever is done and everyone wonders who is to blame. In truth no one is exclusively to blame. It is inherently difficult to design, control, and maintain a unified, orderly curriculum. An educational program is a system of interdependent parts, not merely a collection of isolated courses. A system requires more management than a committee can give. When the College was smaller and the program more homogeneous, a dean could supervise fairly well: he could spot-check proliferation, he could monitor the catalogue, and he had time to refer knotty questions to the President or the faculty. As the College grew and became more heterogeneous it became quite impossible for the dean to monitor the curriculum and still perform all his other duties in connection with registration, evaluation of transfer credits, degrees committee, graduate study, etc. In recent years, the dean of the faculty has been unable to give sufficient time to the supervision of instruction and to educational policy and planning. The curriculum committee, regarding itself as a policy planner more than a policeman, did not or could not fill the gap. However, it recognized the trouble and warned in 1956 of the need for better policing of at least the distribution courses. Since then, it is clear that even more policing, or management, is needed. A welcome result has been the addition, this year, of an associate dean of the faculty. It is to be hoped that this will prompt a more systematic management of the distribution studies and a review and control of course proliferations, of which there are many. There is no question but that our whole system has yielded to centrifugal and fragmenting forces and needs to be tightened up. This cannot be done without administrative leadership and some actual policing.

The Southern Association standards require that the curriculum be in keeping with available financial and academic resources. William and Mary for several years went beyond the spirit of the rule; in attempting to do too much with too little, it stretched its resources thin. There are many examples: elementary education without a nursery or kindergarten, and without a staff of child specialists; music and music education without enough students to fill the classes; evening school without additional staff to help an already overburdened faculty; graduate study without adequate assistantships and fellowships or increased library and research facilities; theater and speech programs without bringing in top professors

to guide them; a new geology department without a good laboratory; extension service courses far beyond the scope of the faculty to control or teach. All the while, the College was growing in numbers of students and numbers of courses, and the result was lowered faculty morale, less research, and less homogeneity of interest on campus.

#### General Education or Distribution Courses

It was thought in 1935 that general education can best be promoted by distribution courses which not only introduce the student by the survey method to a field of study but also cover the basic principles of the discipline intensively enough to constitute a solid prerequisite to intermediate and advanced courses in that discipline. This is a point of view often said to be "traditional" compared to the more "modern" survey, integrated, or block-and-gap courses advocated by so many proponents of the so-called "general education" movement. The College has believed that the distribution course can serve two functions and that it is not necessary to have one course for concentrators and another course for non-concentrators. Thus we have had History of Europe rather than Western Civilization and Principles of Economics rather than Introduction to Economic Behavior. Although the basic philosophy of the distribution course has been maintained in the majority of instances and by the majority of faculty, it has not been without a continuing dissent by a minority. The department of physics was permitted to introduce a parallel first course in 1952. However, the two courses were claimed to be equally expressive of the faculty's intent, the only difference being that one emphasized mathematics and the other history and philosophy of science. Internal changes have no doubt taken place within other distribution courses but without receiving overt attention by the faculty. There is nothing to prevent a department, especially if its personnel are not veterans of the 1935 era, so to change the spirit and content of a distribution course that it no more meets the dual function originally assigned to it. This, no doubt, has happened due to the sheer incapability of policing by the dean's office. Changes certainly have occurred. Whether some of the distribution courses have become largely preparatory for advanced courses and have forgotten their general education function cannot readily be determined. The curriculum committee has devoted a great deal of its time to the assessment of this question without completely definitive results. We do know that the tendency has been to suit the distribution course more to the concentrator and less to the non-concentrator for his general education; that is, the direction of drift is that way. But how strong is the drift? No one knows.

Other changes have taken place, perhaps in a different direction. The content of mathematics has changed almost completely since 1935, along with the recent revolution in mathematics teaching. Philosophy has changed from a course in logic, as was originally intended, to a course in the history of philosophy; this change, however, was done with the curriculum committee's permission shortly after the introduction of the 1935 curriculum. Since the original curriculum required a distribution course in either philosophy (logic) or mathematics, it is interesting to note that philosophy became less logic and mathematics more so.

The philosophy department is now (1963-64) experimenting with a new freshman non-distribution course which emphasizes logic and concept analysis more in line with the faculty's original intention. The alternative between philosophy and mathematics has always been criticized by a strong minority of faculty opinion. Perhaps the new course in analysis of concepts will develop into a worthy distribution alternative to mathematics.

The majority opinion has always been skeptical of the College's ability to keep quality control of the distribution courses. Several times recommendations have been made that "something be done about it." It is felt that someone needs to "watchdog" the distribution courses and the distribution program as a whole to make sure that it is kept up to standard and that it is not changed by departmental action alone. Either the dean of the faculty needs more time to devote to this purpose, or a new committee on the distribution is needed, or department chairmen should meet more regularly to coordinate their work. A debilitating influence has been the selection of department chairmen and other faculty without any apparent regard for their interest in the system, which leads to the possibility that a chairman may be employed who is out of sympathy with the program. The curriculum committee has been able to do no more than warn, point with alarm, and request that some means be found for coordinating the distribution program as a whole. The course offerings in distribution have increased rather than remained constant. Several substitutions have occurred. Fine arts or humanities may now be substituted for sophomore English. Geology has been added to biology, chemistry, and physics as a distribution science. Sociology has been added to history, economics, and government as a social science. Each of these changes was made in different years and for particular, different reasons. The net result has been something of a loss in that component of the original distribution philosophy which represented the systematic general education point of view. Thus there is not as high a degree of unity today as there was in 1935.

Coupled with the above requirements in 1935 was the placement of the courses at freshman and sophomore levels, providing a rationale for the numbering of courses. For example, a student then was required to take two of three social sciences (history, economics, government) but only history was taught in the freshman year and with rare exceptions students were excluded from government and economics until the sophomore year. There was a theory behind this programming: all students should take history as their introduction to the social sciences, and then could elect either government or economics in their sophomore year as an advanced continuation. At first, a few students escaped history and took both government and economics as sophomores or juniors. These students could escape history, however, only if they could find something else to take in the freshman year. There were very few courses for freshmen to take and advisors were to see to it that alternatives to history were not taken without reason. The individual student's course of study, then, depended upon the number of courses available, and the type of advising system.



The control features of this system have now broken down. Since more students are being permitted to take any social science in their freshman year, the old program is replaced by trial and error procedures. If the professor of government wishes to insure that his students have had history by refusing to take freshmen into his classes, he may find that the student merely escapes both history and government by taking sociology and economics. This may not be bad education but it is quite different from the program envisioned in 1935, and hence a practical change in the College's program of general education. Advisors are powerless. More and more students are choosing courses outside the spirit and intent of the original program. Some are earnestly seeking knowledge; many are frantically seeking quality points.

These changes have brought about freshman "escape hatches," that is devices whereby the inadequately prepared student can sometimes avoid studying what the faculty had in mind for him and substitute for history not only economics or sociology, but speech, freshman economics, or psychology of adjustment. It is true that some very few students come to the College with an excellent background in European history and are, in the spirit of advanced placement, permitted to take a sophomore social science in their freshman year. This could be condoned under our basic philosophy, provided that the student's preparation and competence were established. But this is not always done. The old system of 1935 has broken down and should be replaced, as recommended in 1956, with open selection of all social sciences by freshmen.

In the natural sciences five courses, including geology and the two parallel physics courses, are now available rather than the original three. Quite apart from the merit of the individual courses, this means that a watchdog must inspect for quality in five courses rather than three and try to police the educational values and standards of them all. Similarly it is difficult to assess the common educational value of the three courses now available to the students instead of the original sophomore English literature. What is common to English literature, fine arts, and humanities? Can the professors of these courses really recognize and agree on their common aim and can anyone be sure that work and grading standards are equivalent?

There is reason to believe, therefore, that course proliferation within the distribution program has tended to make the program less unified, more scattered, less open to inspection and control, less available to faculty assessment, and more prone to invasion by hostile or unsympathetic interests. Each division-- humanities, science, and social science-- should review again its own distribution courses and evaluate their common aims and content.

When all of this has been said it must be pointed out that the individual courses are still, so far as can be determined, good ones. Whether they are the best ones, whether they mesh one with the other, are separate questions. After intensive study the curriculum committee recommended twice - once in 1956 and again in 1963 - (1) that the College develop some means whereby alternate programs of distribution or general education could

be instituted on an experimental basis for at least some students, and (2) that a tighter control of the present distribution program be established. With regard to the first recommendation, it is known that many other colleges have received financial assistance from foundations for experimental programs that are at least very attractive and interesting, whether or not they ever prove to be better than the traditional program. William and Mary has not sought such support and has not instituted any new ideas along this line. Yet there continues on campus a vigorous minority voice in favor of new programs, of experiment, and in some cases of different approaches entirely. Students criticize our freshman year as a dull one for the better student. Unless we give some response to these voices we are likely to find ourselves in a position of choking off more debate in the name of tradition than is wise and of stifling student interest. The only alternatives to sensible experimentation are rigid traditionalism or radical revolution. We recommend controlled experimentation.

There are, of course, substantive questions remaining about the character of the traditional program as currently modified. For example, the curriculum committee recommended in 1956 and the faculty voted for an increase from one year to two years in science distribution requirements and also for the inclusion of mathematics and experimental psychology. Seven years have gone by without action, except to proliferate by adding one alternative (geology) which adds no second year to the student's program in science. Without intending to criticize science teaching at William and Mary any more caustically than science teaching elsewhere, it remains a pitiful comment on all of us that virtually no non-science students elect second or third courses in the sciences. In this so-called age of science, and with our people's survival thought dependent on it, it is distressing indeed to find so little interest in science except among those with a professional or vocational attitude toward it. Science contributes less to the general education of our citizens than it should. Whether William and Mary should require 2 or 3 years of science or whether, if it did, this would be sufficient to kindle an interest and enhance the wisdom of students is, of course, debatable. But it seems, on the face of it, doubtful that we should continue to require no more science in 1963 than we did in 1935. The science division should be asked to address itself to this task and to make specific recommendations. The curriculum committee has come very close to recommending a two-year science sequence: mathematics, physics; chemistry, physics. But it cannot reach unanimous agreement.

Another difficult and continuing problem is the role of foreign languages in the preparation of an educated person. The curriculum committee and the present study committee have expressed the view that every student should know one language other than his own sufficiently well to use it in furthering his own education, which means, at least in the modern languages, that he should speak it passably; at the very least, he should read it easily. Few of our students today have met the requirement at this level. Whether this is the fault of the faculty as a whole, or of the language departments, or of the public school system, is hotly debated. The present method of teaching the beginning courses in French, German, and

Spanish is widely regarded, even among the instructors, as a failure and needs a review beyond the scope of this committee. The added laboratories, the split sections, are judged by students to be inefficient. Many sections of the distribution language courses are not conducted in that language and the same can be said of some foreign language courses at the intermediate level. Admittedly, very few courses, in other subjects, have reading lists that include foreign literature; indeed, it is a rare professor who can use a foreign language, a fault of graduate schools and America generally. Nor does the library provide foreign periodicals to any extent. The distribution-language professor can't correct all of these deficiencies but perhaps we all could make a spirited effort at training the next generation better. We should require a minimal knowledge of a foreign language as an entrance requirement and couple this with a requirement of a distribution course at the 300 level, in that language in college. We now spend exorbitant effort on language instruction under the banner of "general education" which is either of high school quality, or is mere grammar, or is taught in English; it is in one way or another much too far below ideal standards of general, liberal education.

Of growing importance is the increasing need to articulate all of our distribution courses more closely with the high school curriculum, and not only in languages. While many of our students still come poorly equipped for college, an increasing number is better prepared than ever. Diversity among freshmen is increasing. For the first group we still offer a number of freshman courses which are in large part below college standards. For the second small group we have advanced placement examinations. There is still much to be done in redefining what we mean by the distribution requirements for both groups. The curriculum committee has recommended considering a plan for pre-distribution courses such as freshman grammar and composition, parts of freshman mathematics, beginning courses in foreign languages, and perhaps beginning courses in science. The committee is still undecided whether these should receive any college credits; the inclination is to deny it. Coupled with this is a recommendation that we begin to define our distribution courses as second and third year courses, leaving pre-distribution courses, or more, as prerequisites. The point is to define the goal rather than the beginning. The number of distribution courses could be reduced but their level and quality increased and, hence, more readily policed, evaluated, and understood. This means a redefinition of general education in terms of more advanced courses. A clearly stated redefinition of this sort in each area of collegiate study might help the high schools do their job better. Many of them are already teaching part of our freshman year; college may have to start with "sophomores."

At the present time the curriculum committee is not agreed on all issues involved in the general education-distribution area, but it is agreed:

- (a) That all students should devote, under a faculty-sponsored and monitored program, the equivalent of about 68 to 70 hours of study instead of the

present 50 to 60 hours, thus increasing the general educational requirements from slightly under half to slightly over half of the total college program.

- (b) That this program should be comprised of courses or adequate placement examinations in literature, whether in English or in a foreign language; science, and more than we now require; social science; mathematics or logic; and history, whether intellectual, social, political, or philosophical.
- (c) That some advanced level study be included in distribution work, that is that not all distribution be confined to the freshman-sophomore years.
- (d) That some provision be made for purely experimental programs, so that the College may learn from its own experiments.
- (e) That whatever distribution requirements may exist, their supervision should not be left to the departments alone, but should be monitored either by a dean or by a distribution committee of the faculty.

It has not been possible for the curriculum committee to find time to reach agreement on the place of the performing arts in a general education or a general definition of technical courses. Therefore, the committee recommends no changes at this time in present practice. The recent proposal to include music in the distribution program must, therefore, be denied at this time. The College already has difficulty administering and monitoring the program we have and one more distribution course would make it harder yet.

This also means that the seeming inconsistencies between the College's aims as an intellectual institution and the requirement of physical training will remain largely unexamined, as they are elsewhere in our educational world. William and Mary now requires freshmen and sophomores, but not juniors and seniors, to exercise their bodies and to meet certain standards of physical performance; it does not grant academic credit beyond the minimal passing grade. The student need not be physically fit at the time his degree is awarded. Present requirements are half-way between nothing at all and the endorsement of physical education as continuously worthwhile for everyone. To continue present requirements is mere compromise, though probably realistic. Nevertheless, there are some practices which are open to question. Numerous complaints are made by students that the physical education instructors, particularly women, insist on an arbitrarily high score in each of several skills and consequently students flunk repeatedly even though they try hard and show improvement. The problem is one of placement; perhaps these stu-

dents should be placed in graded classes or given physical exercises. Also, is it necessary to succeed in a variety of team and individual sports? Why not let some students concentrate more in one or the other? The committee does agree that required physical education should remain on a non-academic basis and that its grades should carry no academic quality points. Some favor the awarding of letter grades. This is of small consequence either way, provided that no quality points are counted in the academic program.

It is further recommended, as a practical matter, that the program of distribution studies be used as the chief base for evaluating a student's normal progress toward his degree and that, accordingly, each student be required to achieve a C average in distribution courses in order to be eligible for the bachelor's degree. There is some minor disagreement as to whether this should be interpreted immediately as a quality point average of 1.00 under the present program or whether it would be better to start with, say, a required QPA of .85 or .90 and try to move to 1.00 over a few years period or whether to develop some non-numerical system of counting grades. There is no disagreement on the general principle. The theory behind this is simple: the faculty, which has the responsibility for defining the student's course of study and for grading his work, should expect no less than a standard of student work equivalent to an average grade of C in those courses of study which it regards as the core of the student's education. Few professors really regard the D grade as satisfactory scholarship.

This recommendation is urged not only as sound principle but as a specific corrective to a present unsound condition, namely, the retention of many students on campus who are below standard in their distribution courses; many of these manage to graduate by gaining compensatory high grades either in their concentration courses, or in technical courses, or in elective courses nonessential or peripheral to their program of studies. The seriousness of this situation is indicated by a study made of the class of 1963. This class contained 480 graduates. A random sampling of one-third of the bottom quarter shows the median quality point average achieved in distribution courses to be only 0.677. The highest ranking student in this sample achieved a QPA in distribution courses of 1.096 and the lowest ranking student 0.347. Ninety percent of the sample had averages below 1.0, 88% below 0.9, and 71% below 0.8. Since these students nevertheless managed to graduate, it is clear that they must have garnered their higher grades in electives or in concentrations and it is suspected that many of them deliberately sought "easy" electives and concentrations for the sole purpose of acquiring quality points. A few students openly admit a cynical pursuit of quality points and simultaneously express contempt for the goals of education pronounced by the faculty. The size of this cynical group has not been determined precisely by scientific investigation and, hopefully, it is not large, but any size over zero is too large for a college community's approval. The College simply must do more to discourage such pseudo-scholars. No doubt many in the sample are simply poor students, not "college material," but time has not been available to investigate their aptitude test pattern or their high school grades to see whether their college performance

could have been forecast by admissions officers. Whether predictable or not, their distribution course averages could have been computed by the committee on academic status and they could have been told that they were not benefiting sufficiently to warrant retention. It is an unwelcome but inescapable conclusion that we have been too easy on the poorer student and have lowered our standards to his level rather than encouraging him to come up to ours.

A by-product of this situation is the view rather too commonly encountered among students that distribution courses are not to be taken too seriously, that what really counts in college are the grades in one's concentration. This view is found even among some of those hoping to continue to graduate school! Our present system is one which, if not contributive, at least does little to discourage that interpretation.

A final appraisal of general education at William and Mary: it mainly consists of traditional distribution courses which have lost much of their integrative character and have also lost prestige and status as the heart and core of our educational process to the extent that they often are merely "passed." What is needed now is not a new system imported from Chicago, Harvard, or St. Johns, but a vigorous strengthening of our present program. The measures recommended above ought to prove effective. But additional "integrators," perhaps more dramatic ones, are possible. One in particular has received wide faculty discussion and is advocated by student members of our committee, namely, a "Great Books" course for all freshmen. This easily could be added to the freshman program, which already is rather weak. (It consists of one less course than the five carried by most freshmen on most campuses.) A "Great Books" course might well be used as a generic title to cover other suggested improvements such as summer reading lists for entering freshmen, freshman seminars, and freshman essays. Also why stop with freshmen? If the "Great Books," or any other Common Course, proves effective, let us consider extending it to the sophomore year. Perhaps it is not too idealistic to hope that the time will come when the chief officer of instruction, the dean, will direct the Common Course as one of his primary duties.

The Southern Association standards insist that there be a recognizable common core of subject matter that expresses the educational philosophy of the institution. In review, do we see that we have this? Does any college with distribution options have it? At William and Mary every student takes English but he has options in language, in science, in social science, and in logic-mathematics. No doubt some common core underlies the options but it is not always constant and always recognizable. With the recommended tightening of supervision, it can become more recognizable-- it once was-- and with the addition of a common course for freshmen and possibly one for sophomores it would be more so. The further addition of some advanced common courses would cap the solution. If these things cannot be done within the near future, the College will have to think seriously about instituting some variety of core curriculum in general education.

## Concentration Programs

According to the catalogue, the following rules govern concentration:

- (a) The whole program of concentration shall represent a coherent and progressive sequence.
- (b) The student in consultation with the head of his major department shall select the courses for concentration. Of these, at least thirty semester credits must be with the major department.
- (c) Each department may require as many as twelve additional semester credits in courses from that department or from other departments.

When a student concentrates in a field in which he has received credit for a distribution requirement, such credit shall be counted in the total field of concentration.

No student shall be permitted to apply toward a degree more than forty-two semester credits in a subject field. The subject fields include: Biology, Business Administration, Chemistry, Economics, Education, English, Fine Arts, French, Geology, German, Government, Greek, History, Latin, Law, Mathematics, Music, Philosophy, Physical Education for Men, Physics, Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, Spanish.

No student shall be permitted to apply toward a degree more than twenty-one semester credits in technical courses in any one subject field nor in any one department.

Students may apply twenty-seven semester credits in Elementary Education and twenty-four semester credits in Secondary Education respectively toward the A.B. degree.

The over-riding rule is, or should be, the first one, that the whole program of concentration shall represent a coherent and progressive sequence. This is slightly ambiguous as to whether only the concentration or the whole last two years is meant to be coherent and sequential. Usually it is interpreted as the former, although it may have been drafted as the latter. In any case there is great disparity among departments in the matter of "coherence." Some require only a quantity of courses, some require no 300 courses (indeed, history has none), some require no or few 400 courses. Some department chairmen complain that it is impossible to maintain a coherent sequence for all students because of factors beyond their control: overcrowding, understaffing, and the like. But it is to be doubted that the student understands rule (a) as a degree

requirement or that the degrees committee fully appreciates it. The fact is, some strangely incoherent and unprogressive sequences are offered for degrees and, sometimes after struggles among committee consciences, approved with mercy in spite of the agonizing realization that the student's program meets only the barest minimum of quantity of course work without proper respect for pattern or sequence. The degrees committee has too many of these doubtful cases coming to it. Their temptation is to blame the department chairman for not having exercised power under rule (b), an advisory "control." Rule (b) is consultative, not prescriptive. Department chairmen do not have power, beyond their catalogue prescriptions, to enforce each student's sequence of courses and this leaves, sometimes, a gap which permits unwise selection by the student. It is clear that a tightening up of sequences is needed in some departments and, perhaps more important, greater clarity of statement published to the student. The course-numbering system itself once was a fairly good guide; one simply followed the numbers to the next course. This system is now broken down in some departments and needs overhaul.

Rule (c) may well be questioned. There is among the departments a wide range of concentration requirements which may be questioned, at least on the ground that some students seek the "shortest, easiest concentration" so that they may have a freer choice of electives. A better scheme might be to separate the two parts of rule (c), keeping under (c) only the intradepartmental credits and adding, to replace "other departments," a system of minors. In short, require a minor subject, or even two minors, for the degree and require that they, too, be coherent and progressive.

Rule (b), especially in conjunction with the stipulation that distribution courses must count in the concentration, is especially dubious as a definition of a concentration. No doubt most people think of the concentration subject as the main occupation of the student during his junior and senior years and, indeed, the preface to the rule seems to say so. Yet a student in, say, history which requires only 30 credits total, takes 12 of these in freshman-sophomore courses and has only 18 to take in his last two years-- hardly a "major" portion of his junior-senior 60 credit-hours! Or, in the sciences, a department may (though none do) require only 30 credits including the 10 credits allowed the freshman courses; again, this leaves only 20 hours for the "major" concentration. The point is, the 30-credit definition of a concentration is silly if it means simultaneously to define a junior-senior "coherent sequence" and then permits a third or more of it in freshman or introductory work. The recommended solution is to define the concentration in junior-senior courses. The committee has not agreed on the optimal number, but it should be in the neighborhood of 20 to 30 credit hours, i.e., from a 5th to a 4th of the total college program, or in some sciences more than this if justified, and varying somewhat from subject to subject. If degree certification is ever to be solely or largely based on a departmental comprehensive examination or if we delete credit-hours from all courses, the particular number of concentration credits would matter less. The faculty has not yet been able to agree on the institution of comprehensive examinations. This committee



recommends abolition of credit-hours. Further, we should endorse the "coherent sequence" idea by requiring some reasonable split between 300 and 400 courses in the concentration with 300 prerequisites for some 400 courses, or some other equivalent gradation.

The limit of 42 hours in a subject field will have to be revised if the concentration is re-defined and the term "subject field" needs re-definition also. European and American history may differ more than government and American history; botany and zoology or physiology overlap very little but must both be counted as one subject field? One can study Soviet communism in at least four different "subject fields" and educational psychology in at least three, including military science. What is to be permitted in accumulating a "coherent and progressive sequence" within a subject field? Some students should be permitted more than 42 hours of present units. A simple solution to some of this hodge-podge is to require that a student's whole program, not only in the concentration, be "coherent," if possible progressive, and not overly specialized.

Let rule (a), the "coherence" rule, apply at least to the whole junior-senior period in particular (and to the whole four years as well). Let it dominate and over-ride all other rules. This would help solve the ancient riddle as to "what is a technical course?", which has plagued the degrees committee under the 21-credit limit on technical courses. "Overly technical" programs are more easily discerned than technical courses individually appraised. Strong administrative supervision here is mandatory.

We propose to require each student, at the end of his sophomore year, to file with the degrees committee or the dean of the faculty a plan of study, including his courses in concentration and his minor sequences and some courses listed as "elective." This plan is to be either continued in force or revised before each succeeding semester, with revisions subject to review at least at the beginning of each year. Reasonable variations will be permitted from standard programs but extreme deviations will not be, unless they are coherent. Strong action by the committee against, say, 5 per cent of the worst violators, would have a powerful effect on the student body.

The rules for concentration are not always being followed. The electives rule is consistently violated by some departments, the more professional and vocational ones usually. One department chairman stated that his concentration leaves no room for electives! Yet he is not castigated; his students are awarded degrees in clear violation of the faculty's requirement of nine hours of electives. There are other ways to professionalize the concentration years. One is to schedule required courses in such a way as to preclude the student's taking anything outside the concentration department during one or more semesters. A chief offender here is education's scheduling of full-time practice teaching for half a semester, which blocks out all but education courses in the other half. No doubt an excellent scheme for practicing teaching! But what of its place in a liberal arts college? Students complain that

they miss one entire semester of college; it is replaced by teacher training. This is another instance of conflict between training and true education. Likewise, the accounting program permits no electives: much of what it includes is "technical"; does this exceed 21 credits? The accounting program requires 43 hours, one in excess of the legal limit of 42, but the excess may be in an ever so slightly different "subject field," semantically. Again, strong administrative supervision is needed.

The Southern Association standards explicitly require an orderly sequence of courses in concentrations above the elementary level and a clear limitation on the number of hours allowed in specialized areas. It is hoped that the above recommendations will guarantee alignment with these standards.

The College seems to have been going on the assumption that a concentration would include at least 21 or 24 hours of junior-senior work. A careful examination of some students' actual programs approved for degrees in 1963 reveals that this is not always the case. One student, for example, graduated with only 15 hours of 300 and 400 level courses in his major field, ancient languages. Many other students' programs can be found which contain less than 21 hours of 300 and 400, i.e., advanced courses. This may only be an artifact of the numbering system but it may not be. Although there is reason to believe that in some departments 200 level (sophomore) courses are really as difficult as intermediate level or advanced courses in others, comparative difficulty is not easily determined. Is the fault in the numbering system or is it more basic? If a professor claims that his 200 level course is "higher" than another professor's 400 level course, it surely must take a Solomon to decide. In any case this is a serious problem to anyone trying to evaluate the courses of study submitted for degrees. Clearly we all need more rigid and explicit standards of quantity and quality of work required for the bachelor's degree, especially in the concentration. The situation is not desperate but some tightening up is in order. No doubt this can fairly easily be started, perhaps accomplished, by closer cooperation and more discussion among department chairmen, under the leadership of the dean.

The College awards both the B.A. and B.S. degrees. All departments except those in the sciences award the B.A. Biology, chemistry, and physics award only the B.S. Geology, mathematics, and psychology award either the B.A. or B.S. The distinction here is not philosophically clear. Why should some departments offer both degrees and some only one? The B.S. degree does require mathematics, which the B.A. does not, yet mathematics itself awards either one or the other according to the student's choice. The B.S. requires English literature instead of its alternatives and it requires French or German or Russian as language. But Russian is not available as a distribution course, so a student would have to have taken another language for distribution. The reasons stated for these requirements lie outside the philosophy of a liberal arts education and derive from peculiar professional considerations, including requirements of graduate schools. It is suspected that the



biology, chemistry, and physics departments think of their programs as in some way incompatible with the B.A. degree. Some students gain the impression from this that the traditional B.A. is of lesser value. Reconsideration of this issue is needed. Why shouldn't the above departments award both B.A. and B.S. degrees? The science student who wants to take Latin or Greek or who prefers humanities to English literature is marked as out of line. In any case, the requirements for the B.S. represent intrusion of professional or graduate criteria into our undergraduate curriculum.

Science is not the only, nor the clearest, of the instances of professional-vocational influence on our curriculum. Education, physical education, and business administration offer concentration programs; all three have been challenged especially by students on our committee as unworthy programs of concentration in a liberal arts college. They exist at William and Mary as concentrations either because they are derivatives from earlier college or school status or because they were forced on the College by external pressures or demands of the state. Whether their existence, as concentrations, is compatible with the aims and purposes of the College is not a mere problem in semantics or logic; the question has been, over the years, central to the question of the very nature of the College.

Education was installed as a concentration without faculty discussion, so no statistically based faculty-wide opinion can be cited as to its appropriateness here as a course of study for the B.A. degree. Nevertheless, it is widely thought of by faculty and students as vocational and professional in nature and unworthy of the B.A. degree, and as such, to be studied either in a fifth year or at least in addition to and not as a replacement of a concentration in a regular academic department. Those who urge the "need of the state for more teachers" argue that the concentration in education actually provides more teachers than would otherwise be possible and by implication more than would several other possible schemes of producing teachers. This has never been demonstrated in fact. Yet even if true, it still means that the teacher who majored here in education and who is teaching social studies often wishes that his college had once required him to major in a social science instead. A great many high school teachers say this and in addition, that their education courses were relatively insubstantial. How many elementary school teachers say this is not known, but probably fewer. At any rate there is not the active battle on campus over the concentration in elementary education that exists around secondary education. This is not to say that elementary education is strong for it is not; it is weak. The department needs strengthening if it is to continue, especially in the area of child study.

Some solution to the education issue is imperative but the committee cannot agree on whether it would be best to abolish the concentration or to award the B.Ed. degree for it, which seem to be the only alternatives to the present system. But the present system is a Board directive, recently reviewed by the Board.

Physical education for men, as a concentration field, while enjoying the same dubious status, has not the same air of dispute and conflict about it, at least on this campus. For one thing, it has ancient roots in classical Greek thought, which is generally so much revered by classicists and other scholars. Further it competes less with other academic departments; no one is heard to say "I can teach it better"; it has a relatively small number of students; and it is, at worst, said to be fairly harmless recreation, even by its opponents. It has no very active opponents among undergraduates. Its supporters point to the prominent role of sports and athletics in the avocational life of our people, which can't be denied. The arguments, pro and con, are not parallel with those surrounding the concentration in education simply because there are other ways to train teachers and there may not be many other ways to train coaches. Furthermore, the physical education concentration is a natural one for the many athletes paid by the College to come here under a policy laid down by the Board.

Business administration is another story. It is one of William and Mary's experiments in college education, to see whether it is possible to combine a business course and a liberal arts education. It is in marked contrast to the typical school of commerce, and has been approved by the faculty. The experiment seems to be working fairly well. There is very little apprehension about its direction except, perhaps, for a fear that the technical requirements in the accounting program overwhelm the liberal arts part. This needs continuous watching.

In summary, the undergraduate degree programs at the College are, for the most part, in keeping with the aims and purposes of the College, but there are some possible exceptions and some questionable patterns, chief of which is the concentration in education. The issues could easily be reduced, if not solved, by abolishing the concentration in education or at least in secondary education, but this may not be realistic.

Just as the freshman year is troublesome to design for widely different students, so it is difficult to design for all seniors, "specialists" now, a terminating educational experience. Some departments have some kind of required senior integrative experience-- a research project, a seminar, or both, or a required senior course. But some departments do not, and some merely require selection from several advanced senior courses which inherently are integrative in character. That this situation is not wholly satisfactory is witnessed by the many discussions of senior honors, senior comprehensives, and senior research.

Nothing has come yet of the senior comprehensives idea but the College did install a permissive system of senior departmental honors study five years ago. Begun by four departments, ten departments now offer honors study for six credits. This program is judged to be better than nothing but far short of an ideal system of honors study. It is hoped that it can be improved and extended but the need for honors will wane as the whole College approaches the philosophy of honors work.

The curriculum committee and this study committee have concluded

that some continuation of the distribution or the "general education" idea should exist in the student's program in the senior year, but it has not been possible to specify the details. A non-science major, it is felt, should take some such course as philosophy of science in his senior year and the science major should take something like "art in the modern world." The principle is clear that the senior ought to be enriching his life in an area outside his specialization, instead of, as sometimes happens, hunting for introductory or vocational courses to fill up an "easy" schedule so as to loaf in his senior year. A not uncommon program at William and Mary includes only 12 hours during the senior year, half of which is secretarial science, home economics, freshman speech, etc. A careful examination was made by this committee of one-third of the students graduating in the class of 1963. The study revealed much of this loafing. Shouldn't we require something more? Too many of these students are known to have planned their college career to provide for working "overtime" in the junior year for the specific purpose of easing off in the senior. Would it not be wiser for each department to so arrange its courses and for the faculty to plan the whole curriculum in such a way that the student must expect to play an adult scholarly role when he becomes a senior? Seminars, great books, theses, all might enhance and support this role. A bit of intellectual "loafing" might be a good thing, if it meant the students were really reading good books of their own choice; but many don't even read the newspaper.

In this connection, our M.A. programs might be mentioned. If integrated with certain senior courses, they might well keep up the senior's spirits; if separated, they may dampen instead. The much discussed honors M.A. might stimulate where the terminal or vocational M.A. would probably deaden the atmosphere.

In summary, the senior year is not really bad but it is, for many, not exciting, not demanding and it does need thoughtful reconsideration and some improving. For those seniors who now enjoy good honors work, good seminars, and close contact with professors at their research-minded best, the situation here is very good indeed. But for many, the senior year is non- or anti-intellectual. Every senior should be required to participate in some minimum of genuinely advanced work involving research or small-group seminar work. The rule permitting seniors to carry reduced loads should be abolished.

#### Total Program of Study

Having considered the distribution and the concentration programs, it is time to look at the whole four years of college work as lived through by typical groups of students. The student members of this committee and the curriculum committee both make strong comments here.

Our curriculum is regarded as slightly too easy for the better students, not sufficiently challenging to them in the freshman year, and except for honors students and a few others, in the senior year. At the same time it is regarded as too difficult or too advanced for the poorer students who nevertheless manage to stay in college by seeking out our

weakest spots. Some of the better students elect for themselves wise programs of stimulating work; they take pride and satisfaction in their degrees. Even some of the better students, however, become loafers in their senior year. The poorer students are under exceptionally strong pressure to succeed in collegiate work above a level for which they are prepared and they become an unhappy lot: the work is more than they can do; parents push them toward high achievement; faculty spend extra time with them in remedial help. These poorer students react in different ways: some exploit our weaknesses, and with great cynicism; some give up; some fight through to "over-achievement." There is still a great deal we need to know and to do for and with these groups. A counseling office devoted to research could be of help here.

Of great concern is the large number of patchwork, second-rate, make-shift programs of 120 credit-hours offered for degrees. As noted above, the committee spent days reading the records of individuals in the class of 1963 and tabulating their course selections. They nearly defy statistical summary. The impression given, however, is that most students in the top quarter of the class have chosen well and done well, but half or more in the bottom quarter of the class have followed programs hardly worthy of the name of collegiate education. As pointed out earlier, too many of these-- and indeed too many in the middle half of the class-- have programs overloaded with home economics, military science, speech, television and radio, secretarial science, and other vocational and technical avocational courses. The committee agrees that no one or two such courses is bad, it is the overall program which is bad because these courses may displace a substantial portion of our intended college education. The curriculum committee recommended that no more than 10% of one's college work be permitted in these subjects. This self-study might well endorse this view or some reasonable equivalent, of which there are many: (a) offer these courses but without credit, (b) reduce the number of such courses, (c) award credit but no quality points for these courses, (d) label "academic" courses more carefully and write the degree requirements solely in academic units, (e) reduce the course load to four academic courses per semester, for a total of 32 courses, while at the same time increasing and equalizing their weight and scope, leaving the "non-academic" courses as non-credit, extra-curricular activities. The last alternative is, in effect, what many students evidently now do: their programs consist of three or four solid courses plus one or two lightweights, called "crip" courses. This practice is rather widespread and students discuss it widely. Many colleges require only 32 courses for graduation but all are solid. If we were to undertake to do likewise, we would have a wonderful opportunity to trim out the fat from the catalogues, to eliminate the evils of proliferation, and simultaneously, by reducing the total number of courses offered, to solve in part the problem of too few classrooms.

It is recommended that either: (a) a limit of 10% be placed on non-academic courses, or that (b) no quality points or credits be attached to non-academic courses, or that (c) the student's program be re-written in terms of four academic courses per semester. The principle underlying these recommendations may better be stated as follows: the

College needs to take more responsibility than it now does for the student's whole program of college study. We have fallen into the error of endorsing our curriculum automatically, course by course, and have paid too little attention to the quality of each student's course of study. This must be rectified.

#### Total Course Offerings: Proliferation

The total course offerings of the College are numerous and somewhat fragmented. Proliferation exists. The catalogue lists 630 separate courses under 504 titles! (This does not include graduate courses or those in marine science and law). No single clear picture of liberal education emerges. The prospective student surely must see the catalogue as a wilderness. To the rebuttal that all catalogues look this way, one can only reply that ours probably looks worse than it needs to. Pages are devoted to the outlining of possible courses of vocational or professional study which, the record shows, are actually followed by only a few students. The catalogue needs to be revised so as to be more readily understood by the liberal arts student and to eliminate description of the professional schools such as education, law, and marine science-- which can be separately published.

Fortunately the actual number of courses offered at any one time is not as many as the catalogue implies. In 1962-63, they totalled 298 undergraduate courses in the first semester and 310 in the second, for a grand total of 608. Some of these are repeated courses and some are continuations.

No doubt the catalogue's diversity only mirrors the attempt by the College to do too many different things at once. There are understandable historical reasons for this but now is the time to put the curriculum in focus, to concentrate the College's efforts on its main job of undergraduate education, and to trim back every ancillary effort to a minimum. Some justifications for present courses are mere rationalizations for past empire-building or, what amounts to the same thing, past periods of popularity and variations in administrative favor. The point is, that in a college, whatever goes up does not necessarily come down; indeed, usually it does not. Because of fixed costs, committed staff and other inflexible factors, the tendency is for every department to remain forever at its peak size; it is therefore not possible to expand and contract the size of the curriculum and its teaching staff exactly in the proportions required for changing times. Peaks come from imbalances and are then preserved or embalmed in the curriculum. Some curricula can be more efficient than others, however. Expansion and contraction of sections of a course can be done more readily than courses can be added and subtracted.

The number of catalogue course titles per department varies from a low of 11 for chemistry to 37 for English; the actual number offered is 18 in chemistry and 49 in English, per year. English has, of course, a large number of students, but so does history with 18 titles and 26 offered per year. The difference is partly in the number of continuous

courses, of which history has many and English few. Whatever the disadvantages of continuous courses, they do make for easy programming by the student and they probably make the faculty's effort more compact and efficient. Fine arts lists 44 courses under 28 titles, which seems a rather large number until one notices that many are two-credit courses and some are alternated. The same is true of music which, with a small number of students, lists 34 courses under 20 titles, but many of these are music education, not music per se. Education lists 30 courses under 26 titles and in addition many education courses, at least those open only or mainly to teachers, are hidden under other titles in other departments: music, fine arts, biology, physical education, and ancient languages.

Yet some departments request additions, which seem reasonable: English needs linguistics; philosophy needs ancient and oriental philosophy; business administration needs operations research. Some of our studies suggest the addition of more courses in non-Western culture, in all departments, and perhaps the addition of a new department of religion. Are these requests really reasonable? Would they represent proliferation?

Admittedly the over-all numbers give a false impression; they oversimplify. Some programs contain sub-programs and majors, sub-majors, as in American vs. European history, Greek-Latin, etc. Only the closest scrutiny by an acute dean's eye can catch the real proliferation and avoid pruning out the very course essential for a given student.

But too many courses can foil the dean. Also, if a class shrinks in size, one cannot dismiss half an instructor. More important for curriculum control, a faculty seldom dares remove courses taught by some of its own members, and a curriculum committee lacks the courage to abolish proliferated courses taught by colleagues who are friends. This job of pruning requires vast time and a degree of power, which the committee feels it does not have. It would take heroic full-time effort to accomplish. It can be done only by the President, or the dean, working very closely with each department chairman. We recommend that a thorough review be undertaken soon, by one or both of them, of each course in the College-- its syllabus, examination, etc., and each program, department by department, with a view to weeding out proliferation, to establishing definite limits on total numbers of courses offered in the non-concentration departments of secretarial science, home economics, speech, and military science, and certain other departments, especially education. In addition, every department should have to justify its course structure. This has, in a sense, been done already in departmental self-studies, but in some instances the departmental self-evaluation has been less than rigorous, occasionally even perfunctory. In many instances, this has been effectively accomplished, e.g., in biology, business administration, economics, psychology. A more intensive investigation, by the leadership of the College, might produce even more results. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, such an investigation might usefully be combined with a reduction of the student's course load from five to four courses and a change in the requirements for graduation from 120 academic credits to 32 academic courses. This probably would be the most effective way to set in motion forces counter to the centrifugal forces which have been behind prolifera-

tion.

Nothing in the above argument should be taken to mean that we err only in the direction of proliferation. The administrative review recommended ought to direct attention to gaps in the curriculum which genuinely need filling, such as those already mentioned, and perhaps more. It is recommended that division chairmen be consulted on this matter. Specifically, the following needs to be done:

1. Set in motion whatever administrative powers can be summoned, President, dean, and department chairmen, to prune and revise the total undergraduate course offerings with the aim of really eliminating course proliferation and spotting area weaknesses. A secondary but not unimportant aim would be to involve top officials deeply in the active leadership of the instructional program, its philosophy and operation.
2. Make this curricular over-haul the first order of business before setting up or enlarging special projects such as evening school, graduate study, extension programs and the like. While some merit may exist in some parts of these special projects if they conform to a sound collegiate standard, our first duty is to review and re-establish the basic course standards and programs of study in the undergraduate college. This is particularly true of graduate and evening school offerings; they may have merit but they need a sound base of support. A really solid and healthy undergraduate college need have little fear (nor perhaps any need either) of venturing into extracurricular educational experiments, or of extending the range of its operations, especially if the ventures grow naturally in our climate. But few of ours have done so. They have been unwisely forced on an undergraduate curriculum which, while basically sound, has been coming apart and weakening more and more in the past decade, and on an already overworked, understaffed, and underpaid faculty.
3. Make clear that this overhaul is to be accomplished for the benefit of the faculty and students and not at their expense, especially of the faculty. Unenlightened pruning can be harmful. An "extra" course may be the professor's only fringe benefit if it happens to be the one that he most prizes. The view has long been cogently supported that our course offering is inflated because of the required teaching load, i.e., that courses multiply to keep the teachers busy so that the state will think they are

fully employed. No serious attempt to reduce course proliferation can be undertaken without at the same time attacking certain archaic practices of computing work-load and financial appropriations. This is one reason why the task is one for top administration and not for committee only.

#### Miscellaneous Problems

A. General Honors: In 1960-61 a special faculty committee recommended the institution of a general honors program which would begin in the freshman year. It was contemplated that this program would be supervised by a committee on honors and a director of honors. It would provide honors colloquia in the first two years which would give the basis for either departmental honors programs or a continued general honors program in the last two years. This proposal is strongly endorsed and recommended for action.

B. Transfer Credits: The placement approach to evaluation of transfer credits is unwieldy, time-consuming, and full of pitfalls. Its chief weakness is the evaluation of one-course-at-a-time regardless of whether it fits the student's "coherent" sequence. The department chairman is not in position to judge coherence of programs at the time he approves of "Humanities 1492" at XYZ College. The piecemeal philosophy implied is wrong. The problem becomes annoyingly acute in the case of evening school, extension, summer school, and other courses studied outside of a residential college context. Recommendation: The Dean's office should evaluate transfer programs as programs, with advice from department chairmen where needed.

C. Military Science: The whole program here needs review. The academic portion of the MS&T program should not be left to the military professors alone. The curriculum committee should study this. The military part of the program should not receive college credit. In all probability, a careful review by the curriculum committee would show that some of the rest is not up to academic standard and should not receive academic credit. Topics such as leadership, military educational psychology, and the role of the U. S. in world affairs, must be closely scrutinized. We recommend such a careful study, which has not been possible by this committee, with a view to abolishing academic credit or, at the very least, to abolishing grades and/or quality points for that part of the military work which may prove not to have some academic value.

There is no justification for continuing to grant academic credits, up to four in present practice, for previous military service. Military service should be evaluated solely for its academic content, if any, as would any other transfer credit.

D. Topical Majors and Combined Programs of Concentration: So very few students are enrolled or have been enrolled in the various topical majors that it seems hardly worthwhile to keep them, especially as they



tend toward vocational training or professional programs rather than liberal arts inter-departmental majors. Only two students in the 1958 group finished the combined program in law; none finished the pre-engineering; none the forestry; none the topical pre-medicine; none the topical science. And this class was selected by the registrar as a representative class, one free from "unusual factors" thought to be associated with some other years. It had been thought in the past that these special professional programs would be useful in attracting able students. The evidence seems clear that they attract very few, or at least few who are able to complete them, whose interests cannot be otherwise accommodated.

Something can be said in favor of the interdepartmental concentrations such as area studies or the series of topical majors begun at the College in 1939-41. Indeed, a revival or expansion of some of these, under divisional supervision, could be an exciting experiment. The term topical major as applied to pre-medicine is a hold-over from those days and is now a misnomer. There is no seminar or colloquium for the pre-medical topical majors, nor for any of the students in the combined plans. There is no comprehensive examination. There is, in fact, nothing about the programs to provide distinction or integration, except the possibility of a vocational goal.

The one possible exception is law, for the reason that a student on this campus can move on into our law school with a sense of continuation of atmosphere and faculty, and under circumstances which might provide in the law school a reasonable facsimile of a good senior year.

#### Recommendation

Abolish all topical majors and combined programs except the combined program in law and restrict law to our own students. Work out for them a clearer program of concentration in pre-legal and legal studies and award the degree of A.B. only after completion of the law degree.

E. Teacher Training: The State Board of Education now dominates our department of education and virtually dictates the courses in the curriculum. William and Mary should seek, perhaps with financial support from some foundation, to work out its own alternative approach and should undertake experiments in that direction. If William and Mary is to be distinctive, to offer something new to the state and the nation by way of teacher training, and not merely go along with the state consensus, it will have to strike out on its own. William and Mary needs to be better than the state average and it can attract a higher quality of students. If the College cannot do these things, it should consider requesting relief from the obligation to train teachers. Teachers colleges, as such, can be set up and run elsewhere more cheaply if all that is wanted is the teachers-college type of teacher.

F. Credit for Basic Science Courses: Although we recommend making all courses equal in credit, it must be reiterated that if this should not be done, the least we can do is to reduce basic sciences from five

to four credits per semester, which recommendation has been repeatedly voted by curriculum committees and the faculty. If, as has been said, this reduction would mean a loss in revenue because of its contingent relation to study-credit-hours, this problem must be faced and solved, if necessary by requesting the state to re-arrange its bookkeeping.

G. Technical, Non-Academic Courses: We have a number of courses now that clearly are too technical or too non-academic to deserve credit in the academic portion of the curriculum: secretarial science; most of military science; required physical education; most of the home economics courses (home living, foods, clothing construction, and home management); elementary languages; health education for teachers; most of the applied music courses; first aid and driver education; waterfront leadership. The same criticism might be applied to certain other courses which either should be combined with others, changed materially, or put on the non-academic list: engineering graphics; elementary drawing; elementary stagecraft; photography and the motion picture; geography; introduction to law; group discussion; voice and diction; human anatomy and physiology; and mental hygiene. An additional related problem is proliferation in semi-professional courses which are themselves of doubtful propriety in an undergraduate curriculum; for example, the several courses in guidance and counseling might either be combined into one course in theory of guidance or put on a graduate-professional level either not open to undergraduates, or not permitted without more prerequisites than now exist, for they purport to teach undergraduates how to counsel.

H. Departmental Libraries: Several departments report that they have small libraries of books and tapes and artifacts, and most say they need more. Some departments place priority on the matter. Certainly those departments active in senior independent study and in graduate study require them. What is especially needed are duplicates of main reference sources and current journals. For graduate study, this is no luxury. It is necessary and, in some departments, critical; continuance of graduate programs hinges on it.

I. Faculty: No report on curriculum can wholly ignore the most important ingredient of all, the teaching faculty. In this self-study another committee is concentrating on the faculty, yet our committee felt so keenly its importance that a large portion of its first report in May 1963 was devoted to it. The main recommendations to be made are general: do everything possible to improve the present status of the faculty, including better salaries, recognition, and reduction of teaching load. The student committee criticizes our average class size (their view of teaching over-loads?) more than any other feature of our educational program.

Another aspect of the faculty problem must be mentioned-- the turnover especially among young instructors in large departments such as English. Students often become strong supporters of young instructors only to find they are not rehired after their two- or three-year tenure, and they protest. There may be some justification in their complaints,



for they have not made the degree of personal contact with the senior professors that they have with the instructors and their sense of loss is greater for the young poet than it would be for the relatively unknown scholar with tenure and high rank. A simple but partial solution exists: require that senior professors share in the instruction of freshman-sophomore courses. If they could contact the eighteen-year mind, maybe they too would be more appreciated. On other grounds, too, the rotation and spreading of the teaching duties more evenly among all staff members is a wise one: let the ablest people teach the youngest minds; let some young instructors get acquainted with juniors and seniors; let every professor share in the teaching of the distribution courses.

J. Instructional Methods: Detailed analysis of the instructional techniques used in every course has not been possible. Answers given to relevant questions in the departmental inquiry are not complete. There is a tendency to teach wholly by lecture in some departments; by conference and discussion in others. One or two courses in business and in education are taught by role-playing almost exclusively. One department, psychology, has used programmed text books for part of one course and recommends them strongly for rote aspects of learning. Several departments have tried closed-circuit television; some continue to favor it (including fine arts) and some (including philosophy) have found it unsuccessful.

Some sentiment exists for abolishing the final three-hour examination and some for restoring it in all courses. No simple conclusion here.

K. Scheduling of Classes: In spite of the large number of courses and class sections, it is possible that not enough courses are offered in a given semester. Case: one student entering in 1962 scored well enough on the language placement examination to be assigned to the second semester course in that language, i.e., 102. But there was no 102 offered in the fall semester in that language, or, for that matter, in any modern language. Against the student's wishes, enrollment in speech was necessary as the only way to "fill up a program." The 102 courses, in due time, were offered in the spring semester but by now the placement advice from the department was changed and the student was advised that, because of lapse of time and possibly other factors, he should begin a new language. The student did so but was required to attend the summer session of 1963 to catch up. Meanwhile the freshman year was drastically altered, not to say botched badly, through no fault of the student. Obviously no recommendation or no new principles are pertinent here. It is simply bad management if the required distribution courses are not made available.

L. Numbering of Courses: In the proposed review of courses and program, it is hoped that attention will be given to re-numbering all first courses as 200-level or as 100-level. Despite the feeling of some departments that their basic courses start at the sophomore level, they do, more and more, permit freshmen to take them. Hence they should be re-numbered to be alike. There is no educational justification for

numbering history and science courses as 100-level while numbering other social sciences and humanities 200-level. Probably all of them are really 200-level in content and probably the easiest resolution of the issue would be to number all beginning courses 201-202. Naturally this leaves the freshman without "purely freshman" courses; this could be an advantage.

#### Recommendations of the Steering Committee

Without attempting to propose in detail a plan for a revised curriculum, the steering committee does recommend certain major steps which in our judgment would bring our curriculum in line with the purpose and aims of the College as these have been stated earlier in this report. These recommendations are intended as an outline, a sketch. The precise details are secondary in importance and they might be filled in by different hands in this way or in that without altering the main configuration of the picture. In any event, the details can be decided only by the faculty after close study of particular problems. But such study will be no more than futile tinkering with the machinery unless certain broad ideas are established as a framework.

We have said that the primary purpose of the College is "to educate men and women whose particular individual skills and abilities will derive meaning from a broad vision of the good life and the good society," and we have further defined liberal education as "concerned with the pursuit of truth: truth about the nature of man, his culture, and the universe in which he lives." The vision of the good life and the pursuit of truth are ideal ends to which the best curriculum can be only an imperfect means. Yet if liberal education in this sense is indeed the primary purpose of the College, certain corollaries about the curriculum seem to be inescapable. In the first place, our curricular arrangements must insure that this kind of education takes clear precedence over any and all professional, vocational, or technical considerations. Second, this education must be conceived of as a coherent experience, an interrelated total program, and not as the accumulation of a prescribed number of more or less interchangeable course credits. And third, whatever particular direction this experience may take for any individual student, an education at William and Mary must contain a large measure of common or at least comparable experience for all students.

We believe that our undergraduate curriculum should be revised by taking the first radical and salutary step of forgetting the system of course credits and defining a degree program primarily as the satisfactory completion of a fixed number of solidly academic courses. This change would of course mean that standards for determining normal progress toward a degree and other academic requirements, including recommendations on these matters made elsewhere in this report, would have to be translated from our present system into the new one. The change would also involve problems in handling transfer students to and from the College. But these problems can be solved, and in fact the shift to a new system of counting courses rather than credits would itself

eliminate more problems than it raises.

We propose that the fundamental requirement for both the A.B. and the B.S. degrees be the satisfactory completion of 32 semester courses in academic subjects. If these courses are rigorously defined to eliminate the peripheral activities which now receive academic credit, the new requirement would not represent any diminution in the content of a degree program. We would expect, first, that the 32 academic courses would become more demanding. Second, the reduction in the minimum number of courses would open the way for several desirable enrichments of the curriculum. We intend that the basic requirement of 32 courses would be supplemented in several ways. A student's normal load would be four academic courses per semester. During his first two years he would take required physical education courses in addition to his academic ones, as he does now. Throughout his college career he would be responsible for independent reading, over the summer as well as during the regular session, on which he would be examined either directly or in connection with his courses. This reading would be tied in with integrative courses at the sophomore and senior levels, and, in the last two years, with comprehensive examinations in his major field. It might also be related to "great books" discussions and to colloquia in a four-year honors program.

Subject to suitable limitations, a student would be permitted to carry more than the minimum number of academic courses. He could also take a reasonable number of non-credit courses in military science, secretarial science, home economics, and such other subjects as the faculty might define as non-academic. These courses would continue to be offered, and there would be room for them in the programs of students who desire them; but they would be taken for their intrinsic merit without any confusion over their relevance to an academic degree in liberal arts and sciences.

From 16 to 18 of the 32 academic courses would be basic courses in the areas of foreign languages, the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences and mathematics. We propose to avoid the term "distribution courses" in favor of a more precise differentiation of general education into (1) courses which are introductory and exploratory in nature and (2) those which are summary and integrative. The first kind should naturally come in the freshman and sophomore years. These courses provide tools (as in elementary foreign languages) and the necessary background of information; they also open the eyes of young students to possibilities they may not have dreamed of. Our requirements in this area should allow fully for advanced placement and credit when students come to us well prepared. The second kind of summary and integrative course is appropriate both at the sophomore and the senior levels. We wish to encourage experimentation with both kinds of general education courses and with the integrative type at both sophomore and senior levels.

Of the 16 to 18 courses devoted to general education, we propose that 4 be in the area of physical sciences and mathematics, 4 in the

social sciences, 6 in the humanities, and 2 to 4 in foreign languages. We believe that precise requirements in these areas can be worked out, which will allow considerable flexibility and at the same time insure more genuine community between alternatives than often obtains at present.

From 8 to 10 courses at the junior and senior levels would constitute the concentration or major and the remaining 4 to 8 would be elective. Departments should assume much more authority in advising their concentrators and seeing that their whole programs are coherent than some apparently do now. This does not mean that every detail must be spelled out in written requirements.

We do not think a concentration program in secondary education is appropriate in a college of liberal arts and sciences or that it is the best way to prepare accredited teachers. We recommend that this concentration be abolished. We would set up an inter-disciplinary committee of persons in professional education and the secondary school teaching fields to devise and supervise a superior program for preparing accredited teachers through a concentration in an academic field and the necessary professional courses, some of which might be taught in academic departments rather than in the department of education. In elementary education the concentration is appropriate and we would continue it.

We also recommend abolition of all the pre-professional programs operated on a combined plan between this College and other institutions, including the combined program in law with the Marshall-Wythe School of Law. These programs are unnecessarily professional and experience shows that very few students follow them anyway. This recommendation does not mean, of course, that pre-medical, pre-engineering, pre-law, and other pre-professional preparations could not be obtained in four years at this College; we recommend abolishing only the combined arrangement in which part of the undergraduate work is done at another institution. The topical majors as originally conceived at this College are in another category and might well be recreated.

Because it is essential that an undergraduate education at William and Mary be a whole coherent experience, we urge that the policy of admitting transfer students and evaluating their credits take this principle into account. The nature of the institution from which they come and the kind and quality of work they have accomplished is far more important than the number of course credits which can be discovered in their records. For the same kind of reason, we recommend that no academic credit be allowed for military service or military training or on the basis of General Educational Development tests.

We think there should be no distinction drawn in theory between the A.B. and the B.S. degrees. While it will doubtless remain true that students pursuing a science will probably study German rather than Greek, it is not always true that this is best for them and in any case their choice should rest on more enlightened grounds than compulsion.