Delmar T. Oviatt, Track 2

Reel 2

DS: Testing, one, two, three, four, now we've got some action here—

DO: As I indicated when we were here last time, I was delegated to come to the San Fernando Valley and do the initial planning for a branch of Los Angeles State College. I don't know how many different ways there are to stare—to start an institution of higher education. There are at least two that have been, have been followed as I have observed in these last years in California. One, is to do an extensive amount of pre-planning. To establish a hierarchy of leadership, and to have what might be considered as a basic program organized and housed and financed and developed. Before any serious effort is made to staff the program either with instructors or with students. And the other way is to bring in complete cross-section of everyone who will ultimately be involved, meaning students, teachers, and administration, and start the development altogether, as it were. Now, if we'd followed this second path, it means, then, that you, if you're going to have the services of the instructors and you're going to have an enrollment of students, then you have to begin to actually operate. And for better or for worse, we chose the second pattern of operation. I was asked to transfer to

(00:02:23)

the San Fernando Valley in July. By September, we had classes organized, and instructors on the job, and classes and instruction was being held two months after the initial appointment was made. As I say, I'm not sure which is the better way to do it, by contrast, Cal State Dominguez Hills had a president for five years before there was ever a class held. Five years of searching for a site, and developing the background that they felt was necessary to hold a college. The first classes, then, at San Fernando Valley State College, were really an extension of Los Angeles State. And the first classes were held at the San Fernando High School. We went to the San Fernando High School and leased space, they gave us a lease for ten rooms, and we went to the Los Angeles State College and borrowed faculty, since we were a part of the same institution, and we started that fall with the services of ten instructors, which would be the equivalent of forty classes. We had no bookstore, we had no library, we had—we had nothing but instructional space. It worked reasonably well. We had classes four nights a week, four afternoons a week, my office was down on Vermont Avenue, I would leave home at 7:00 in the morning and drive to Vermont Avenue, stay in Vermont Avenue until 3:00, and drive to San Fernando High School, and stay there until 7:00, till those last evening classes were started, and then drive home. I managed to pick up, as I recall, four traffic tickets during the year. And since I was the traveling bookstore, I would take orders and bring them out in my car. And as I recall, I lost thirty-seven dollars serving as the

traveling bookstore. So, from two points of view, it was not a practical situation, but at any rate, it was an interesting one. Meanwhile, they had, they, the Department of Finance had agreed to construct some bungalows on this campus. And quite frankly, one of the reasons for the quick initial start was to almost force the hand of the Department of Finance. If there were classes here, and if the college was started, then the provision of some kind of facilities was almost inevitable. And so, they began the construction of the bungalows. I think, at the—by the following September, as I recall, I think we had four such bungalows built. And for the next three years, we continued to build bungalows that had various rates, and with a certain sporadic activity, I suppose I had never noticed the frequency of workman's strikes before then, but every summer, someone in the building industry would strike, whether it was the gravel haulers, or the cement workers, or the tinsmiths, or the carpenters. And every year, we sweated out whether or not we were going to have any additional space. And so, then, in September of 1956, we had the bungalows, we had hired a staff of forty people, and we had a brave little ceremony over in front of what is now bungalow C, and we had a politician there, of course, you have to have a politician at all these things, and he made a little speech and we ran up the flag and everybody cheered and then we went off at 9:30 to teach our classes. And that was the, that was the beginning, as it were, of classes on this campus, September 1956. President McDonald was going to be president, now, of three colleges. He was President of City College, he was president of the Los Angeles, which had now gone, at that time, moved out to the east side, and he was President of this

(00:07:33)

college. It didn't work. It didn't work being president of three any better than it did when he used to be President of only two. One of the interesting things was, it was not until President McDonald came to this campus after college had started for the first time that he realized there was no place for him to sit down. They had not provided a President's office. And so, President McDonald came out and, I think he never realized until he came to the building, that there's no place for him to sit out here. So, I invited him into my office and made an excuse and left for some busy work, so that the President would come and sit in the Dean's office. And this didn't satisfy his sense of what was appropriate. He had a huge big Buick car, and on his infrequent visits, he was supposed to come one day a week out here, he very soon changed that and would come maybe once a month. And on his infrequent visits, he used to sit out in his Buick car and talk to people out in his car, his car was sort of his office. Now, two things, at this point, I want to—I want to emphasize. One was the concept of the service area. The state had––Department of—state Department of Finance or Education, whoever it was, had subdivided the state, as it were, into what they called service areas. And there's no problem setting up a service area around Fresno State College, there's none particularly difficult setting it up around Humboldt. But when you get into a metropolitan area, such as we had here, the drawing of service areas was important. Not only for our—the visiting of high schools and recruitment and things of this sort, but equally important for

the development of extension programs and other services to the college. The service area for the San Fernando Valley, then, was set to include all of the San Fernando Valley, the area of Westwood, and the Ventura County, and then they very graciously gave us the entire Owens Valley. So, our service area went as far as Mammoth, despite the fact that Fresno State College was much closer to that area than we were, it was over the mountains. Then in attempting to develop a college, you then have to say, What kind of a college, what kind of a program should we have to fit this particular service area? What kind of curriculum would the San Fernando Valley, which is essentially our service area, best support? And at this point, I have to confess that whoever is responsible for these things simply has to make a value judgment. There is no voice, so you can't go to the community and say, What kind of a college do you want? So, you make a value judgment as a result of talking to as many people and as many students and as many faculty, and so on, as you could. And so, then, it was established that we would attempt to follow what would, I suppose, be considered, certainly today, at any rate be considered, a traditional, liberal arts, pattern of curriculum. This meant, then, there would be emphasis and strong emphasis in the fields of academics, in the fields of the humanities, in the field of foreign languages and English, philosophy, psychology, sociology, history, mathematics. The one worry that was going to be most difficult to develop was the field of science, cause of all the so-called liberal arts, science is the one area that requires specialized space and specialized equipment. And the Department of Finance, although it was a rather difficult decision to us, refused to put—to build science laboratories in the bungalows. So

(00:12:43)

the result was that our science program was handicapped on this campus for a number of years. It was probably in the long run, a good decision, because it meant, then, that since they did not provide virtually any facilities in the bungalows, that the science building had to take precedent, and we got a good science facility at a rather early date. So, while it was hard going the first two or three years, it was probably in the long run, from the curriculum point of view, a helpful decision to the college. Then, on top of the liberal arts program, we added two "vocational", in quotes, curriculum. The one was in teacher preparation. At that time, the teacher shortage in the San Fernando Valley was acute. There were very few teachers who wanted to come out to the west Valley, and it was most difficult to get—to staff the schools. So, then, we started a teacher education, teacher preparation program. The second area that we began, and initially here, was a program in business. Again, the San Fernando Valley was essentially an area of small businesses, light industry, and programs in marketing, in accounting, and then general business procedures would tend, in our opinion, to serve the clientele, the taxpayer, of the San Fernando Valley. And so, then, we started in this pattern. The next question, of course, was within the pattern: what kind of activity, what level of excellence, what level of achievement do you aim at? We found that there were, at this time, the majority of the students from the San Fernando Valley, who were the degree seeking,

were going to USC or UCLA. In effect, as we looked around, we said these are our competitors. Now, they didn't consider us their competitor, but we thought of them as our competitor. In other words, if we were going to attract to this campus the support of students and the support of their families and the support of the business community in general, then we knew we would be compared to those kind of institutions in terms of the quality of instruction. So, there was a deliberate effort made from the very beginning to attempt to establish, academically, not in quantity, but at least as much as we could in quality, a program that would be comparable to institutions of that kind. How well we succeeded, of course, is hard to say, but, I think with no question that the administration and the faculty and I believe, to some extent, the near(??) the students accepted this concept of a curriculum that was traditional in its approach, and oriented, as it were, to the established programs. This was not, in any sense, an innovative institution. Not in any sense the kind of far-out academic structure that it might have been. Now, again, you see me, and this is simply a value judgment, a great many people say, wouldn't I love to start a college? I wouldn't start it anything like the old ones, you know? We'd be innovative in this, and this and this and this and this. Well, as I say, at any rate, the—the support that the San Fernando Valley State College received from the community, when I speak of the community now, I'm talking about the taxpayers, the PTA, the women's clubs, the Rotary Clubs, all the various groups, was never critical of the direction of which the college was going. Now, had we chosen to be the innovator, the far-out type institution, I don't know whether they would have been critical or not. Can't say, because it didn't happen. This meant, then, that the admission standards for the college hewed

(00:18:12)

the line very closely. At that time, the admission standards were set by the Board of Education. And they were fairly stringent. And so far as I know in those early years, there were zero exceptions to the standard qualifications. At the same time, in the recruitment of staff, some of the same sort of standards, or same sort of philosophy was at work. In staffing, since we were a branch of Los Angeles State College, our first choice of staff was from Los Angeles State College. Now, at that time, Los Angeles State College had about two hundred faculty members. President McDonald indicated in a staff meeting that the faculty, any faculty member who wished to transfer to the San Fernando Valley should send him a letter. He got one hundred letters from a staff of two hundred people. Now, that wasn't because the San Fernando Valley was so attractive. I told you the other day about the conflicts that had gone on, on that campus, Vermont campus, and at that time, we were still on the Vermont campus. So, in effect, it was sort of a reaction against the kind of conflict and the frictions and tensions that had been on that campus. Well, it meant, then, when we sat down to select faculty members, that we had a rather wide spectrum of choice. And the selection was made, essentially, to support the kind of curriculum that had been envisioned. The result was, then, that thirty faculty members from Los Angeles State College were transferred to the San

Fernando Valley that first year. We had a total of forty positions, thirty of them were filled form the San Fernando—er, from Los Angeles State College. We like to think that we got some of the finest academic teachers and finest academic scholars that Los Angeles State College had. And I'm sure that the Dean at the college thought so too. That is, the Dean of Los Angeles State College. There was a rather bitter confrontation over whether or not the choices would be limited to those people who had indicated their desire to come, or whether or not the president would allocate some others out here, and the person who was responsible for the academic program at Los Angeles State College actually proposed that I should select one faculty member and he would assign the second one, and we would just alternate. I would choose one, and he'd appoint one, and I'd choose one, so I would get the good one, and he would appoint one that he felt—he would like to be rid of. And, needless to say, this was not accepted, and went to negotiation to the president, and the President decided that the selection would have to be from those people who had indicated their willingness to come. This gave us, then, as a beginning college, a core of faculty who are used to working together. Gave us a core of faculty whose—whose selectivity had been carefully done. In addition to that, we devotion made sure that the recruitment from outside the college, so far as possible, reflected the same dedication, as it were, to the standard liberal arts type program. Of the ten that we hired, I have forgotten, I have to check out, but I think about eight out of the ten, had already earned doctorates. Now, the acquisition of an earned doctorate, let me say parenthetically here is no guarantee of good teaching, I sometimes think it's mostly a guarantee of patience and longevity. But at any rate, the position the doctorate does reflect, to some extent, the attainment of this devotion, or skill, or whatever you want to call it, in

(00:23:30)

scholarship. And for the succeeding years, the same kind of faculty search went on. The doctoral programs, at that time, this was, you see, from '56 through '60, '65. The number of doctorates who were coming out of the universities was rather small in comparison to demand. And the search for faculty was one of our major responsibilities. It was my opinion, at that time, and I think it was shared generally, that if you get the right type faculty, then the most of your worries about running a college are taken care of. If you get the wrong type faculty, then the numbers of problems you have in operating the college are never ending. So, the selection of faculty was, perhaps in my opinion, the most important contribution that any person could make to the leadership of the campus was to help pick faculty. And there was a very careful screening program set up, careful recruitment, we were much more zealous in the recruitment of faculty than in the recruitment of students. Great deal more time spent on the faculty recruitment. And we zeroed in, particularly on recruitment of faculty from outstanding eastern colleges, as well of course(??) from the outstanding colleges on the west coast. It was always an interesting trip to go out as a faculty recruiter, and try and explain to those people in Boston where the San Fernando Valley was, and what the San Fernando

Valley State College was. They had never heard of it. Fortunately, at that time, there had been a rather popular song, I'll make the San Fernando Valley my home. And every time there was a major scandal in Hollywood, it was always mentioned that one of the parties had a ranch in the San Fernando Valley. So, this kind of publicity helped us. The other big recruiter, big recruiting thing we had going for us, was the Rose Bowl. I would gear the recruiting trips always for February, when it was cold and miserable and snowy in Boston and Philadelphia, and the sight of the Rose Bowl and
the Rose Parade having been recently televised, and on January the 1st, particularly if there was a storm in the east on January the 1st, and most people would sit on their televisions and see the bathing beauties riding the floats, it was the best recruitment device that we had. The cameras in those days never got close enough to show the goose pimples on the girls, and the people who had snow on their windowsills couldn't believe that the climate here was what it appeared to be. One year, I remember, we did an underhanded thing. We had a book of pictures made up, showing the campus. And I would leave this in the outer offices, I would be recruiting and let the people who were coming in leaf through this book to get an idea, you know, there's a map of the valley and pictures, and so on. Two pictures in that book recruited more staff than any others. One was a picture of the students lined up, in shirtsleeves, registering. We had no big rooms to go into the register, and the students used to stand in lines outside the bungalows. And have a picture showing registration, February the 6th, 1958, with everybody in shirtsleeves. The other picture, was one that I always used to flip by and complain, "I don't know why they put this picture in, it simply shows one of our faculty member having a Christmas dinner on his patio." "What did you say?" (laughter) And, you know, you would belittle it, and flip the page over, and say it shouldn't have been put in. In other words, we sold the climate, we sold the news of the institution, we sold

(00:28:40)

the opportunities for advancement, as I say, it was an interesting kind of experience. The result was, then, that we deliberately, and when I say we, I don't mean myself only, I mean the entire college, attempted to establish this high-level academic pattern, measured as nearly as we could by whatever the faculty set as their standards. At one time, we would have, we had as many as forty-five percent of the freshman of this college on probation. Now, you may argue with that, and I could argue, but at any rate, the grading standards, and the academic requirements, were deliberately set by the faculty since the faculty gave the examinations, and so on, at a pretty high level. At that time, there was, in the education code, a spell-out of the grades that you had to have to come to state colleges. And there was what our registrar used to refer to as the escape hatch. Two percent of the student body did not have to meet that entrance requirements. This was so we could take in the councilman's son, and left-handed quarterbacks, or whatever other kind of exceptions you wanted. And as I say, as near as I recall, the exceptions, for a number of years at this college, were zero, or very nearly zero. Incidentally, parenthetically, let me suggest here that one of the people you ought

to have talk to this group, or some of you ought to talk to, is Mr. Robert Williams. He was the chief of our student admission services, and so on, at that time, and he could give you lots of insight into these early days. The first task, the first big—well, one of the first big tasks that we had—I told you the other day that Los Angeles State College was an upper division school. One of the first things we did was to ask for permission to bring in freshmen. This was one of the things, as I indicated, we turned as much of the curriculum development into committee structure as we could. This is one of the first things the faculty wanted, was to establish a lower division program. And this was done, we established one hundred level courses for the year 1957, and two hundred level courses for the year 1958. So, by the year 1959, we had a four-year college. We moved as rapidly as we could away from the two-year college concept. The—after that had been done, then the development, the curriculum development, moved in two directions. One was the addition of advanced
degrees in the field of master studies. And MA and MS programs were established in a variety of fields, I don't remember the order, but they were very carefully examined, and a number of them were sent back to departments for strengthening and revision. The—the second development, after we had a four-year college pattern, was the branching off into other areas. And so, while the business department, School of Business, had—Department of Business, it was called at that time—no, Division, Division of Business. While it had had, I think, the beginning, three majors, one in accounting, one in general business, and the other in business education, within—after these first two years, within the next three years, they had developed a program in marketing, they had developed a program in production management, they had developed a program in finance, and so on. The same thing happened, do you see, in other areas. Our Department of Sociology, for example, split and became a Department of Anthropology and a separate Department of Sociology. A Department of

(00:34:17)

Philosophy was established, a man was hired and brought here to head up the Philosophy department. And so, then, gradually, the development began to take place. At first, we had had three divisions. Education, the liberal arts, education, and business. The liberal arts school then split into two schools, and became the School of Fine Arts, in one case, and the School of Letters and Science in another, do you see? The Fine Arts, later, subdivided and became the Department of Art, the Department of Music. Then, the Department of Drama split off from the Department of Speech, which had been over in the School of Letters and Science. They split off, and changed schools, went over into the School of Fine Arts. And so, then, this gradual branching, bifurcation took place as the colleges develop. Two additional areas come to mind, curriculum-wise. One was the field of home economics. There was requests, particularly from the public schools, that we should begin to turn out home economics teachers, and after some debate, we moved into the school, into a Department of Home Economics. There was an equal pressure and request from the aerospace industry that we move into engineering. There

was a great debate about engineering, about whether this college should go into engineering or not. I pointed out that we had essentially recruited, almost purposely recruited, a faculty who were essentially traditional, liberal arts oriented, and so on. The addition of the engineering school was not, well, let me say, many of these liberal arts people oppose the development of the engineering school. They felt that it was a move toward a technical kind of school, it was not part of the liberal arts tradition, and they felt that it should be—remain at Cal Poly or wherever it was. I think that the engineering school essentially came in as a result of the—of the pressures of the aerospace industry, which at that time, of course, was growing very rapidly in the Valley, and they simply kept urging that we establish an engineering school. Another—another question came up in those early days, curriculum wise, was the request for the program in police science. This was debated, discussed, faculty, and eventually turned down. Another request for curriculum that received a great deal of debate and discussion on the campus was in the field of nursing. Should we establish a school of nursing or a department of nursing education, and this was discussed to great length and turned down.

USP: Was there ever an attempt to establish an ROTC?

DO: No.

USP: Or, USAR(??)?

DO: I don't know why. As I recall, we inquired at one time at the Chancellor's office, and got nowhere with the request. And there was no re—there was no particular incentive or no student request or anything of this kind for the ROTC program. Why nursing was turned down, I don't know, it's hard to tell. A number of the state colleges have nursing programs, the advisement we got was that the

(00:38:59)

nursing profession was a difficult profession to work with, organized nurses were difficult people to get along with, and whether that scared us or not, I don't know. But at any rate, there were—there were requests for various kinds of curriculums, I say, that for some reason or other, were turned down. This whole business of curriculum development has, from the very beginning on this campus, been largely faculty oriented. Now, as I say, let me say this, I would not want to leave any with the impression that the administration of the college did not have a significant role. But, essentially, it was a role that was shared with faculty, and those first years, the first year in particular, we had faculty meetings once a week, the total faculty met, there were forty of us. And we met on a regular basis, once a week. There was a big curriculum job, the development of the lower division program, and the faculty as a whole set out certain areas of curriculum, what they thought had to be developed, in order to have a strong lower division program. I recall, they referred to them as curriculum blocks, and then they split up into subcommittees, certain people worked on the communications

blocks, certain people worked in the fine arts blocks, certain worked somewhere else. Every faculty member was on a block, course it was only natural if they elected their own chairman and called him the blockhead. (laughter) And the development of the—the development of direction of this campus essentially embodied the administration and the faculty. There are two philosophies in higher education. One is that the faculty, representing essentially the classroom teachers, the people who are actually in the classroom day to day, ought to have their deliberations and their policy formation untainted by the administration. In other words, the theory is that you set up a subcommittee or a committee of faculty, and you put an administrator into that, that you, in effect, have that administration dominated. Are, there're very good arguments in favor of this. The faculty member probably has no tenure, and if he wants tenure, he doesn't want to be crossing the boss too often, do you see? And all these kinds of arguments. But the administration has to see that the process from a—through a different set of eyes than does the classroom teacher. That the faculty, then, should have its own organization, its own structure, its own policy decision, the administration should have its own, and then the top administration should amalgamate and fuse these two streams into a policy, into an operational plan. Now, you see that has, as I say, a certain amount of validity, it also has a certain danger involved, and that is that if there is a conflict at the ultimate fusion point, somebody has to lose face, somebody has to back down, somebody has to be defeated, somebody has to be disappointed. And most often, it's the faculty that lose if we face it. If there's a strong administration and the administration has a channel of department chairman and other people bringing recommendations to the president's office, and the faculty are bringing different kind of recommendations to the president's office, then the chances are that the president is going to accept the administration. That's just—therefore, it seems to me, that if there is going to be a difference of opinion, if the faculty and the administration are looking at curriculum and college development and policy through different eyes with different arguments, then those different points of

(00:44:14)

view ought to come into the original recommendation, rather than wait until positions have been taken and set and then the decision made. So, as I say, there's a danger no matter which way you go. Now, we chose to go the amalgamated realm. The integrated route, if you want to call it that. And so, we attempted to set up a committee structure on this campus that would have faculty and administration in on the very basic decisions, so that finally, when the decision reached the top office, or the top offices, there was only one recommendation, not two. I know that the question often came up, in those days, what about the students? Why are not the students involved in the same kind of policymaking? And efforts were made to include student representation in such committees as curriculum, in the Graduate Studies Committee, in the Student Affairs Committee, I don't think there was ever a serious effort made to bring them into the Personnel Committee, and this was essentially at their insistence of the faculty. The most important thing that the facul—or that the Personnel Committee had to do and still has to do is in retention and promotion, and the administration was willing, indeed

almost anxious, to have student participation, and the faculty was unwilling and equally anxious not to have student participation. We have had sporadic attempts on this campus, as some of you may be aware, of efforts to bring students into personnel affairs, either by organized means and sponsored student evaluation of individual teachers and all kinds of things, and by informal means, and there never seems to have been found a way in which student participation in personnel affairs has been successfully worked out. The other—one area in which student involvement was deep, of course, from the very beginning, was in the area of Student Affairs, student personnel. In the field of curriculum, which was my primary interest, we made repeated efforts to try and bring students into curriculum operations, curriculum deliberations. And it never worked. Now, I don't know why. In theory, it ought to work. But—let me go on a moment or two—it was difficult to find students whose interests were, at least where they felt, that they should—should involve themselves. If it was a science student, for example, and the curriculum problem that we were chewing on was whether we ought to establish a department of radio and television, journalism, if the student was from the science department, he or she just didn't want to participate, do you see? You can understand why. Another thing we found was that the meetings, curriculum is a drag, let me tell you this. You know, the hours and hours that you have to spend on—in any, curriculum committees are the most boring meetings that are taking place on this campus are in the field of curriculum. Students simply lost interest in it. These professors sitting around debating about the Washington plan of general education, you know, the way they—University of Washington does it. And then, they get into arguments about the Harvard study, and then they get into something else, you know, about the way it's done at Antioch with work-study, and they want to read reports and they want to—you know. And the students lost patience with this kind of thing. Then, there was the student, the turnover. It takes, in my opinion, at least a good two years to generally develop any kind of a defensible curriculum structure. And students simply didn't have the

(00:49:33)

continuity to sit. Generally, it was a senior who was sent in, in a semester he's gone. And another one comes in, you see? There was a—this constant student turnover. So, as I say there ought to be a way of involving students in curriculum, I think it's working better, perhaps now, where it's—where the curriculum now essentially is developed on a departmental basis. And there, the student in the field of music, for example, if he's working in a curriculum department at the music level, at the department level, and he's—he feels much more competent and much more involved—now, you got a question?

USP: That was a question about what the <u>train person(??)</u> on the level of that would be, right?

DO: Yes, it's moved in that direction, considerably. And I can do, now the—but it's, it's much larger. You see, sometimes, we had, we had to fuse two and three faculty members in a department. And there was not a strong feeling on the part of the faculty that two or

three people ought to be able to develop curriculum without some checks and balances.

USP: What was the view towards the P.E. Department at this time?

DO: Physical Education Department was one of the earliest ones established out here, and I think has—has never been in a position of disfavor, as it has in some. One of the reasons was because Dr. Arnett, who was first director of physical education, still here, that Dr. Arnett was willing to take the same standards and—for recruitment, and promotions, and so on for physical education, as was the history department or any others. In other words, completion of a doctorate, publication, all this kind of thing, you see? They were willing to add a rather strong scholastic element into their program. One of the strong areas it upheld was in the field of research, and we have, still some rather good research projects over in physical education and in the health department, which at that time was associated with it, do you see? The second thing was, that—that—and there was a considerable de-emphasis, a relative de-emphasis, on intercollegiate athletics. The coaches were brought in as assistant professors. Dr. Winningham, for example, who came here as a football coach, came here as an assistant professor, and was not given his promotion until he had earned his doctorate. Do you see? So, this kind of willingness on the part of the Physical Education Department, I think, prevented some of this split off.

USP: Just one more question, isn't our athletic department, or P.E. department one of the most academically oriented? Because I know it's rated as one of the highest in the nation.

DO: Yes, yeah. So this same—this same kind of acceptance of standards, there. And incidentally, the, in exchange, as it were, to the coaches, and so one, the coaches were on a tenure track, so it wasn't a matter of, you know, if it's a winning—losing, or if it's a losing season, doesn't mean the coach gets his head

(00:53:21)

cut off, so he's on tenure same as anybody else is. Well, there's one other aspect of this curriculum development if we want to call it this, that has touched the college much more recently, and in a sense, maybe equally vitally. There had been a growing concern on the part of a number of faculty, several of the faculty, about some of the problems related to poverty and social conditions and things of this kind. And one that came to the foremost very early was a question of a better understanding of the problems of the Mexican-American people, Latin American people, and so on. And Dr. Stelck, here, happened to be one of the persons, at that time, who brought the proposal that we—this college should get into— we didn't call it ethnic studies, I believe, but it was essentially an ethnic studies program. And, Dr. Stelck and a number of other people brought it to the educational policies committee, and we had the possibility of bringing a retiring diplomat, as I recall, somebody who had worked in the Latin American foreign

service here. And we never were able to make it go. It would be interesting to wonder what might have happened in this whole field of ethnic studies, had the faculty been willing to buy that earlier attempt. Dr. Stelck can probably tell you better than I some of the reasons that it didn't go, but at any rate, it—we were never successful in getting it approved. And the question, then, of the ethnic studies and the interests in the plighted minority peoples, and so on, hit this campus, probably with more force, more impact, more confrontation, a greater shock level, than it did most campuses. And in retrospect, it's—it is an interesting sort of development. We, well, I say we, the President, received several messages, some of them written, some of them verbal, that this college had been selected as a target college by minority groups for action. And, I think the President, and I can tell you that the Vice President, who I happened to be at that time, probably discounted that there would be an organized attempt to disrupt the college. The college, however, as I say, in retrospect, was in a sense, almost a paragon of some of the things that the militant minority groups felt was wrong with education. Here it was, virtually a hundred percent white, located in a suburb, developing a standard kind of academic program attempting, in a sense, to put the emphasis on what we might can say is the intellectual task, as opposed to what might be considered the social change agent concept, and so on, do you see? And this situation, there had been unrest in the Berkeley campus, of course, there had been unrest at Columbia University, there had been—all the problems that had been attended upon the universities in the South, University of Mississippi, and the 19—well, the University of Alabama, the 19—when was it, 54, that Eisenhower sent the troops into Little Rock, Arkansas? These things had been developing. Been developing all across the country. And in a way, our college had gone ahead with our own pattern, and not attempting, in a sense, to involve itself in any way with the problems that were plaguing other areas. President Prator had been President of this college for nearly ten years. He'd come here in 1958 when the college had separated from Los Angeles State, and at the end of ten years, he had indicated—at the end of nine years, he had indicated to the chancellor's office that he wanted to be

(00:59:54)

released from his presidential duties. Now, he made this announcement in October, as I recall, of 1967. By 1968, nothing had been done to find a successor. I say nothing. Nothing concrete had been done in ten months to find a successor to President Prator. And the thing that had happened was that a power struggle had developed in the state college system between the Chancellor's office and the faculty. The Faculty Senate had been organized, statewide Faculty Senate, and they were seeking some way in which they could—they could bring faculty participation in college administration into a much more important role. Chancellor Dumke felt that they should be advisory, the leaders of the faculty felt that they should be decision making. And the bone of contention turned out to be the presidency of San Fernando Valley State College. Who's going to choose the president? Is it going to be a faculty representation? Or is it going to be the

Chancellor's Office? So, when I say nothing had been done toward finding a president, there had been a great deal done in this power struggle, do you see, as to who would or wouldn't. And so, then, at the end of the 19—June 1968, President Prator, simply as he said, hung up his uniform, and the college was without a president. Efforts were made to establish a temporary situation, and President—the President—temporary presidency was accepted by Mr. Blomgren. Dr. Blomgren, head of the School of Business. Some of the rest of us had felt that it was such a political football that it was not the kind of meat grinder anybody wanted to get into. And then on November the 4th of 1968, there was an explosion on campus. The Black students, the militant Black students, had a cause which they thought was—was severe enough that it could be handled only by confrontation tactics. There had been, previous to that, at least a semester, probably two semesters, of argumentation regarding the establishment of an ethnic studies program on campus, a Black studies program on campus. And we had a group of previous year, a group of about thirty Black students, several of them were militant leaders, and they had approached, and wanted courses, they wanted the establishment of the Black studies program. And the educational policies committee, and certainly with my support, had indicated that if there should be such a studies, department, it should evolve, that we should put in some courses, try out the courses, see if we could gather students for them, and after having tried out introductory courses, if the support, and if the development of the pattern, if the library facilities could be had, and if certain other qualifications could be met, then the establishment of the department would depend upon—

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]