

CHAPTER II

A YEAR OF PLANNING

On September 1, 1967, Robert G. Bone stepped down as president and Samuel E. Braden took over as the University's tenth chief executive officer. A faculty selection committee, chaired by Warren Harden, Head of the Department of Economics, had worked months screening and interviewing candidates before making its recommendation to the Board of Governors. Born in China to missionary parents and educated at the University of Oklahoma and the University of Wisconsin, Braden came from Indiana University where, in over twenty years of service, he had climbed the academic ladder to professor of economics and then was drawn into administration, becoming in 1959 Vice President and Dean of Undergraduate Development. His appointment as president of Illinois State was viewed by the University community as a fortunate and happy choice of a person who would bring to the University substantial faculty and administrative experience to assist the institution in charting its next decade of growth.

Samuel E. Braden served as the tenth president for only three years, 1967 to 1970, but they proved to be among the most vital and tumultuous years in the University's history. In addition to the multiple and chronic problems of institutional growth, which routinely produced crises of one sort of another, it was a time when student and faculty activism peaked, when some within the University community sought to plunge the school into the troubled waters of the anti-Vietnam war movement, when campus emotionalism, unrest, and disturbances over race became nightmarish contradictions of that rationality and calm traditionally associated with the academic enterprise. It was also a time when the University had to establish a relationship with a

new governance system, the Board of Regents, which in turn needed to define its own governing policies. Finally, it was a time when the State of Illinois discovered itself to be in poor fiscal condition and imposed budgetary restraints on higher education. It was in this framework of turmoil and uncertainty as well as growth that the University, under President Braden, sought to give meaning and scope to its designation as a “developing liberal arts University.”

The direction of further University development had been earlier outlined by the Board of Higher Education in the second phase of its “Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois.” Coming only a year after Illinois State ceased to be a single purpose institution, Master Plan-Phase Two sketched the University’s new purpose in a way few people a short time earlier would have thought possible. Approved in December, 1966, after months of study, Phase Two recommended a comprehensive program of educational expansion to meet the predicted doubling of college enrollments in Illinois by 1977. The document came to dominate campus thinking, aspiration, and expectation about the University’s future for the next several years. Among its major recommendations, Master Plan-Phase Two proposed placing the “developing liberal arts universities,” Illinois State and Northern Illinois University, under a new Board of Regency Universities with the objective of “developing doctoral programs designed to prepare college professors.” The two Regency Universities were to confine their doctoral planning efforts to the liberal arts and sciences “with only a limited number of associated graduate professional schools, usually education or business administration,” as the best course to meet their challenge of filling the “vast and growing need for college and university teachers.”

During the 1966-67 school year and prior to President Braden’s coming, the University’s Committee on Campus Planning conducted a sweeping assessment of future institutional requirements. The Committee’s report was published in July, 1967, as a “Blueprint for the Future, 1967-1977.” While acknowledging that the expansion of graduate programs to prepare college teachers had immediate priority as directed by the Master Plan, the committee focused on a larger problem: preparation for a projected enrollment range of 21,000 to 28,000 students within ten years. It was a staggering prediction. Based on conservative

estimates, each year for ten years the University would have to provide 1,250 additional beds, recruit faculty for 100 new positions, and fill 100 new civil service jobs. The impact on the town of Normal and its ability to provide services to the University, especially water, would be equally great. What the additions of students, faculty, and staff meant, of course, was that the University had to embark at once upon an ambitious program of curricular expansion, land acquisition, building construction, and assistance to the community. The Planning Committee emphasized that state funding had to be forthcoming if the University was to meet its responsibilities to the state's college-age youth. But beyond the conclusion that the University would become larger and that more of everything would be needed in the coming decade, the "Blueprint" did not presume to define the University's new multipurpose functions.

Evidence of growth could already be seen everywhere when President Braden assumed leadership of the University in September, 1967, and there was grounds for optimism about the future. The state legislature had completed work on the 1967-69 biennial operating budget during that summer and Illinois State's increase of 40% over the previous biennium (from \$27.5 million to \$38.4 million) gave the school resources to continue its pattern of growth. Four buildings, valued at \$20 million, were under construction: a 28 floor residence hall complex, a large addition to the administration building, a classroom building, and a structure to serve as a food storage center for university-operated dormitories. In addition, it was expected that bids for a \$19 million union-dormitory complex would be opened in November. Enrollment topped 11,000, a fourteen percent increase over the previous year, while the faculty numbered 850, a quarter of whom were as new as President Braden (100 of the new faculty filled new positions). A College of Business came to life that September, as well as a new interdisciplinary graduate program in Western European Studies.

Thus, the University's condition when Samuel E. Braden became president was the result of its transformation from a "normal school" to a general purpose university. Some changes had already occurred but more were anticipated. As President Braden cautioned, even before his arrival, no one could rest content with the current state of things. "The changes of the past

century and especially those of the last decade have been remarkable, but they are not finished. The challenge of the next decade is for us to build new areas of strength without weakening any now in existence and worthy of continuance." What those new areas of strength should be and where they would lead the University was the heart of the problem confronting the University, its new president, and its faculty. Indeed, President Braden insisted that the entire academic community participate fully in decisions regarding the University's future development. A month after his arrival he told a faculty meeting that an "academic plan" was crucial to meet the challenges of the coming decade. And though a committee headed by Dean Richard R. Bond, vice president for academic affairs, was already at work, President Braden recognized that the final outcome depended upon the aspirations and planning of the faculty within the departments. He urged the departments, therefore, to consider what programs they wished to establish within ten years and to determine as best they could the human and financial resources necessary to reach their goals. The ten year department plans would then become the raw materials from which the Academic Planning Committee, comprised of the college deans and faculty representatives, would construct a comprehensive plan for the whole University.

Although planning was urgent, everyone recognized that the process could not be completed quickly. First the department faculties had to act, their proposals to be screened by each college before going to the University Planning Committee. In addition, specific interdisciplinary programs in higher education, health professions, international education, and continuing education would come from special task forces appointed by Dean Bond. Once a preliminary draft of a plan had been prepared, it would be reviewed by the Academic Standards and University Curriculum Committees, the vice presidents, college deans, and then presented to the faculty of each college for discussion and reaction. The revised version would then be ready for final campus approval by the University Council before submission to the Board of Regents. It was not to be an easy process. It required hundreds of hours of discussion and compromise, but it was the only way to assure that the administration and faculty agreed on the University's goals and would work harmoniously

to achieve them. From start to finish, the process required nineteen months to complete.

The Academic Plan approved by the University Council in March, 1969, was an extraordinary statement of where the University hoped to be within a decade. Little escaped the attention of the planning committee, coordinated by Warren Harden, in its presentation of the six major components of the academic enterprise: admissions, undergraduate education, graduate programs, research, public service, and administrative structures. Change and more change into the future was the quintessential message of the document. To that end, evaluation and review of programs, faculty, and administrators must become an established exercise, for only by the constant attention to what is and consideration of what ought to be, could the University hope to adjust, modify, and add to its programs to remain responsive to the interests and demands of society. Admission standards and selection procedures must remain firm to assure a quality student body. The enrollment mix in the years ahead would emphasize, according to Master Plan recommendations, upper division and graduate students, with the size of the freshmen class remaining constant after 1970. By 1979, therefore, the University could expect to have over two-thirds of its campus population in the last semesters of undergraduate education or working in a graduate program. Although the Plan laid out a timetable for the planning and implementation of fourteen masters, eighteen sixth year, and fourteen doctoral programs by 1979, following the mandate of the Master Plan, undergraduate development received equal attention. In fact, the Academic Plan's basic assumption was that the strength and quality of the University depended upon its undergraduate programs. General education and department majors and minors must be reviewed by both faculty and students; administrators would be evaluated in terms of their leadership in undergraduate program development; new programs, indeed, the whole undergraduate curriculum, whether in terms of regular programs or continuing education, must achieve flexibility to facilitate student interest and society's needs; international education should be increased substantially to acquaint students with the riches and diversity of world cultures. The Plan listed seventeen new undergraduate programs, majors, and degrees in

various stages of development, all, hopefully, to be implemented in the coming decade. Finally, whatever the level or direction of academic development, the Plan stressed the value to the University of faculty research and public service, no less than its commitment to teaching, for only through research and service would the University maintain its quality and attain distinction and recognition.

In retrospect, the Academic Plan of 1969 must be seen as the cumulative outcome of the earlier efforts to change the University's name and single purpose function. The plan was an ambitious projection of Illinois State University upward to a level in higher education comparable to that of the leading institutions of higher learning. In the context of the times, it represented the fullest dimensions of the faculty's aspirations and goals, however idealistic from the vantage point of a later time. If achieved, the University would "leap frog" to a higher status. But there was a condition upon which the transformation of aspiration into reality depended. From the very outset of the planning process, President Braden, Dean Bond, and other central administrators recognized that institutional goals, however grandly stated, depended "upon the kind of financial priority the State of Illinois accords higher education." As President Braden remarked at his first faculty meeting, "We must work toward a quantum jump in our financial and human resources." Without adequate funding, little in the University would change.

In December, 1967, with academic planning underway, preparation of the capital and operating budgets for the 1969-71 biennium was initiated by President Braden. Ideally an academic plan should have been available as a basis for preparing the budget requests, but it was not possible to wait until one was ready. An informal coordination of the two activities, however, did develop in several ways. The weekly meetings of the vice presidents with President Braden, known as the "presidency," the meetings of the college deans with Dean of Faculties Richard Bond and the department heads with their college dean—all provided a flow of information vertically within the University. In addition, Dean Bond was chairman of the faculty committees responsible for the academic plan and advising President Braden on the policies, guidelines, and procedures to be used in making the operating budget; he was also a member of the Campus Plan-

ning Committee, chaired by President Braden, which determined the need for new buildings. Finally, the Coordinator of Budgets, John Sealock, asked the academic departments to estimate the budget requirements of new programs and other activities being planned for the future. By various means, then, budget preparation and academic planning became interconnected, accepting as starting points that enrollment would double in ten years and that the Master Plan-Phase Two imposed on the institution the mission to develop undergraduate and graduate programs to make it into a "liberal arts university."

The capital budget was ready first, in July, 1968, totalling \$47.7 million and including six projects with a construction cost of \$37.3 million. The most important was an \$11 million first phase of a new library complex with a minimum holding capacity of one million volumes, study space for 7,000 students, and carrels for graduate students and faculty. As the budget document stated, without such a library facility available for use within a few years it would be futile to attempt the addition of graduate programs, so dependent were those programs upon adequate library resources. The other construction projects, also important to the University's future expansion, were a general service and storage building, housing for the College of Business, a music auditorium, the first phase of a new complex for the physical and natural sciences, and an addition to the women's physical education plant. In addition, the capital budget requested funds for equipment, utilities, site improvements, and remodeling of older structures. Finally, as a portent of things to come, the University needed \$2.8 million for land acquisition, a half million to plan for five building projects to be proposed in the 1971-73 biennium, and a contribution toward the Town of Normal's street improvement plans necessitated by the growing number of student cars. The University's capital requests were modest compared to the proposals of other Illinois public universities—in fact, only ten percent of the state total—yet what the University wanted was nearly three times larger than its capital appropriation for the 1967-69 biennium. Locally, the capital budget was astounding evidence of the University's greater immediate expansion.

In September, 1968, the proposed operating budget for 1969-71 was completed and presented to the Board of Regents and the Board of Higher Education. Overall the University asked

for a \$30 million increase above its appropriation for 1967-69, a jump from \$38.4 million to \$68.5 million. As great as the requested increase appeared, nearly 90 percent of the total was dictated by formula of the Board of Higher Education or required by state law over which the University had little control, assuming its enrollment projections of 15,353 in 1969 and 17,589 in 1970 were accurate. The remaining ten percent, however, was the University's request for "new money" above the formula, totalling \$7.1 million and representing those curricular and programmatic changes and additions regarded as a beginning toward the realization of the University's new mission.

Of the new money, \$1,407,058 would allow the implementation of undergraduate majors in geology, social work, and law enforcement administration; master's degrees in social work, law enforcement administration, computer science, recreation, and public administration; sixth year graduate work in English, industrial technology, chemistry, business administration, and business education; doctoral programs in geology, history, psychology, English, curriculum and instruction, and speech, with doctoral planning in special education, mathematics, sociology, and guidance and counseling. In addition, \$1,513,386 was for new instructional and research centers and institutes in the allied health professions, higher education, continuing education, teacher education, deviant behavior and social control, culturally disadvantaged pre-school children, applied economics, economic education, and fluid power. Improvement plans for existing programs came to \$1,288,317, while special additions for the library, science equipment, and computer services totaled \$1,365,520. Finally \$1,118,835 was intended to underwrite faculty research and graduate assistants as necessary adjuncts to the new graduate programs, and provide matching funds for those federal and corporate grants which the University hoped to obtain.

The new money element of the University's combined capital and operating requests of \$116.2 million for 1969-71 was in the faculty's view the most daring and important. For one thing, the \$7.1 million for new and expanded programs stood in sharp contrast to the \$341,500 for the same purpose included in the last appropriation, an amount which suggested that the University might become only a larger version of its older self. The new

proposals appeared to be tangible evidence to the older faculty of the University's commitment to the change of purpose which many of them had long worked for; to the recently hired faculty, who were easily a majority of the total, the \$7.1 million appeared to be proof of an institutional determination to achieve the status of a major university as they had been told would happen. Or so it all seemed during the school year of 1967-68.

While academic planning and budget preparation were crucial activities, a myriad of other tasks, problems, and issues occupied the Braden administration. To begin with, attention had to be given to the prosaic details and inescapable routine of institutional life. The continued patterns of enrollment growth, frequently beyond budgeted projections, created shortages of housing, classroom and laboratory space, course scheduling, textbooks, and parking; problems which demanded time-consuming treatment. The process of locating, screening, and interviewing new faculty seemed never to end for department and division heads. And hanging as a pall over the University were the councils, committees, task forces, and boards, the inevitable consequence of both the academic style and university growth, each requiring time and energy of faculty, administrators, and, before the year was out, a number of students. By the spring of 1968, the committee situation had become so alarming to one member of the faculty governing body that he proposed that a ceiling be fixed on the number of assignments one person could be expected to accept.

The emergence of the student power movement in 1967-68 also came to challenge the importance and urgency of determining the scope of the University's new mission and function. Student interest in university affairs grew only slowly in the early Sixties, with a small number of students serving on a few committees dealing with extracurricular matters. Student government generally limited its time to the traditional aspects of campus life, highlighted by the elections of class officers, homecoming queens, and "Mr. Grunt," while the student newspaper, *The Vidette*, dutifully reported University events and news. There were stirrings in the student body, though few on campus at the time believed that it meant much. Students had already participated in the name-change controversy and responded to the humanitarian idealism of the Peace Corps, but by 1965 new

issues were taken up. The University's *in loco parentis* policies became a target for student criticism. The Association of Women Students circulated a petition in favor of liberalizing the curfew hours enforced in the girls' dormitories. Indignation was expressed over the conditions of racial inequality and injustice in the South. When Martin Luther King and his civil rights marchers encountered violence at Selma, Alabama, the senior class advisory board sent letters and telegrams of protest to Congress and President Johnson. A few weeks later, the Student Senate, aided by SNCC representatives, recruited and contributed financial support to three local student volunteers who participated in the national effort to register black voters in the South.

The next year, 1966, the war in Vietnam was added to the list of student concerns. Two student organizations sprang to life in response to the mounting public debate over the nation's foreign policy, the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF), formed in 1964, defending the country's involvement in Southeast Asia and the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) organized in February, 1966, critical of the Vietnam War. Neither group had many members, nor did their spasmodic activities attract more than curious stares. But their very existence, as well as other student activities and the advent of the hippie life-style on campus, were symptomatic of a beginning consciousness and sensitivity within the student population to those problems and issues of American life which transcended the social swirl and academic drudgery of traditional campus life. It is doubtful that many would have agreed with a *Vidette* editorial of 1965 which claimed for all students that "This has been the winter of our discontent. This has been the winter we suddenly began to see ourselves as student-citizens and to have the imagination to act in that role." Whether true or not, student interests and values were changing by the middle Sixties and the activities of 1967 made that transformation clear to everyone on campus.

Several issues raised student activity to a level that commanded attention in 1967. The fall semester had hardly started when agitation began for the abolition of women's hours. Considering the changes already made in the student code, the issue was not momentous, but it was important as a symbol of the older policy of *in loco parentis*. Campus leaders, like student body president Walt Dare, social science senior from Farmington,

moved the issue along. Several large outdoor meetings were held in September, one attracting 500 people including President Braden and Richard Hulet, vice president for student services, both of whom were sympathetic listeners; a survey of women's attitudes on the issue was taken, with positive results; both the University Housing Board and the Student Senate urged the administration to drop the curfew policy. After some hesitation, Dean Hulet on December 19 announced that hours for women would be dropped as soon as possible in favor of a self-regulating policy to be determined by the women themselves. It was a small triumph when measured against later events, yet it was a symbolic victory for student leaders seeking to influence university policy.

And more followed quickly. As Walt Dare and other students warned that fall and winter, in the Student Senate and on pages of the *Vidette*, student concerns about the rigidity of general education requirements, the depersonalization of large lecture classes, the quality of teaching, and the dubious value of final exams, could no longer be ignored by the administration and the faculty. Students had a right, it was claimed, to expect that the University would serve their interests, assist them in their search for "life experiences" (the University was deemed to be life itself), and recognize their ability to determine what was best for themselves. The faculty, some students insisted, could not be trusted to help students reach their goals, for faculty were a cynical, self-serving lot preoccupied with research and other personal activities that lacked "relevance" to the real world of the young. Students, therefore, had to rely upon themselves to promote and protect their interests and rights through representation on University committees dealing with curriculum and other substantive matters and by means of course evaluations to expose the indifferent and incompetent members of the faculty.

Although the views expressed were those of only a handful of campus activists, the University made a carefully measured response. Dean Bond proposed to the University Council that students be placed in an advisory capacity on the curriculum, general education, and teacher education bodies. The Council approved the plan and at the same time established a joint faculty-student panel to examine more fully the role of student involvement in school affairs and the composition of student-faculty

boards. Chaired by Professor Charles Hicklin of the Council, an opening hearing in May attracted 25 to 30 students who demanded the immediate inclusion of students at all levels of policy-making, including membership on the University Council and the Board of Regents. Academic departments were encouraged by Dean Bond and the college deans to develop methods of evaluating teaching that would include students. Dean Hulet's student services area approved a Student Senate plan to conduct a student survey of general education courses; published and distributed free in the spring as the *Dyad*, the judgments on individual faculty were usually titillating but not always constructive nor accurate. President Braden announced his intention to keep open hours every Thursday afternoon to hear student views and complaints, a general policy followed by other administrators as well. The steps taken were neither dramatic nor a knee-jerk response to the drum beat of the student power movement; nor were the results very encouraging. But administrative and faculty leaders were sensitive to the difficulties and disturbances already occurring on other campuses when students were ignored, and they readily admitted their concern in campus and community talks. Equally important to the University's response was the decade-long practice, initiated by retired President Bone, of encouraging student leaders to involve themselves in more than dances and homecoming parades, the increasing numbers of new faculty whose ages and outlook were not much different from those of the students they were teaching, and the open-mindedness of President Braden's administration. As President Braden remarked on different occasions, students of the Sixties were more mature, knowledgeable and sensitive to the issues of society than those of his college days, and they were ready for larger responsibilities in the academic enterprise of which they were a part. What those responsibilities should be and how the principle of accountability could be applied were questions that could be resolved by reasonable people.

Another dimension of campus life claiming attention in 1967-68 was the rising student concern over social and political issues. The range of interests and activities was broad, but all expressed that generation's eagerness to seek out and correct the ills and injustices of society, revealing along the way a quick impatience with delay and compromise. The war in Vietnam was the special

though not only concern of the SDS, led that year by Lee Hayward, senior from Des Plaines, which sponsored a number of speakers on draft resistance, showed antiwar films, and distributed literature condemning the so-called repression within American society. Free in spirit and dress, contemptuous of conventions and authority, and argumentative worshippers of four letter words, the small cadre of SDS members, students and faculty alike, were at this time no more than a colorful fragment of campus life, a curiosity in the Student Union where they could usually be found. Some in the Bloomington-Normal community, however, saw them as radicals plotting the destruction of American institutions, warning President Braden of the danger and demanding that he root out the subversives. In reply, the President warned of the greater danger to freedom if a university violated its time-honored trust to examine all ideas and their expression, however peurile or unpopular they might be judged.

Of greater significance was the involvement of university people in the local debate over race discrimination in housing. Concern and indignation over the conditions and practices of racial injustice in American society had been slowly growing among students and faculty for several years, though the increased sensitivity to the need to root out prejudice and discrimination had not as yet been translated into action. That changed abruptly and dramatically in 1967-68 over the issue of open housing in Normal. Although the neighboring town of Bloomington had earlier passed a strong ordinance as urged by that city's NAACP chapter, the Normal Town Council rejected the recommendation of its own Human Relations Commission, chaired by Professor Harold Born of the Physics Department, that a similar ordinance outlawing discriminatory housing practices be adopted for Normal. Instead, the Town Council on September 18, 1967, approved a weaker measure that excluded owner-occupied one and two-family houses from its provisions, and revealed in the course of its discussions that some council members had a strong distaste if not hostility to any admission that Normal might need a fair housing law.

Controversy erupted at once. A petition signed by over 2,000 residents expressed opposition to any open housing law, while the Human Relations Commission, the University NAACP, and individual faculty and students voiced indignation, at Council

meetings and in the local press, over the town's reluctance to stamp out fully unfair housing practices. Feeling the pressure from all sides, the Town Council decided to put the issue before the community in a referendum, a delaying tactic that further outraged the Council's critics. Student leaders brought the issues before the Student Senate on November 7. In a packed meeting also attended by the NAACP and SDS, a heated discussion took place between Gordon Jaeger, the Town Administrator, and Council member William Hammitt on one side and student leaders on the other, and in the end the Senate formally condemned the Town Council for its "blatant disregard of moral law and the university student code" when it passed Ordinance 681, which "makes bigotry legal" in the community. The next day an angry Gordon Jaeger demanded a public apology from the Student Senate for the insulting action and disrespect shown the Town Council, and though Jaeger later apologized for his own intemperate words and agreed to reopen discussions with Walt Dare and other student leaders, fuel had been added to the fire.

Activities increased noticeably in the weeks before Christmas break. The University Council named a special committee under Carroll Peterson to study the issue and in mid-December affirmed that the University's historic policies and rules clearly and unequivocally prohibited discrimination according to race in all student housing. The Student Senate held a speakout on Ordinance 681 at which there was talk of a student boycott of Normal businesses and other ways to influence the Town Council. Sensing that a boycott would probably not be effective, the Student Senate planned instead a protest march for December 3. Three hundred people, mostly white students and faculty, assembled that Sunday to hear various speakers, including Charles Morris, a new black assistant professor of mathematics, who told of the humiliating experiences his family suffered when house-hunting in Normal; the crowd then walked along the sidewalks in orderly fashion to the City Hall and back to the campus, singing "We Shall Overcome." But the Town Council, meeting the next day, was unmoved by the march or the protestors who filled the meeting room; it refused to alter its position on open housing. Daily picketing of the City Hall, under the watchful eye of Normal police, began on December 7 by "US," a community civil rights group, and the Student Senate sponsored

a second protest march on December 13 which brought 170 people out on a cold Wednesday afternoon. The University's Christmas vacation and continued cold weather brought this activity to a temporary stop, but it resumed again in February, 1968, as the time neared for the March 4 referendum. From February 17 through February 28, the NAACP conducted protest marches to the City Hall every Monday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday, dodging police who sought to prevent the demonstrations from blocking street traffic. Unlike earlier marches, those conducted by the NAACP involved more black students, some of whom carried "Black Panther" signs, symbolic of the rising movement of black power across the nation. If the last marches were intended to influence community voting on March 4, the results of the open housing referendum must have been disappointing to the student-faculty demonstrators. In a fairly good voter turnout, nearly as many people were opposed to any sort of open housing law as were in favor of Ordinance 681 or something stronger, ending the episode on an anticlimatic note.

Yet the energetic support given to open housing by students and faculty did have several important consequences. First, the efforts of university people, especially students, to influence Town Council decisions angered many local residents as an unwarranted and unwelcomed intrusion into community affairs. It was bad enough that University growth created fire-protection, water, sewerage, and traffic problems and raised taxes for everyone, but it was an intolerable situation when young people tried to tell the Town's officials what they should do. Students, of course, rejected that view, as a *Pantagraph* reporter's poll of 50 students suggested; 75 percent of those questioned felt that students should have a voice in town affairs. But as Gordon Jaeger warned President Braden in mid-December, the community condition was tense if not explosive because of student activity: "It is my feeling that there is now more anti-University sentiment than there has probably been in one hundred years." Efforts of the past three years to improve town-gown relations over common problems would probably be destroyed by what the students and faculty have done, Jaeger concluded. Though he may have been testing the mettle of a new president by overstating his case, Jaeger was correct that the sensitive state of town-gown relations, already strained by the University's

changes and expansion, now required special attention. And while President Braden in the months ahead would work hard to repair the damage, he also alerted townspeople to expect continued student interest and activity in community affairs. Thus, local suspicion and distrust of students and faculty which appeared in 1967 died hard and remained a problem over the next several years.

A second consequence of the University's involvement in the open housing controversy was its contribution to an awakening within the University community to issues and problems of institutional race relations. It is difficult to pinpoint just when the process began, but certainly the civil rights movement, the message of Martin Luther King and the summer ghetto riots of angry black people disturbed the complacency of some University people sufficiently to prompt the University Council in 1962 to reaffirm the institution's 1871 statement of non-discrimination and to make it a part of the 1967 Student Code. Then, too, the University's NAACP and Human Relations Board became more active in the early and middle Sixties in response to national developments, while Dean Richard Bond, as the new academic vice president, appointed a committee in 1966 to consider what the University could do to help "culturally deprived" students. But it was open housing in Normal which awoke people to the fact that issues of equal rights and justice for all people was as much a local matter as it was a national concern. Certainly that was the message delivered by the few minority students and faculty on campus who told of their local experiences with prejudice and discrimination. It was also the message brought to the campus by guest speakers, particularly Charles Hamilton, co-author with Stokley Carmichael of *Black Power*, who castigated educational systems like Illinois State for their irrelevancy to the needs of black people and who urged unity and organization among black students as a way to remedy that educational problem. Finally, the assassination of Martin Luther King on April 4, 1968, and the demonstrations that followed were tragic proofs, if more were needed, of the need and urgency to eradicate racial bigotry and injustice. One thousand students, faculty, and townspeople attended a memorial service in Horton Fieldhouse on April 5 to honor the slain American leader.

As President Braden put it, the “institutional conscience” was disturbed, and a number of things were done. At the request of black student leaders representing the newly formed Black Student Association, and black faculty, administration discussions considered ways of increasing the number of minority students enrolled in the University. A “High Potential Students” program for 1968-69 was the result, an effort to recruit and retain “economically, culturally, or educationally deprived students.” With Professor Charles Morris as acting director and assisted by George Pruitt, senior from Chicago, and Lucille Smith, sophomore from Coal City, teams were sent to inner-city schools where 100 high school seniors were interviewed and thirty were invited to become HPS scholars under a special admissions waiver; nineteen applied through regular procedures. To help the University “understand better the fact of differentiation among social groups” and assist in the determination of appropriate policies, President Braden on May 15 named a Task Force on Inter-Group Relations, chaired by Vernon Pohlmann, Professor of Sociology, and consisting of people from all segments of the University. The Task Force was to plan a year-long campus emphasis on inter-group relations, encourage curricular innovations, explore community improvement projects, consider equal enrollment and employment opportunities for minorities, and promote research to increase society’s understanding of the problems of minorities. Although little time remained before the school year would end, Professor Pohlmann drove the Task Force to complete a report to President Braden by June 19, 1968, which recommended a long list of possible activities for 1968-69. In addition to speakers and programs for the coming year, high on the list of recommendations were the expansion of the HPS program to 100 students by 1969, with appropriate financial aid and support services; extra efforts to employ minority faculty, civil service, and student workers; special courses for 1969-69 on black life and culture and examination of regular offerings for biased content and materials; and a number of public service and research projects that would involve the University in social action. It was an ambitious set of proposals which, if fully implemented along with the HPS program, would end the University’s role as an “uninvolved intellectual enclave” apart from the society it was meant to serve.

Yet, while the University was being drawn into the student power movement and activities of social reform, it was also pursuing more ordinary academic business. Doctoral proposals in history and geography, the first since 1963, were approved by the University Council and the Board of Regents and sent on to the Board of Higher Education for final approval. The Council on General Education under Dean Henry Hermanowicz, after five years of study and review, completed a major revision and suggested changes in that requirement, which triggered the customary anguish and jostling among departments associated with such proposals. The Academic Standards Committee, headed by Ellen Kelly, Professor of Health and Physical Education, reported a pass/fail option, which the University Council approved, intending to encourage students to take courses outside their major-minor areas. International education activities, a special interest of President Braden and Dean Bond and directed by Theodore Sands, Professor of History, were advanced in a variety of ways. Summer programs for 1968 were opened at Grenoble, France, and Taiwan for ISU students, 40 Japanese teachers of English spent the summer on campus in special study groups, and an arrangement was completed to accept two Kenyan educators as administrative internees for 1968-69. A three-day campus festival in May, 1968, emphasized the importance and opportunities of international education in the university curriculum.

Considering all that transpired in President Braden's first year, it was an auspicious beginning. Most importantly, the University was on course in its need to define and clarify its new status as a developing liberal arts institution, and doing so in a campus environment that was open and free of those violent student demonstrations which had disrupted Columbia and Berkeley. Though not intended, the comparative calm of the University and the continuity of its growth and development became the unofficial theme of Samuel E. Braden's official inauguration on May 11, 1968, as the University's tenth president. The inaugural ceremony was in the best tradition of colorful costume, music, and distinguished guests, and like others of its kind, it was a happy social event. But President Braden could not refrain from sounding a serious note in addressing the members of the

academic community who came to honor him and the University. He said of the common elements which made them an academic community:

Unless we still find there the elements of honesty in investigation, integrity in the publication, freedom from bias in teaching, tolerance in discussion, self-motivation beyond the requirements of duty, respect in interpersonal relationships and genuine love for humanity, we have problems other people will gladly move in to help us solve. I detect no serious shortcomings in those areas at Illinois State. . .