CHAPTER VI

Currents of Change

During the 1960s and early 1970s, the United States experienced profound social and political change. Inspired by President John F. Kennedy’s call to service, undergraduates across the country turned their attention beyond the campus, and found themselves confronting a multitude of concerns, including America’s involvement in the war in Indochina, the struggles of the civil rights movement, and the collective sense of uncertainty that resulted from the assassinations of President Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy, and the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. College students questioned the state of affairs in the nation, and challenged prevailing assumptions about authority and tradition.

At the same time, momentous events were unfolding on the international and national scene: the Bay of Pigs; the Cuban Missile Crisis; the Tonkin Gulf Resolution; the bombing of North Vietnam and the “incursion” into Cambodia; increasingly militant anti-war protests; the establishment of the Peace Corps; civil rights confrontations resulting in part from lunch counter sit-ins, “Freedom Rides,” and voter registration campaigns; the passage of civil rights legislation, and the dawn of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s Great Society; the outbreak of urban racial violence, beginning with the Watts riot in 1965; the death of Malcolm X; the rise of the Black Panthers; the revolution in sexual mores; the onset of the drug culture; undergraduate rebellions on campuses such as Berkeley and Columbia; the tragedies of Kent State and Jackson State; the phenomenon of Woodstock; the aberration of Watergate; the formation of the National Organization for Women (NOW); the triumphs of the space program; and the innovative music of the Beatles. Student disillusionment and disaffection gradually intensified and became increasingly radical, finding expression in action as well as in rhetoric. One of the earliest manifestos for change, *The Port Huron Statement* (1962), issued by Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), urged young people “to break through their privatism and political apathy,” as Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz has noted, and strive for a new “participatory democracy.” Among students especially, there gradually emerged a “counterculture,” which J. Ronald
Spencer '64, Associate Academic Dean and Lecturer in History, once characterized as "contemptuous of traditional mores, fueled partly by psychoactive drugs, espousing a vision of uninhibited sexuality, of a 'new consciousness,' of alienation overcome through the creation of a loving community — a sort of perpetual Woodstock Nation. On every hand, conventional wisdom was questioned, authority mocked, established institutions derided."  

Despite the changing nature of undergraduate attitudes and behavior, and the uncertainties of a nation increasingly beset by unrest, President Albert C. Jacobs was unwavering in his belief that an education in the liberal arts remained of crucial importance, and that Trinity was in the first rank of America's small liberal arts colleges. Among the various documents and memorabilia sealed in the metal box that he placed in the cornerstone of the Life Sciences Center on April 6, 1968, Jacobs included a letter addressed to the College's president in the year 2073 (the 250th anniversary of Trinity's chartering, and the 120th anniversary of Jacobs's inauguration). In the letter he reflected on the turbulence of the late 1960s, and the seemingly intractable problems of the moment — "a puzzling and dismal war," the "tragic problem of race and civil rights," "the plight of the American city — the urbanization of our population . . . [and] the increase of violence," and the inability of "the richest nation in the world . . . to abolish, or even to minimize, the plight of poverty." Jacobs then expressed his optimism about the future, declaring that "our students are more thoughtful in motive, more intellectually gifted, more concerned, and of greater potential for good than those of any earlier college generation. Earnest and eager, some tend to approach excess in their zeal to reshape society in a day or a week. But it would ill become us who are their elders to charge them with grievous shortcomings. It is we who have permitted wars, poverty, and political and social ills to mar their world . . . . The task of the liberal arts colleges in the years that intervene before you receive this greeting must be to provide the youth of our land increasingly with the knowledge and motivation that will build a national community and a world of peace."  

Five years earlier, in the spring of 1963, on the 10th anniversary of President Jacobs's inauguration, the Trustees' Executive Committee, while reviewing his annual compensation, discussed the matter of his tenure in office. Jacobs had just turned 63, and the question of when he should retire had not been raised at the time of his appointment. The College had no established mandatory retirement age for administrators, and after considerable discussion by the full Board in executive session, without the presence of Jacobs, the vote was unanimous to establish June 30, 1968 as the date of his retirement. As discussed in the previous chapter, the remaining years of Jacobs's presidency were particularly active, marked by an intense focus on fund raising and the continued expansion of Trinity's physical plant. During his final year in office, his health deteriorated considerably, and twice he underwent major surgery. As his retirement approached, Jacobs could take satisfaction that, during his administration, the undergraduate body had expanded from 900 to 1,250, and become more
geographically diverse; the number of full-time faculty had increased from 83 to 134; the College’s finances had grown stronger through the raising of more than $25 million, principally in two major campaigns; the facilities had been substantially enlarged and improved through the construction of four dormitories, an arts center, an administration building, a student center, two buildings devoted to instruction in the sciences, an athletic complex and two service structures, plus the renovation or expansion of several previously existing buildings; and Trinity had deepened and solidified its ties with Hartford.6

In President Jacobs’s final public address, his charge to the members of the Class of 1968 at Commencement, he exhorted them to pursue a life of service “to a nation and to a society in which the need for men of courage and conviction, of integrity and leadership is more imperative, indeed, more crucial, than ever before in our history.”7 He then challenged each graduating senior, “in the year immediately ahead, in the year 1968-1969, to seek out in the community in which you find yourself a young man of the culturally disadvantaged group, a potential candidate who is equipped or who can be helped to equip himself for admission to Trinity or to another college of similar standing. Help him, encourage him, plant in him the desire for higher education . . . . Doing so, you will advance not only one of the causes to which this College is dedicated, but you will also assume the responsibility of the educated man for social progress in our land.”8 Among the honors the College accorded the retiring president were the conferral of an honorary Doctor of Letters degree, election as a trustee emeritus, and designation by the Trustees as president emeritus, the first in the College’s history.9

A Decade of Student Activism; A New President Takes Office

In 1966, three years after they had stipulated the date for President Jacobs’s retirement, the Trustees began the search for his successor. On January 19, 1967, Lyman B. Brainerd ’30, the Board’s Vice Chairman, announced at a special meeting of the faculty that five days earlier, one of his fellow trustees, Dr. Theodore Davidge Lockwood ’48, Hon. ’81 (VI-1), had been unanimously elected president. In his remarks, Brainerd acknowledged that “it is most unusual for a Board of Trustees to elect one of its own members to this high office. However, Dr. Lockwood’s experience not only as a teacher and administrator, but also as an alumnus and trustee of the College makes him uniquely qualified to become Trinity’s 15th President.”10 That there would be a president-elect for a period of 18 months was an exceptional situation, but as an editorial in the Winter 1967 issue of the Trinity Alumni Magazine stressed, neither the College nor President Jacobs considered the long period an “interregnum,” and there was much work to be done, particularly in meeting the Ford Foundation funding challenge. The editorial’s conclusion asserted that the intervening time would be the focus of “a new intensity of purpose as the years of one fruitful period flow with steadily increasing strength into the years of another.”11

The president-elect was the son of Harold J. Lockwood, Hallden Professor of
Engineering, and entered Trinity in the fall of 1942. An experienced skier, he served from 1943 to 1945 with the U.S. Army's 10th Mountain Division, participating in the Italian campaign, and returned to the College in 1945, graduating with the Class of 1948. Lockwood's academic achievements resulted in his election to Phi Beta Kappa and Pi Gamma Mu, and designation as valedictorian of his class. He also was involved in a number of extracurricular activities, including varsity football, the Senate and Medusa, and served as president of the Political Science Club. Lockwood received the Terry Fellowship to pursue graduate study in modern European history at Princeton, from which he received the M.A. degree in 1950, and the Ph.D. in 1952. He then served on the faculties at Dartmouth, Juniata College, and M.I.T., became Associate Dean of the Faculty at Concord College, and in 1964, accepted appointment as Provost, Dean of the Faculty, and Professor of History at Union College. For several years, Lockwood was a member of Trinity's Board of Fellows, and in 1964, he began service as an alumni trustee. Although history was his field of scholarly endeavor, he had wide-ranging interests, one of which was Volunteers for International Technical Assistance (VITA), an organization devoted to helping solve technical problems in developing nations, and whose board he chaired. He and his wife, Elizabeth, were the parents of three daughters and a son.

Dr. Lockwood assumed the presidency of Trinity on July 1, 1968, and his inauguration took place the following October 12. In his inaugural address, "The Integrity of a College," he touched on several themes that would be reflected in his administration of the institution. For Lockwood, the liberal arts college in the broadest sense was "the arena within which we work out the meaning of human experience." To provide the atmosphere needed for this to occur, there had to exist: "openness to ideas, debate, and dissent . . . commitment to the search for truth, beauty, and understanding . . . and genuine concern for the individual, whatever may be his or her race or creed." The College had to be wary of the "new relativism" in higher education. The latter's expansion "during the last twenty years has reinforced academic fragmentation" while simultaneously producing "professionally equipped specialists. One result has been a hasty adjustment of academic expectations within a college to the occupational assumptions of the day, the imperial expansion of professional preparation." Another result of the prevailing relativism was "the shattering of general education. It is difficult to speak sensibly about the unity of learning when curricular coherence consists merely of fulfilling a few distribution requirements outside the major field . . . . We must reassert the relatedness of all learning to the common goal of each person's search to make sense of his experience in life." Moreover, "if the independent college is to serve society effectively, it must retain its privilege . . . to examine society, and freely to question its assumptions and practices . . . . [In addition,] a college must play an active role in helping to resolve, not simply to identify, issues off campus." Within the broad context of such concerns, President Lockwood went on to issue
several calls to action on the part of the College. First, in reference to a world rapidly shrinking on the global level, he believed there was a clear need for greater understanding of the rising expectations of other peoples, declaring that “Trinity affirms its intention to devise new approaches to improve international sensitivity among members of this community.” Second, “Our own society offers ample challenges as well . . . . A college must explore new opportunities to relate itself to the wider community of which it is a part . . . . Trustees and alumni — quite aside from students and faculty, are already involved in community affairs and can join in that effort. Trinity affirms its commitment to consider new programs directly related to public service and to work closely with other groups in the Hartford community in creating a better environment for all citizens of this area.”

Third, the time had come for independent colleges “to restate the case for a liberal arts education.” At Trinity, this effort would consist of “devising a new approach to general, multidisciplinary education and a sound judgement as to what criteria will be applied in determining which segments of knowledge appear in the curriculum.” Fourth, Lockwood asserted that liberal arts colleges should offer their students a wide range of opportunities “to understand the significance of science,” adding that Trinity thus “affirms its continuing commitment to a program of studies explicitly related to man’s need to make decisions in an increasingly complex environment.”

Fifth, because in his view flexibility in the curriculum was fundamentally necessary to foster learning, he declared that the College “affirms that it will experiment vigorously both inside and outside the formal curriculum to arrive at truly creative learning experiences.” Finally, Lockwood argued that, in a community of learning, students should be afforded “ample opportunity to explain their ideas and join in implementing whatever commitment the community as a whole makes . . . Trinity affirms its determination to discover new means by which students, faculty, administration and trustees may cooperate responsibly in planning the future of this particular community.”

The reference by President Lockwood to the College’s commitment to public service had been reflected for some time in the concerns of the undergraduates, many of whom had sought to help address problems in the community or beyond through increased involvement in volunteer work. The 1960s were a time of extremes in the country, and energized by intellectual vitality and moral fervor, college students nationwide sought to counter the pervasive forces of gloom and devastation that were present on the national or international front, and whose manifestations were being reported daily in the press as well as on radio and television. Trinity students looked beyond the campus to engage in a host of local activities. Among these was tutoring disadvantaged children from Hartford’s North End, particularly those from the black and Puerto Rican communities, under the auspices of CODE (The Committee Organized to Defend Equality), and the Hartford Tutorial Project, Inc., whose president was Robert O. Stuart ’64. Serving on the Project’s board of directors were Dean of Students O. W. Lacy, professors Philip Kintner (History) and Leon I. Salomon (Government), with
Vice President Albert E. Holland '34 providing fund-raising and financial advice. Students also became involved with the North End Community Action Project (NECAP), the initiative of Peter B. Morrill '62. With the assistance of Robert H. Mitchell '64, Morrill guided NECAP in efforts to help clean up the North End, to improve job opportunities for blacks, particularly in “visible” forms of employment such as the work of waiters and waitresses, and ultimately to dispel the myth that blacks were “second-class citizens.” During the summer of 1963, NECAP picketed Hartford-area businesses including restaurants, and in one case, engaged in sit-in tactics, reportedly the first such incident in Hartford, and among the first civil rights actions of its kind in the Northeast. In addition, students worked on various projects with Edward T. (Ned) Coll and his Hartford Revitalization Corps, later organizing a chapter of the Corps on campus. In 1970, continuing interest in Hartford and its neighborhoods found an outlet in the Trinity Community Action Center (TCAC), an organization in which Kevin B. Sullivan '71 (later the College’s Vice President for Community and Institutional Affairs) played a leading role. Through the coordinating efforts of the Center, students volunteered for tutoring and recreation programs, assisted community organizations in working on issues ranging from education to welfare reform, and arranged for courses and independent study in urban-related topics.

Galvanizing student interest early in the decade was the Benjamin Reid case, which George F. Will '62 (VI-2) brought to the campus’s attention in the Tripod. A black man, Reid had been convicted and sentenced to death for the fatal bludgeoning of a Hartford woman in an attempted robbery in 1957. William Styron, the novelist, had discussed the case in the February 1962 issue of Esquire, and following the appearance of Will’s article on February 19 in the Tripod, interest in the convict’s welfare grew. Mobilized by Will, Trinity students and faculty, among them professors C. Freeman Sleeper and William A. Johnson, both of the Religion Department, rallied to the cause. Involved also was Vice President Holland, whose contacts, organizational sense, and political acumen were vitally important. Holland was an opponent of capital punishment, based on his personal experience during World War II as a prisoner of the Japanese in Manila, and his near-execution at their hands. In June 1962, the efforts of Reid’s Trinity supporters led at the last hour to his sentence being commuted to life in prison. Professor Theodor M. Mauch (Religion) and several Trinity students later helped Reid learn to read and write, and to complete his high school diploma requirements. In November 1969, as a result of the Trinity community’s continued interest, the State’s Pardons Board reduced Reid’s life sentence, making him eligible for parole, which, however, he forfeited when he escaped from prison the following spring and was apprehended.

Other volunteer opportunities for students included involvement with various aspects of the civil rights struggle, working with patients in mental institutions, and following graduation, service in the Peace Corps or VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America). Perhaps the most dramatic and selfless instances of undergraduate partici-
pation in off-campus activities were the front-line efforts during 1962-1963 of Ralph W. Allen ’64 (VI-3) and John H. (Jack) Chatfield ’64 (VI-4), who took part in the voter registration movement in the Deep South spearheaded by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Both Allen and Chatfield worked in southwest Georgia, and their lives were constantly in danger during the months they spent in such rural communities as Sasser and Dawson. Allen became associated with SNCC in June 1962, following the conclusion of his sophomore year. He had driven to Atlanta with a large quantity of books for transshipment to an Alabama college, and had offered his services in connection with an integrated voter registration drive then underway in the Albany, Georgia area. Allen eventually took a leave of absence from Trinity, and spent more than a year with SNCC as a field secretary. In the spring of 1963, he was the victim of a beating, but remained undeterred.\(^3\)

That summer, while participating in a march, Allen and two fellow workers were arrested in Americus, Georgia, on various charges, among them attempting to incite insurrection, a capital offense under Georgia law. Held without bond for several months, they were convicted and imprisoned, but the conviction was later overturned by the Georgia Court of Appeals.\(^3\) The Trinity community rallied on Allen’s behalf while he was awaiting trial, contacted congressmen, held protest gatherings, and sought the intervention of Connecticut Governor John M. Dempsey, before justice prevailed.

As Jack Chatfield once put it, “I was brought to Georgia by my college days.”\(^32\) Inspired by, among others, George F. Will ’62, who levelled “withering blasts against a host of heavily entrenched foes,” including at that time, “a student body immunized against political understanding and commitments,”\(^33\) and astonished at the news that his close friend, Ralph Allen, had been arrested, Chatfield resolved in the late summer of 1962 to journey south. Taking a leave of absence from the College, he lent his efforts, as had Allen, to the voter registration movement, becoming a field secretary for SNCC. Chatfield later characterized the work in which he participated as “the beginnings of a political movement without precedent in the history of modern America.”\(^34\) He, too, became the target of violence, suffering gunshot wounds in September when night riders fired on the home where SNCC staff were staying in Dawson, Georgia.\(^35\) Chatfield eventually joined Trinity’s faculty as a member of the History Department. His experiences in the early 1960s led him to organize a conference at the College in April 1988, on the history and activities of SNCC. Called “‘We Shall Not Be Moved’: The Life and Times of the S.N.C.C., 1960-1966,” the three-day gathering reunited more than 120 SNCC workers and leaders.\(^36\)

As the decade of the 1960s progressed, the pervasive effect of the war in Indochina on American political and social life was increasingly felt. On campuses, students protested vigorously, engaged in teach-ins, and participated in local, regional, and national anti-war rallies. Intense feelings of distrust toward the nation’s political leaders found their focus in the occupant of the White House, and influenced President Lyndon B. Johnson’s decision not to run for reelection. Pent-up frustration
with the political system led to the militant demonstrations that disrupted the Democratic National Convention held in Chicago in the summer of 1968. Draft counseling and protests against the presence of military recruiters became widespread on college campuses, including Trinity, discussions of national policy issues assumed a more radical character, and elements of the “New Left,” including the SDS, spoke out more vehemently on a range of concerns.

Student activist movements of various kinds had existed on college and university campuses periodically since the beginning of the 20th century. Allegiance to political philosophies varied across a wide spectrum. One of the earliest organizations, the Intercollegiate Socialist Society (ISS), was founded in 1905, and flourished in the pre-World War I era. Not a mass student movement in its early years, the ISS served to affiliate many local clubs that had socialist and liberal agendas. In 1921, it became the League for Industrial Democracy (LID). Another early group with a particularly radical orientation was the Young Intellectuals. In the 1920s and 1930s, other organizations came into existence, such as the Intercollegiate Liberal League, the National Student Forum, the National Student Federation of America, and the American Student Union. Concerns focused on issues ranging from compulsory service in the U.S. Army’s Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (ROTC) and infringement of civil liberties, to aspects of American foreign policy, including nonmembership in the League of Nations and the furthering of world peace. In the post-World War II period, there appeared such organizations as the Young Progressives of America, the Labor Youth League, the Progressive Youth Organizing Committee, the Young Socialist League, the National Student Association, and the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID), an offshoot of the League for Industrial Democracy. By then the country’s oldest continuously active political organization for students, SLID could trace its lineage back to the turn-of-the-century Intercollegiate Socialist Society.37 These and other groups focused primarily on issues related to civil liberties, civil rights, and global peace. Undergoing a transformation toward the end of the 1950s, SLID became Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), one of the most vocal student organizations of the 1960s.38

The SDS had a strong campus orientation, and viewed students as agents for social change in the United States. Growing in influence at a period when American involvement in the war in Indochina was intensifying, undergraduate anti-war protest was mounting, and Black Power was supplanting nonviolent tactics as the driving force in the civil rights movement, the SDS held special appeal because it had a multi-issue focus. In the late 1960s, the SDS came to foster open revolution while falling victim to internal dissension over the means to the end.39 At its 1969 convention in Chicago, the organization split into two factions: the Weathermen, who went underground as the result of the acts of extreme violence in which they engaged; and the Worker-Student Alliance, which emphasized organizing the working class. Neither group experienced success on campuses, and by 1970, each had failed in its aims.40
Founded in early February 1966, the Trinity chapter of SDS, according to its first president, James L. Kaplan '68, espoused "the establishment of social democracy in the United States, and a humanist view of the rest of the world." It sought to promote both of these aims by means of a "dual approach of broad-scale political and social education and of political action." Although autonomous, the chapter agreed with the "values and purposes" of the national organization that were expressed in The Port Huron Statement, and which focused on the establishment of "a true representative social democracy," "effective equality of opportunity," "a reevaluation of United States foreign policy," "a commitment to non-violent means rather than violent means in the process of social change," and "the use of a popular movement and mass education" to accomplish these goals. The chapter's program for Trinity called for abolishing the mathematics requirement, establishing a sociology department, increasing the student voice in institutional decision making, undertaking community action projects in the North End, sponsoring lectures on campus, and speaking out on Vietnam.

The SDS chapter began to fulfill one of its program goals immediately when it sponsored a speech in February by Carl Oglesby, the president of the national SDS, who assailed American policy in Vietnam. The following spring, the chapter held a panel discussion on civil rights, and in May 1967, Nick Egleson, the new national SDS president, discussed the organization's program and goals in a panel presentation, asserting that people should be more engaged in questioning "the system." Declaring that a Trinity education was "insipid," another panelist, James L. Kaplan '68, past president of the Trinity chapter, demanded that the College "teach people how to function in a democracy by encouraging them to challenge and question authority." The following January, the chapter sponsored a symposium on Vietnam, and in October 1968, introduced a new initiative, the Radical Education Program (REP), which consisted of three parts: holding campus seminars on racism, national foreign policy, and the educational process; sponsoring SDS lectures at area high schools and preparatory schools; and arranging for SDS speakers to visit churches in the Hartford area in cooperation with the Hartford Seminary Foundation. Steven H. Keeney '71, SDS chapter president, and Robert B. Pippin '70, vice president, conducted the seminars, Keeney addressing various issues associated with cultural revolution, and Pippin dealing with theoretical aspects of radicalism. By the end of the decade, SDS had run its course on campus. In 1969, the split of the national SDS into two factions shifted the focus of interest away from issues of immediate concern on college campuses, and the organization's appeal soon waned. By 1970, the Trinity chapter had ceased to exist.

In an address that he delivered at the 16th annual Business, Industry, and Government Dinner, which Trinity hosted on March 17, 1969, President Lockwood shared his reflections on student unrest. Employing a meteorological metaphor, he noted that on college campuses "we . . . live in the eye of the hurricane. Swirling
around us are all the vigorous movements within society [as well as] within the world ... . Because we are at the eye of the hurricane, and not at the fringe, we cannot lift any barricades against intrusion and we have no shutters to close out uneasiness." 

Colleges were not immune from society's problems, he contended, and cited an observation made by Dr. Harold C. Martin Hon. L.H.D. '70, Union College's president, that "The college is much more a mirror of society than the old will admit or the young concede." Describing students as "restless, inquisitive, critical, articulate, and bright," Lockwood claimed that they were more "politically alert than any previous generation with the possible exception of the 1930s."

In President Lockwood's view there were several causes of student restlessness, including a growing uneasiness with conformity and the impersonal, concern about the issues of war and the draft system as well as the nuclear standoff of the super powers, the imbalance between rich and poor countries, and of America's inability to address a host of social problems. He argued that an orderly process of change was crucial in dealing with these issues, and that in higher education, "we cannot allow confrontation to become the major, permanent extracurricular activity on campus." Furthermore, campus unrest was directly related to what was happening on campuses. Trinity included. "Political in bearing, worried about personal relationships, questioning the wisdom of elders, today's students carry these concerns to the walks 'neath the elms." All students, not just those of radical inclination, "note what is happening to faculty and administration as well as fellow students . . . . They see a faculty divided between professional absorption and devotion to a particular academic community. They see universities devoting major efforts to research rather than teaching. They see administrators consulting abroad or consumed with bureaucratic tasks of which they sense little relevance. They hear a series of private languages instead of one language for the community." In addition, the actions of students "often appear as a rejection of the belief in rational discourse."

To address student unrest, President Lockwood argued for the reestablishment of a community of interest on college campuses, and this called for a redefinition of the goals of undergraduate institutions. Teaching remained the chief concern of colleges. Students were seeking values by which to live, and trying to relate their education to what was going on in society. "Freeze-dried knowledge delivered in carefully packaged courses uninspiringly taught" was of no help. Colleges had to transmit knowledge effectively, and design new learning opportunities that would help students understand themselves as individuals accountable for the decisions they made. In this process it was necessary to move openly and seek student input, remaining sensitive to legitimate grievances while rejecting unreasonable approaches. The response should be intellectual rather than authoritarian, seeking to establish a community of constructive reflection.

President Lockwood concluded by stating that, in his judgment, the independent liberal arts colleges had the best chance to offer the programs and atmosphere essen-
tial for enabling students to contribute toward bettering society. Citing the remark made by Sol Linowitz, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Xerox Corporation, that “a society which can send a man to the moon can also bring dignity into the life of every one of its citizens,” Lockwood asserted that black power, reflecting the country’s racial dilemma, demanded “an unequivocal answer from our colleges and universities if we are truly persuaded that discrimination and deprivation should not persist.” By recapturing “that generosity of spirit which permits reason and compassion to prevail,” colleges and universities could contribute to addressing the nation’s social problems. Such thoughts on the role of liberal arts colleges, and the challenges they faced in dealing with the complex issues regarding undergraduates would find expression in the course of Lockwood's ensuing presidency.

The civil rights movement in the early 1960s heightened undergraduate awareness of race relations and the status of blacks in America, and prompted many Trinity students to ask why more blacks were not being admitted to the College. In a spring 1964 interview which appeared in the Tripod, F. Gardiner F. Bridge, Director of Admissions, stated that his office was always searching for “the best qualified candidates we can get, no matter who they are.” Trinity was “vitaly interested” in encouraging blacks and other disadvantaged students to apply. Prior to 1970, the College maintained no records on the racial background of its undergraduate or graduate students, and except for one instance in the 19th century, it is unknown precisely how many black undergraduates attended Trinity from the time of the College’s founding until World War II. The first black person known to have received a degree from the College was the Rev. Edward Jones. A graduate of Amherst, in 1830 he was awarded a Master of Arts degree in course preparing him for a career as a missionary and educator. Jones became Principal of the Fourah Bay Christian Institution in Freetown, Sierra Leone, a school that later became Fourah Bay College of the University of Sierra Leone. The name of the black undergraduate who attended Trinity in the early 1830s is unknown, and the only reference to him occurs in the published recollections of Robert Tomes, Class of 1835. The student reportedly was from Africa, and according to Tomes, received his degree and was ordained an Episcopal priest.

By contrast, during the period from the end of the 19th century to 1920, a number of Asian students, especially from China, attended the College, and their enrollment was due largely to the influence of missionaries. From the end of the Civil War to the close of the 19th century, a considerable number of Trinity alumni became clergymen, especially priests of the Episcopal Church, and many of them served as missionaries, particularly among the American Indians and in China. Chinese students may also have been attracted to the College because of the cordial reception Hartford had accorded an earlier generation of their countrymen who attended schools in the city and surrounding communities from 1872 to 1881, under the auspices of the Chinese Educational Mission to the United States. Established in Hartford by Yung Wing, the first Chinese graduate of Yale, the Chinese Educational
Mission coordinated the education of the students, prepared them for careers of service in their native country, and provided instruction in the Chinese Classics.61†

In the postwar period, the number of black students and students from abroad who attended Trinity slowly began to grow. The Rev. Kenneth D. Higginbotham ’50 was the first black to receive a degree after the war. From the late 1940s through the mid-1960s, a few black students from Hartford, other Connecticut communities, and from out of state enrolled at Trinity. Among those from Hartford was Ralph F. Davis ’53, a graduate of Hartford Public High School, who was a member of the freshman swimming team and became the first black athlete at Trinity to letter in a sport (track).62† In addition, there were several students from Africa.63† The low numbers of black students enrolling at Trinity was a situation reflected at other private colleges and universities in the Northeast, many of which had relatively high tuition rates in comparison with public institutions. Enhancing the opportunity to pursue a college education was an important way of helping blacks improve their socioeconomic status, and institutions of higher education began to seek new ways of increasing the number of black applicants. In 1964, a $150,000 grant from the Rockefeller Foundation enabled Dartmouth College to undertake a three-year experimental program known as “ABC” (A Better Chance), to help socially and educationally disadvantaged secondary school students improve their preparation for college. A collaborative effort between Dartmouth and the independent secondary schools that participated in the National Scholarship Service and the Independent Schools Program of the Fund for Negro Students, the initiative brought 35 black students and 15 other students from low-income families to Dartmouth each of three summers for an intensive eight-week period of study. Depending on their progress, the students then entered an independent secondary school, having already been granted admission and scholarship assistance on a contingent basis, and completed their preparation for college.64

Commenting on the ABC program, Dartmouth’s president, Dr. John S. Dickey, noted that blacks and other disadvantaged groups faced “a deepening and dangerous frustration of their aroused desires for equal opportunity unless more individuals from these groups can be qualified to lead in our society.” “The main barrier to this development in most northern colleges,” he contended, “is the lack of qualified applicants for admission and financial aid. Progress on the problem requires action at all levels and in various ways, but any swift, substantial improvement will depend upon qualifying more candidates for college from boys and girls now in the early stages of their secondary schooling.”65

Similar programs, on either an individual or group basis, were getting underway at the same time at other colleges and universities. In referring to Princeton’s program, which had also received Rockefeller Foundation support, the University’s president, Dr. Robert H. Goheen, stated that the hope was to prepare the students selected “to qualify for admission to any first-rate institution,” and to make real the possibility that they
could exercise choice in selecting a college. Dr. John A. Kershaw, president of Williams, noted that his institution's program was a cooperative venture with several other colleges, "one doing the actual training, two or three others, the recruiting, and all providing faculty members and undergraduate tutors." Upon successful completion of the summer program, the students could choose one of the participating colleges. Kershaw hoped that one of the program's benefits would be an eventual increase in the number of well-educated black teachers.

In another joint effort, eight Ivy League schools and the Seven College Conference for Women received funding from the Carnegie Foundation to support the Cooperative Program for Educational Opportunity, whose objective was to encourage "promising high school students from all socio-economic backgrounds to prepare for the opportunities open to them." A major goal was to acquaint the students with the scholarship resources available to them through the cooperating institutions.

Smaller institutions such as Bowdoin and Swarthmore encouraged undergraduates to become admissions representatives, and to visit high schools, meet with guidance counselors and students, and encourage black students especially to apply for admission. Noting the "dearth" of black students at Trinity, a *Tripod* editorial in the spring of 1964 called on the student body to adopt a similar strategy. Visits to high schools, the editors hoped, might encourage disadvantaged students to consider applying to the College. During that same year, as one way of intensifying its efforts to attract black applicants, the College cooperated with other institutions and organizations in developing a program directed at disadvantaged students from New York City. The Association of College Admissions Counselors (ACAC), in conjunction with the Higher Horizons initiative of New York City's Board of Education, had established a program to identify in its school system disadvantaged New York public school students with the potential for a college education. Trinity was a member of the College Admissions Center, a division of ACAC, and on the recommendation of Higher Horizons, the Center would forward to its members the credentials of likely applicants for admission. Each participating college would be obligated to accept at least one disadvantaged student.

In addition to such factors as academic record, class standing in secondary school, and College Board scores, flexibility and a certain degree of risk-taking in regard to nontraditional candidates were also important in arriving at a final decision on admitting an applicant. In mid-April 1968, W. Howie Muir '51, who had become Director of Admissions four years earlier, observed in a *Tripod* "Inside Feature" on admissions at Trinity, that the College had become more open-minded in admitting candidates. Recruiting qualified young men into the applicant pool and getting them to come to Trinity were major concerns. Muir was not optimistic about recruiting by alumni, who, from his perspective, were for the most part "out of touch with the drastic changes taking place in the College, and tend to want to interview established candidates, rather than really recruit new ones." In the months prior to the publication of the *Tripod*...
feature, members of the admissions staff visited an estimated 400 secondary schools in California, Texas, Illinois, Michigan, Florida, Virginia, Washington, D.C., New York State, Pennsylvania, and New England, including inner-city schools in metropolitan areas, and were just beginning to increase the pace of visits to public schools in New York City. Recruiting by students was experiencing some success under a recently instituted program in which undergraduates were matched with applicants in their home areas, contacts being made during spring vacation. More effective, however, was the Freshman-Sophomore Honors Scholar Program, which the College introduced in 1967. The program helped a small number of incoming freshmen, many of whom were from disadvantaged backgrounds, adjust to Trinity’s academic pace by permitting flexibility in the course load. Based on the pursuit of such initiatives as these, the persistent and determined effort of the Trinity admissions staff began to yield results. The number of black students in incoming classes rose slowly from four in the fall of 1966, and eight the following year, to 10 in the fall of 1968, and 20 in the fall of 1969, plus four transfer students. The following year, 1970, the total number of black undergraduates stood at 87, 6.8 percent of a student body of 1,493.

In Muir’s view, one of the major difficulties the College faced in attracting the broad spectrum of black applicants was that many of the black students then at Trinity were activists. Muir maintained that in 1967 the College had lost several black applicants because they were scared off. These kids don’t want to be crusaders, they wanted to go to college, and they went someplace else.” In April 1967, the black students at Trinity formed the Trinity Association of Negroes (TAN), in part to make incoming black freshmen feel more at home on the campus. TAN’s central goal was “the achievement and extension of awareness . . . of our heritage, awareness of our responsibility, awareness of our capabilities as black students.” Membership was open to all black students at Trinity, then 13 in number, and the organization was “rooted in the spirit of mutual cooperation and shared commitment,” but was not intended “to dissociate or isolate ourselves from the remainder of the campus community.” TAN’s organizers believed that the College needed to be more cognizant of the presence of black students on campus, and that there was a “definite need for a DISCLOSURE and ACKNOWLEDGEMENT of the fact of the black student at Trinity.” With a view to “self education and education of the campus at large,” TAN’s program called for: meeting with the leaders of the local black community; sponsoring readings and exhibitions of the works of black writers and artists; recruiting black students, and welcoming incoming freshmen; establishing a library of material about blacks; and increasing participation in civil rights activities. The following fall, Alan S. Winter ’68, writing in the Tripod, noted that TAN could work toward eliminating communications barriers between white and black students on campus, as well as help black students accommodate themselves to Trinity and be accepted as part of the community. In Winter’s view, “although the environment is not hostile to his presence,” the black student generally felt out of place at the College.
Among the factors colleges and universities had to consider in the admissions process was how much financial assistance could be provided in cases of need. In keeping with many small colleges, Trinity had limited resources that it could commit to financial aid, particularly scholarships. During 1963-1964, for example, the College provided $230,055 in scholarship assistance to just over 25 percent of the student body, and the average amount awarded was $892, considerably less than the full tuition cost of $1,400 a year. While a number of students received full-tuition scholarships, many were granted only partial tuition support. One of the central goals of the fund-raising campaign launched in the fall of 1964 was to increase endowed support of scholarships. Although a long-standing need, it was clear that more scholarship aid would be required as the College implemented the Trustees' January 1964 decision to expand the student body from 1,000 to 1,250 during the period from 1965 to 1970. In addition, the cost of providing a Trinity education was rising, and tuition charges were increasing accordingly. During 1963-1964, tuition costs stood at $1,400 per year, and were $1,650 the following year. By 1966-1967, tuition had jumped to $1,850 per year, and by 1968-1969, it stood at $2,100. In 1967-1968, the College was able to provide a total of $208,400 in aid to the freshman class alone, a marked contrast to the situation in 1963-1964. Of this amount, $139,900 was in the form of scholarships, the remainder consisting of college loans, National Defense loans, bursary employment, and $15,300 in Federal Educational Opportunity Grants. The average financial assistance package was $1,985, and 31.8 percent of the freshman class received aid. If further increases were to occur in the number of disadvantaged students enrolling at Trinity, the amount of funds the College designated for financial aid, especially scholarships, would have to be augmented on a continuing basis.

The assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. on April 4, 1968 stunned the campus community as it did the entire nation. The sense of shock, outrage, and revulsion found several outlets. In a three-day “witness” that began on the Quad the morning after King’s death, Professor James W. Gardner, Jr. (English), conducted a solitary “public fast in shame and astonishment for my own violence and for the violence of my white brothers.” Implying institutional complicity in the country’s race relations situation, Gardner stated that “Until Trinity College—its trustees, its administration, its faculty, and its students—shows more organized and effective concern for the violence our white structures nourish, I will not willingly leave this witness.” Among other responses on the part of the College community, students participated in memorial services for Dr. King at the Church of the Good Shepherd in Hartford as well as at the Chapel, where over 800 gathered, and speakers from the College and the local community engaged in a teach-in. At an all-College meeting on April 8, the student body resoundingly supported a resolution drawn up the previous evening by the Student Senate’s Committee on Race and Poverty, and passed by the Senate in a unanimous roll call vote. The April 7 resolution called on the Trustees to use Senate
funds, an apportionment from each undergraduate's general fee, and matching funds from the College to establish scholarships for blacks and other disadvantaged students from the Hartford and New Haven areas. The Senate also proposed increasing ties with St. Paul's College in Lawrenceville, Virginia, a predominantly black institution that Trinity was preparing to assist in connection with curricular matters under a federal grant, and the development of credit-bearing courses in black history and urban problems.

In reaction to Dr. King's death, President Jacobs, who was just completing recuperation from major surgery, declared at the all-College meeting on April 8 that Trinity would "gladly cooperate with our students, our faculty, our administrators, our friends in doing all in the College's power effectively to resolve the racial issue in our community and in our country." Noting that progress would be achieved only gradually, he went on to urge the student body to follow "recognized procedures" when undertaking initiatives in furtherance of their concerns. Jacobs also invited a number of students and faculty to his home to explore ways in which the College could utilize its resources to ease racial tensions in Hartford.

Several days prior to preparing its resolution on scholarships for black students, the Student Senate expressed frustration that prompt action had not been forthcoming on another resolution it had forwarded to the Trustees on March 30. Reiterating a proposal originally made early in the preceding month, the March 30 resolution demanded that the College establish a "4-4-4" (student-faculty-trustee) Joint Committee on Priorities. The Committee would "insure for the faculty and the undergraduate community the right of democratic participation in the areas of college decision-making that affect our lives," including "the size and composition" of the student body, the extent and variety of social facilities, new buildings, and a number of improvements in the academic program and in academic affairs in general. The idea of the Committee grew out of disagreements with the administration during the course of the academic year in regard to the provision of additional social facilities, including a center for the senior class, changes in the parietal regulations in the dormitories, and the surprise announcement of a $250 tuition increase.

The parietal regulations controversy heightened student sensitivity to the disciplinary functions of Medusa, the self-perpetuating organization discussed in the previous chapter, which consisted of seven members of the senior class who "tapped" their successors in the junior class each spring. Undergraduate questioning of Medusa's authority, which derived from the Senate, had been increasing as the decade of the 1960s progressed. In the spring of 1967, at the suggestion of Dr. Roy Heath, Dean of Students (VI-5), a "3-3" Committee was formed, through the cooperation of Medusa and the Faculty Committee on Academic Standing and Discipline. The new committee's function was to handle severe infractions of the regulations governing undergraduate social conduct, an area of concern with which the faculty was not then involved. The "3-3" Committee, known technically as the Student-Faculty
Disciplinary Committee, consisted of three Medusa members and three faculty members, the latter drawn from a panel of six elected by the faculty for a three-year term. The Dean of Students called the Committee together when the need arose to deal with a particularly severe case of student misconduct.96

Although not directly leading to the formation of a specific committee to address the issue, the dispute over social facilities did result in a peaceful demonstration by a large number of students. At an October 1967 forum, which Dean Heath sponsored, representatives from the administration and faculty, as well as Dr. Charles E. Jacobson '31 of the Board of Fellows, heard many students complain vociferously about the administration, which they described as “authoritarian and paternalistic.” An article in the *Tripled*, discussing the forum, cited the administration for failing to maintain effective communications with the student body, a problem that had the effect of fostering an increasingly “skeptical and hostile” attitude among undergraduates.97

The Senate’s March 30 “4-4-4” resolution regarding a Joint Committee on Priorities received consideration by the Joint Committee on Educational Policy, whose trustee and faculty members expressed interest, but raised questions about the lack of trustee veto power except in matters concerning legality, and about student involvement in issues of faculty hiring and promotion.98 Apart from such concerns, the issue of undergraduate participation in policy-level decision-making served to slow the pace of deliberation, although, a year earlier, at their April 15, 1967 meeting, the Trustees had approved undergraduate service on the special committee of the faculty concerned with revising the curriculum, leaving the “mechanics of meaningful student participation” to the faculty.99 Another factor working to delay a full response to the Senate resolution on the “4-4-4” Committee was President Jacobs’s planned retirement at the end of the 1967-1968 academic year and the resulting transition in leadership of the College.

On April 8, President Jacobs wrote to Leonard P. Mozei ’69, the Senate’s president, thanking him for forwarding the “4-4-4” resolution, indicating that the matter had been referred for further study to the Joint Committee on Educational Policy, and its subcommittee, known as the Dialogue Committee, and that the full Board would consider the recommendations of the two committees at its June 1 meeting.100 Because the Senate experienced a delay in having the April 7 scholarship resolution properly typed, the administration did not receive a copy unofficially until April 17. Two days later, Senate President Mozei and Vice President Peter H. Ehrenberg ’69 called on President Jacobs to ask about the scholarship proposal, and he informed them that he had developed his own proposal but could not disclose it prematurely.

On April 21, the Senate once again sent a resolution to the Trustees concerning the scholarship proposal, requesting the Executive Committee of the Board to “act with all deliberate speed” in implementing it. President Jacobs did not officially receive the original April 7 resolution until the morning of April 22, when Senate President Mozei delivered it to him in person. At that point it became clear that the Senate expected the Executive Committee to consider the precise terms of the resolution at.
its meeting that day. Jacobs assured Mozzi that the proposal would be on the meeting's agenda. Members of the administration then proceeded to draft a response to the proposal for trustee consideration.\textsuperscript{101}

Based on the April 7 scholarship resolution, the initial response of the administration was cautious, pending careful study. J. Kenneth Robertson (VI-6), Treasurer of the College, had noted on April 17 that the general fee was considered part of tuition from the point of view of the bookkeeping and accounting practices then in effect, and that it was impossible to determine how much of the funds for student activities came from the general fee, the latter covering the activities budget, student insurance, and the support of the Mather Student Center, as well as laboratory fees, vocational tests, and admission to athletic events. As a consequence, the Tripod noted that senators anticipated difficulty in having students determine which activities they would be willing to forego in favor of the scholarship fund. Robertson suggested that the solution might be to increase the general fee by $50, but this would require approval by the student body before it could be considered by the administration.\textsuperscript{102}

**The Sit-In and Its Aftermath**

Undergraduate frustration at what was perceived as the College's deliberately slow pace of response to the Senate's resolutions, widespread distrust of the administration by the student body, mounting dissatisfaction with ineffective communication on a wide range of decisions affecting students, and a heightened sense of dismay at the state of racial relations in the country brought on by the assassination of the Rev. Dr. King, combined to create a highly volatile situation on the Trinity campus. On April 22, the Trustees' Executive Committee gathered at 4:30 p.m. for its scheduled meeting in the boardroom over the archway of the Downes Memorial Clock Tower. Present were: Dr. Jacobs; President-elect Theodore D. Lockwood '48; Lyman B. Brainerd '50, the Board's Vice Chairman; A. Henry Moses, Jr. '28 (VI-7); Henry S. Beers '18; Seymour E. Smith '34 (VI-8); William P. Gwinn, Hon. '61 (VI-9); Glover Johnson '22, Hon. '60 (VI-10); J. Kenneth Robertson, Treasurer of the College; Dr. Harold L. Dorwart, Dean of the College (VI-11); and Ms. Elisabeth (Betty) Belden, Executive Secretary in the President's Office.\textsuperscript{103} The major item on the agenda was consideration of the Senate's resolution on the scholarship fund for black students. The terms of the proposal called for establishing $150,000 in scholarship assistance. The Senate would coordinate the efforts of the student body in raising $15,000 "through a Work Day or other similar means," and would pledge from its activities budget the difference between what the students raised and the amount specified. The College was asked to allocate $60,000 toward the scholarship fund, based on an apportionment of $50 from each student's general fee, and the Development Office was expected to procure $75,000 in matching funds.\textsuperscript{104} In addition, the Senate had requested Trustee support for faculty initiatives to develop courses in urban affairs, black history, poverty, and psychology of the ghetto, for expansion of the Education...
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Department, and for community development efforts.105 The Executive Committee commenced its discussion, and the minutes state tersely what then occurred: "Consideration of the above proposals was brought to an abrupt halt when it was discovered that about 160 students had taken possession of the building and intended to prevent the trustees from leaving until they had agreed to their proposals. No decision could possibly be reached under these conditions and the trustees were finally allowed to leave the building at 8:30 p.m."106

In an action unprecedented in the College's history, 168 students occupied the Downes and Williams administration buildings in an effort to force the trustees to consider the Senate's proposal concerning scholarships for black students. In an April 30 memorandum addressed to the Trinity community, including the alumni, President Jacobs reported the details of the "sit-in," and recapitulated the events, as then known, which led up to it. Prior to the Executive Committee's meeting, the administration had been aware that members of TAN, with the assistance of SDS, were planning a demonstration to urge implementation of the scholarship proposals. "We expected the demonstration to be non-disruptive—as have been most campus demonstrations in past years—," Jacobs noted, "though there were rumors of a possible sit-in in the Downes and Williams administration buildings... At about 4:45 p.m. some one hundred and fifty students quietly entered the hallways of the two buildings. There was no disruption of the meeting nor of the College offices. At 5:15 p.m. one of the Trustees on the Executive Committee [William P. Gwinn] was excused from the meeting so that he could meet a prior engagement. Students standing by the doors of the Trustees' room blocked his path... he was not permitted to leave the room. Then my request that the trustee be permitted to leave was firmly denied by the students."107

According to the Tripod, President Jacobs "came out of the room and told the students that the Trustees had been giving 'very favorable consideration' to the proposal but that now they refused to consider it further. Jacobs asserted that the group would not work on the proposal under pressure."108 As the Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committee Report later stated, the situation resulted in a deadlock: "the Trustees refused to consider the student proposal while the 'hold-in' continued, and the students refused to give up the 'hold-in' until the Trustees enacted the student proposal or its equivalent."109 At 5:55 p.m., President Jacobs requested that Betty Belden be allowed to leave the building. The students complied and explained that they were not threatening the trustees. A. Henry Moses, Jr. '28 replied that he felt they were, but the Executive Committee nonetheless considered the scholarship proposal of great importance.110 About an hour later, Dean Dorwart asked several of the students to consider the terms of a scholarship proposal that President Jacobs had formulated, and to which the Executive Committee had given its informal agreement when deliberations were interrupted. The president's proposal offered $15,000 from the College's general funds to match the money the Senate was prepared to allocate from its budget. The students rejected this offer because it fell far short of the $150,000 the
Senate’s proposal had envisioned. An hour later, a number of seniors who had just attended the Senior Class Banquet joined the crowd outside Downes and Williams, and a “counter-demonstration” developed. Shortly thereafter, at 8:30 p.m., TAN permitted the trustees and administrators to depart. The demonstrators then began an occupation of Williams in an effort to deny access to offices until the Senate proposal was implemented.\textsuperscript{111}

The standoff continued throughout the night and during the ensuing day (VI-12). President Jacobs was loath to call in the Hartford police, stating in his April 30 memorandum to the Trinity community that he was determined to preserve the detachment of the College community in its free pursuit of inquiry and knowledge, “a privilege which is eroded each time the academic community is disrupted, however briefly, and it is a privilege which is eroded each time the academic community surrenders authority, however briefly, to an outside agency.”\textsuperscript{112} While Director of Campus Security Alfred A. Garofolo (VI-13) and his staff maintained close watch, the College administration proceeded to achieve resolution of the situation through the efforts of an ad hoc committee composed of members of the administration and the faculty. Shortly after midnight on April 23, agreement was reached, and at about 1:00 a.m., the demonstrators called off the sit-in, which had lasted for more than 30 hours.\textsuperscript{113} President Jacobs indicated that discipline of the students who participated in the sit-in would be carried out through the College’s normal judicial channels. In the conclusion of his memorandum he stated: “the events of the 22nd and 23rd of April seem to me to constitute a tragic offense, one that threatened the very integrity of the academic community . . . Violence was avoided. There was no damage. The College retained control of its affairs. There are no martyrs. While there was a brief disruption of College business, there was no loss of control over College affairs.”\textsuperscript{114}

Faculty reaction to the sit-in as reported in the \textit{Tripod} ranged from sympathy and understanding (“heroic” and “justifiable”) to disapproval and disgust (“arrogant” and “gangsterism”).\textsuperscript{115} Professor Stephen Minot (English) viewed the demonstration as an effort on the part of the students to gain control over their “immediate environment,” and to “shift priorities in the U. S. and in its educational institutions” through “appeals, demonstrations, or disruptions,” forms of action that he considered “constructive instability, a strong insistence for program change.” Minot further asserted that faculty members in general had failed to “provide ways in which students can be heard.”\textsuperscript{116} Professor James W. Gardner, Jr. (English) believed that the faculty did not understand “the demonstrators’ message,” which, he claimed, was that “nearly a fourth of our students—and the brightest and most responsible are among them—honestly felt that the established and ‘orderly’ procedures for communication had not and were not working.” Gardner went on to observe that “the so-called moderate faculty have expressed shock that civil disobedience was necessary on this campus. They praise the leaders of civil disobedience elsewhere, but they will not see that it was as necessary here as it was in . . . Memphis.” “When these tactics are used against the ‘politically
powerful,” Gardner pointed out, they were usually sanctioned, but when “applied against the powerfully uncommitted, the moans and groans begin.” Professor Heinrich H. Stabenau (English) held that the sit-in was unnecessary, and noted the “naive tendency on the part of the students to see everyone in Williams Memorial as villains.” In his view, the demonstration was the result of “misunderstanding, with neither side giving the other a chance.” In a panel discussion, “Are Students Revolting?,” the Tripod reported that Professor George B. Cooper (History) “challenged the tactics that were used, stating that the methods destroyed the validity of the ends. He felt that little imagination was used . . . to create ‘a viable means of communication.’” In Cooper’s view, the sit-in was “a confrontation of power with power, with none of the processes of scholarship evident. This in a community supposedly made up of scholars.” The demonstrators were “dude ranch moralists” who wanted to accomplish their ends without the support of a solid intellectual underpinning.

The ad hoc negotiating committee, consisting of Dean Dorwart, Chaplain Alan C. Tull, and professors George C. Higgins, Jr. (Psychology) and Richard T. Lee (Philosophy) (VI-14), assured the demonstrators that it was fully empowered to find a mutually satisfactory end to the disturbance, and disclosed that Trinity was in the process of appointing a black admissions staff member who would be responsible for intensifying the recruitment of disadvantaged students. The final agreement called for the College to provide sufficient financial aid for as many black students “as are available,” not just from the Hartford and New Haven areas, with a minimum guarantee of 15 full scholarships for disadvantaged students, and to match the Senate’s pledge of $15,000 in scholarship funds, “with the intention to go as far beyond that as the budget of the college will allow.” The student negotiating team submitted the terms of the agreement to their fellow demonstrators, who voted their approval. All participants in the demonstration agreed to accept the consequences of their actions in regard to discipline. In response to the College’s agreement to provide increased scholarship assistance for black students, the Senate later passed a motion made by Ralph G. White ’68, which called for students to contribute directly to the scholarship fund in an effort to demonstrate personal commitment in improving race relations, and to lessen reliance on an allocation of funds from the Senate’s budget. The Senate reaffirmed its pledge to make up the difference between what was raised and the $15,000 total it had promised.

The local press reacted to the events of April 22 and 23 with such headlines as: “Trinity Students’ Lock-In Bars President,” “Trinity Trustees Outraged, Regret Students’ Action,” “Grave Issues Reign On Clear Spring Day,” and “Trinity Sit-in Ends, Funds Promised.” The New York Times, under the headline “200 Youths Tie Up Trinity College,” noted that “Trinity College was virtually paralyzed today [April 23] by a civil rights demonstration . . . .” The Trinity story, however, was quickly swept off the front pages by the breaking news of the disruption that had begun at Columbia University, an occurrence that, in contrast to the situation at
Trinity, involved a much larger number of students, lasted over a week's time, and resulted in police intervention. Furthermore, Columbia was brought virtually to a standstill on a false pretext, as Mark Rudd, one of the incident's principal architects, later revealed. In a speech he gave in the fall of 1968, urging Harvard and other Boston-area students to carry out demonstrations of their own, Rudd admitted that: "We manufactured the issues. The Institute for Defense Analysis is nothing at Columbia. Just three professors. And the gym issue is bull. It doesn't mean anything to anybody. I had never been to the gym site before the demonstration began. I didn't even know how to get there."126 In characterizing the Trinity incident, President Jacobs asserted in his April 30 memorandum that: "The direct outcome of the entire occurrence was, ironically, consistent with the desires of both the demonstrators and of the institution—a reassertion of commitment to take action of the problems of Race and Poverty 'within the scope of our ability to contribute meaningfully to the solutions of those complex and urgent needs.'"127 At a special meeting on April 24, the faculty endorsed Jacobs's handling of the situation.128

President Jacobs initially favored taking stern measures against the six students who had masterminded the sit-in, but soon determined that all of the participants should be brought before the Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committee (the "3-3 Committee") to face appropriate action. Of the six leaders, three were seniors, two were juniors, and one was a freshman. Also, three were white, and three were black. In regard to their fields of study, three were social science majors, two were humanities majors, and one was a science major. Subsequent investigation by the Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committee revealed that, in general, the 168 participants were "not a homogeneous group," and "represented a wide spectrum of the student body. Included in the group were many student leaders, varsity athletes, members of various academic and honorary societies, and others from all segments of the student population. The number of so-called student radicals was relatively small, and there is no way to distinguish that their involvement was any greater than that of other students."129

Trinity undergraduates did not universally support the sit-in, although many sympathized with its goal. In referring to the demonstrators, one freshman stated that "I think what they're doing is idealistically correct but they got caught up and lost their perspective." Another student observed, "We're for the program but against the tactic." Yet another noted, "I don't think this is the right way to do it."130 An editorial in the Tripod stated: "Crisis did not bring out the best in Trinity gentlemen," and urged the student body "to give careful thought to their policies, and to discard the use of 'crisis-diplomacy' as a viable political method."131 While the sit-in was underway, life seemed to continue more or less undisturbed on the campus, notwithstanding the serious nature of the situation. Several athletic events were conducted on schedule, and at one point, reportedly, there was an informal bocci game underway on the Quad.132 The Hartford Times noted that "it was a peaceful sit-in . . . . And it was a tidy sit-in. Student leaders assigned work crews to keep the administration building..."
clean "so we can give it back to the administration just like we found it," according to one protestor.  

The trustees present in the Board's meeting room were decidedly upset, and several were outraged. After his release, A. Henry Moses, Jr. '28, referring to the act of detention as "outrageous" and "illegal," remarked that "We are not going to act on the dictates of the students." Henry S. Beers '18 stated that "the general purpose of what students demanded was excellent. But the action of the group was wrong." He was impressed that the demonstrators were "so orderly except for one thing: the completely illegal and inexcusable prevention of trustees from leaving the building." The Board's Vice Chairman, Lyman B. Brainerd '30, president of the Hartford Steam Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company, described the demonstration as a "block-in" rather than a sit-in, and indicated that the Executive Committee might have come to a decision at its meeting except for the action of the students. "We were prepared to stay all night," he went on. Adding that, in his view, the demonstration undermined the students' cause, he concluded: "I think the executive committee members are broad-gauged enough not to hold the demonstration against them (the students)."

Another trustee present, Dr. Theodore D. Lockwood '48, recalled that he had been invited to attend the meeting in his capacity as president-elect. "I was not prepared for April 22nd, and can quite understand as one who was after all in full-time education, why the other trustees and the Executive Committee on that particular afternoon were so disconcerted and surprised." Lockwood was recovering from a broken leg suffered in a skiing accident, and still wore a cast. He remembered that after William P. Gwinn had been denied exit from the boardroom, "we reassembled and really didn't know what was happening . . . There was no way either to get out of it [the room]—the stairwell was blocked—or to call out of it . . . " "Al Jacobs had not been well that spring," Lockwood continued, "and the situation 'caught him off guard.'" Opinions about what to do ranged across the spectrum, and Henry Beers reportedly stated that it was necessary to "understand what the issues are and help the president come to grips with them some way or another, and work our way out of this." In Lockwood's view, the sit-in "crushed Jacobs. He was terribly shaken by it, quite properly regarded it as an affront to the trustees, for which he bore some responsibility in his view, and I think it was just he was not having that easy a spring physically . . . . Here was graduation a little over a month away and all hell is breaking loose." The demonstrators had signed a petition stating that they were prepared to "assume a collective responsibility for the action, rather than permit only six men to bear the punitive burden." On April 25, Dean of Students Roy Heath read the charges against the demonstrators at an open proceeding, and on April 26, the Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committee (the "3-3" Committee) began to hold individual hearings for each student "on the charge of responsibility of restricting the right of access and exit" to the trustees and administrators in Downes. The "3-3" Committee consisted of professors Theodor M. Mauch (Religion), chairman, Don A.
Mattson (Mathematics), H. McKim Steele, Jr. (History) (VI-15), and Medusa members Samuel H. Elkin ’68, Daniel L. Goldberg ’68, and a classmate who participated in the demonstration and therefore disqualified himself from service on the Committee. On May 17, 1968, the Committee issued its report. That same day, prior to the report’s release, President Jacobs, in his executive capacity and as Chairman of the Board of Trustees, issued a formal “Statement Concerning The Disruptions” in which he reiterated the substance of his April 30 memorandum and stated that “the College will not condone any recurrence of the disturbances . . . .” He went on to indicate that his statement was made prior to having knowledge of the penalties imposed by the Committee, or of the reaction of the faculty, which was “responsible for the behavior of the student body.” The Committee determined that the charges applied to 168 students whose names were appended to its report, and not to an additional 37 students originally thought to have been involved. The report found that: the incident was not inevitable and could have been avoided; the student proposal was so inflexible that it precluded consideration of other ways of financing the scholarships, and led to literal interpretation by students; there was an urgent need for the Trustees to be more open to student concerns and problems, and the procedures for dealing with student proposals needed to be clarified; and credit was due both sides in keeping the incident from becoming disorderly. The central finding was that communications on the part of the administration and the students were equally faulty, before and during the sit-in.

The Committee determined that there was an immediate action the College needed to take: the establishment of a “Trinity Interaction Center” (TIC), which would facilitate “interaction among individuals and groups toward a viable society and creative community,” both at Trinity and in Hartford. Located on campus, the Center would have a governing board composed of representatives from the campus community and the Hartford community. In regard to disciplining the 168 demonstrators, the Committee recommended instituting a “pensum,” through which students could demonstrate social concern in a concrete way. In the case of the seniors, the pensum had to be accomplished before graduation, and for the other students, by June 1, 1969. The pensum for each senior consisted of soliciting contributions from seven prospective donors toward a goal of $400 that would help establish the Center and support its activities. A senior could also choose to carry out the pensum designated for freshmen, sophomores, and juniors, which required engaging in a wide range of social projects coordinated or approved by the Center. At a special meeting on May 17, the faculty considered the report, and voted to approve it as well as President Jacobs’s previously issued statement on the disruptions. Also receiving a favorable vote was a motion that required that the faculty rather than the proposed Center approve any special project a student might carry out as a pensum.

On May 18, President Jacobs convened a special meeting of the Board of Trustees to consider the Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committee’s report and recommenda-
tions. After considerable discussion, consensus emerged among the trustees that the disciplinary procedures in place were inadequate to address the severity of the incident, and that the penums were insufficient punishment. Calling attention to the College Charter that stated that the Trustees had ultimate authority in matters of discipline, Glover Johnson ’22 moved to expel the 168 students, and suggested instituting criminal proceedings against them. In his view, the students’ actions were criminal, and the students involved should be held responsible. Lyman B. Brainerd ’30, Vice Chairman of the Board, argued that the penalties the Committee’s report proposed were too light, particularly in regard to the seniors. Many trustees held the view that because so much time had passed since the disturbance, it was too late for expulsion. On the other hand, amnesty was out of the question. Dr. Lockwood later recalled that “the trustees were badly divided because some wanted them [the demonstrators] expelled, some wanted [them] at least suspended, . . . the Board was just all over the hall, . . . [and] felt increasingly discouraged at how you could . . . keep the community from falling apart.”148 While maintaining that guerrilla tactics were unacceptable, Lockwood cautioned his fellow trustees that whatever action was taken should not result in making martyrs of the demonstrators, and that the disciplinary procedures then in effect needed review and strengthening. Following Lockwood’s suggestion, which Henry S. Beers ’18 and other moderate trustees strongly supported, the Board voted to enter “disciplinary probation” on the students’ permanent record cards. The Trustees also made it clear that if there were any further infractions of the College’s rules on the part of the freshmen, sophomores, and juniors, immediate expulsion would occur. The demonstrators could, however, petition the Trustees, no earlier than the beginning of the spring semester of the following academic year, and have the notation of the punishment removed from their records. The Trustees’ action did not preclude a student from graduating upon successful completion of academic requirements. The Board also voted to receive the Student-Faculty Committee’s report, but to withhold adoption of its recommendations.149

The Trustees issued a public statement on their decision shortly after the conclusion of their meeting. After reviewing the statement, which, for some unknown reason, included no mention of the possibility of petitioning for removal of the punishment notation, Medusa immediately demanded that President Jacobs appear before them to discuss the situation. Explaining that her husband was exhausted from the day’s deliberations, Mrs. Jacobs offered to speak with Medusa members, and went to meet them at Mather Hall in company with Dr. and Mrs. Dorwart. She pleaded with Medusa for understanding of Dr. Jacobs’s condition, and suggested that they meet him the following Monday, two days hence. Displeased, Medusa called in Dean Dorwart, and expressed to him outrage at the Board’s “interference with normal disciplinary procedure,” alarm at the apparent possibility that freshmen, sophomores, and juniors might be “gagged” for the remainder of their years at Trinity, and shock at the realization that the penalty notation on a student’s permanent record card might
bear negatively on admission to graduate school.\textsuperscript{150}

By Sunday, May 19, the situation had reached such a critical point that President Jacobs and Dean Dorwart, deeply dismayed by the hardening views on the part of students, faculty, and trustees, seriously considered resigning, but decided that if they could weather the storm for three days, final exams were scheduled to start on Thursday, which would likely have a “sobering effect” on the students.\textsuperscript{151} On Monday, both men, together with Dean Heath, visited Vice Chairman Brainerd at his corporate office to determine whether there was any room for movement on the part of the Board in response to demands for reconsideration that the student body had made at meetings held the previous evening. Brainerd “replied in the negative,” Dorwart recalled. “Mr. Jacobs then said, ‘I guess you give me no alternative but to consider resigning.’” Dorwart “quickly said, ‘If Mr. Jacobs resigns, I resign also.’”\textsuperscript{152} Brainerd was steadfast in his “steely attitude,” and the three administrators returned to the campus. Later that day, in a conversation with Dorwart, Jacobs indicated that he “was determined to stay through Commencement,” to which the Dean agreed with foreboding.\textsuperscript{153}

At a special meeting on May 20, called to consider the Board’s action, the faculty adopted two resolutions. The first, which Professor Jerrold Ziff (Fine Arts) introduced, recommended convening a commission on the College’s disciplinary procedures, with membership consisting of representatives from the Board of Trustees, the administration, the faculty, and the student body. The second, introduced by Thomas A. Smith ’44, Associate Dean of the College, called for establishing a commission, as described in the Ziff motion, that would “meet to plan procedures by which the government of the College will be realistically and effectively established . . . with full cognizance of the role and responsibility of faculty and administration in matters of discipline, and with full cognizance of the roles and responsibilities of students and trustees, and established in a manner consistent with the needs of the College in the late 20th Century.”\textsuperscript{154} In addition, Smith moved that the faculty suspend its previous adoption of the Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committee’s report, and respectfully requested the Trustees to suspend their action of May 18.\textsuperscript{155}

On the following day, May 21, in response to the faculty’s action, Vice Chairman Brainerd released a statement, which he had prepared with the assistance of several other trustees. The statement declared that the Board stood by its decision in creating a new disciplinary penalty, but “did not intend to overturn current disciplinary procedures.” Furthermore, beginning in the spring semester of the following academic year, students could petition the faculty’s Committee on Academic Standing and Discipline for removal of the disciplinary notation from their permanent record. In addition, the statement continued, the Trustees were anxious to be cooperative in resolving the problems the College faced, and were therefore willing to designate members to serve on the Ziff-Smith commission.\textsuperscript{156} Brainerd’s statement was released in the late afternoon, prior to several student meetings scheduled that night. Frustrated at the situation, Medusa members resigned, unwilling any longer to perform their disciplinary
functions. Tension was growing, and the idea of a student strike was in the air, as word spread that the faculty would hold a special meeting the following day. At a 10 p.m. meeting of the student body, which adopted a resolution reaffirming the “integrity and legality” of the Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committee’s recommended punishment of the demonstrators, Charles T. (Chuck) Kingston, Jr. ’34, a trustee, argued that he felt “the faculty recommendations made a hell of a lot of sense.” Kingston went on to state that he would discuss the situation with every trustee “as soon as possible,” and observed, “I think you should make some effort to understand the trustees—they’re really not a bunch of stupid jerks.”

In Dorwart’s view, Kingston’s remarks “had the effect of keeping the lid on things that night. He deserves great credit for his action.”

The following day, May 22, Professor Theodor M. Mauch (Religion) asked Dean Dorwart to arrange a meeting with Vice Chairman Brainerd, which proved unproductive. At its meeting later in the day, the faculty voted to designate three of its members to serve on the commission, and adopted a resolution by Professor Richard T. Lee (Philosophy) reaffirming the faculty’s May 20th position regarding disciplinary authority. Then followed lengthy discussion of a motion by Professor Paul Smith (English) (VI-16) stating that, because there was “no instrumental definition of the phrase ‘Disciplinary Probation’ in any document concerning the order of the College, therefore, be it resolved that no record of these charges shall appear on the college records of the charged students until the Commission can report back to the college community.” The motion passed by one vote. The newspapers carried reports of the faculty’s action, which the students, according to Dean Dorwart, regarded as support for their position. That same day, the students and the Trustees selected their representatives for the commission, and President Jacobs appointed three representatives of the administration. The Board’s Executive Committee designated G. Keith Funston ’32, A. Henry Moses ’28, and Seymour E. Smith ’34 for commission service, declaring unequivocally, however, that their action “in no way takes away the authority of the Trustees.”

The Commission on Disciplinary Procedures was not scheduled to meet until after Commencement, and the issue soon arose as to whether the notation of disciplinary probation should be entered on the permanent records of the student demonstrators. At its meeting on June 1, the Board of Trustees stated that the notation “Disciplinary Probation May 18-June 2, 1968” had to appear on the students’ permanent records. If not, in the case of the seniors, graduation would not occur. Dean Dorwart reluctantly ordered the entering of the notations. On June 10, President Jacobs released a memorandum to the faculty and administration indicating that the “disciplinary probation” notation had been entered on the permanent records of every demonstrator. Each student and his parents were also notified. At its meeting on June 12, 1968, the Faculty Committee on Academic Standing and Discipline authorized that the notation on the seniors’ records be supplemented by a footnote reading “Notation Not Authorized by Faculty.” Subsequently, the records of all of the demonstrators bore the footnote.
In retrospect, the Trinity sit-in testified to a breakdown of the climate of trust and respect for authority at the College, a phenomenon reflected in the country’s political institutions as well as on many college and university campuses. The sit-in came at the zenith of the student movement in the 1960s, and in contrast to demonstrations at Berkeley, Columbia, and elsewhere, was peaceful and nonviolent. President Lockwood believed that “we went through it [the sit-in] in a fairly good manner, and I think people were unnecessarily self-critical subsequently because really there was no physical damage here. There was no bitterness created. Faculty didn’t leave because of it. Some trustees had a little hard time recovering from it, but overall we handled it well.”166 Associate Academic Dean Spencer concurs with Lockwood’s views, noting that “no elaborate ‘mythology’ [in regard to the sit-in] developed here (unlike at Columbia) to be transmitted to ensuing generations of students . . . . While it took Columbia a decade and more to get over its troubles, Trinity seems to have put the sit-in behind it pretty quickly, and without a lot of lingering wounds (save perhaps for some donors) . . . .”167 Ironically, as previously noted, the steps the College had taken to increase the enrollment of black students soon resulted in significant improvements.

In connection with scholarship funds for black students, the results of the protests undertaken by the demonstrators in the Class of 1968 are unrecorded. In January 1969, the Senate launched a scholarship drive among the student body, the administration, and the faculty. Philip S. Khoury ’71, head of the Senate Scholarship Fund that was coordinated by the Senate’s Race and Poverty Committee, noted that it would require several years of effort on Trinity’s part to increase the number of disadvantaged students enrolling at the College. Part of the fund drive’s strategy involved approaching foundations, particularly those linked with families of Trinity undergraduates, and with President Lockwood’s agreement, students pledged that they would raise as large an amount as they could.168 In the years following, the student fund-raising effort gradually dwindled as memory of the sit-in faded, but the College remained determined to increase scholarship funding and to provide assistance to as many undergraduates as possible.

The sit-in resulted in a number of important changes at the College. The administration reviewed and strengthened judicial procedures and mechanisms for dealing with student discipline, became more sensitive to the need for flexibility in responding to student concerns, including participation in decision making, and sought to improve communications with the campus community. Called into question by their ineffectual response during the sit-in, established institutions of student government gradually disappeared, their place taken eventually by others, and activist-minded students turned their attention to various projects in Hartford coordinated by the Trinity Community Action Center. In addition, the faculty became aware that its increased participation in college governance across a broad spectrum of issues was critically important in maintaining and asserting its authority and powers.169

During the spring of 1970, two other notable incidents of protest occurred on
campus, one an act of violence, the other an act of peaceful dissent. In the early morning hours of Wednesday, March 25, a fire bomb destroyed the reception area and heavily damaged an adjacent office in President Lockwood's administrative suite in Downes Memorial. The police investigation proved unsuccessful in identifying the perpetrator(s), whether on- or off-campus. Later in the spring, as Associate Academic Dean Spencer recalls, “following the Cambodian ‘incursion’ and the killing of students at Kent State and Jackson State . . .;” Trinity students, in keeping with those at hundreds of colleges and universities across the country, “declared a ‘strike,’ but here it was ‘non-coercive,’ which meant classes continued to be held for those who wished to attend them . . . Students who preferred to spend the remaining week or two of the term working against the war were excused from attending—and also exempted from taking final exams.” With the approval of the faculty, an estimated 800 to 900 students availed themselves of the opportunity to voice their disagreement with national policy. They engaged in letter-writing campaigns to members of Congress, circulated anti-war petitions in the Greater Hartford area, and spoke before a wide range of business and community groups. In Spencer’s view, the noncoercive protest gave “non-radical students the feeling that they were making a real contribution to ending the war . . . Compared to what was happening on a lot of campuses that tumultuous spring, . . . the conduct of Trinity undergraduates represented one of the bright, shining moments in the annals of student activism.”

On the national scene, the student movement had peaked by 1970, and thereafter declined rapidly in importance and influence. In attempting to explain this phenomenon, Dr. Clark Kerr, president emeritus of the University of California (Berkeley), and former chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, has noted the disappointment students felt that their efforts “to influence national policy . . . had been a failure . . . They were turned off by the violence of Kent State and Jackson State, in Greenwich Village and in Madison. They wanted no part of it.” Kerr also maintains that “the movement had been taken over by the Weathermen, the Maoists, and the Black Panthers . . .;” had come to embrace acts of illegality that were proving counterproductive, and there was uncertainty as to its future direction. In addition, radical student leaders had “misjudged the situation by believing that a minority of college students . . . could carry out a revolution all by themselves in a highly stable democracy.” What Kerr found extraordinary in the movement’s aftermath was that “college students of that generation became . . . the strongest supporters of a . . . conservative president . . .;” the real ‘movement’ was to make money economically and to go right politically.”

At its meeting on June 1, 1968, the Board of Trustees authorized President-elect Lockwood to appoint “an advisory council of four students, four faculty, and four members of the administration to meet with him during the coming academic year and to confer upon issues before the Trinity community.” Known as the Trinity College Council, the new body was advisory in nature, and its purpose was to
respond in a coordinated way to matters brought to it by the president, the administration, the Student Senate, and the faculty. In an article which appeared in the *Trinity Alumni Magazine* in 1969, the Council's secretary, Thomas A. Smith '44, then Director of External Affairs and former Associate Dean of the College, observed that, to his knowledge, the initial meeting of Council members in September 1968 was the first time in the history of Trinity College that a group composed of students, faculty, and administrators had been gathered for the purpose, on a continuing basis, of conferring with and advising the President on non-academic issues which were of concern and interest to the college community. It was also the first time that such a group had come together as colleagues to deliberate upon policies which would influence the well-being of the institution... [and] attempt to come to terms with issues and needs within a framework which could not simply endure dissonance but also convert it to consonance.177

Lockwood considered the Council a great improvement over previous mechanisms, under which issues of mutual concern had been considered by different groups individually, a haphazard process that he believed contributed to slowing deliberation, blurring lines of responsibility, and impeding resolution. The Council was also expected to help the president improve communication with all constituencies in the College community. The student body and the faculty elected members to serve on the Council, whose first challenge was to review a new campus judicial system, which a committee of three (one student, one faculty member, and one administrator), drawn from the Commission on Regulatory Procedures and appointed by the president, had undertaken to develop during the summer of 1968.178

President Lockwood affirmed the importance of both the Council and the Commission at the faculty’s meeting on September 11, 1968, the Council assembling for the first time that same day. During the 1968-1969 academic year, faculty membership of the Council consisted of: professors Edward W. Sloan III (History) (VI-17), chairman; Frank M. Child III (Biology) (VI-18); Robert D. Foulke (English) (VI-19); and Murray S. Stedman, Jr. (Government) (VI-20). Representing the administration were: Dr. Robert W. Fuller (VI-21), newly appointed Dean of the Faculty; Thomas A. Smith '44, Associate Dean of the College; Dr. Roy Heath, Director of Student Affairs and Dean of Students; and John S. Waggett '63 (VI-22), then Associate Director of Admissions. Pending a student election in November, there were three undergraduates on the Council: Joseph M.Connors '69, vice chairman; Peter H. Ehrenberg '69; and James M. McClaugherty '70. By 1970, Council membership had broadened to include representatives of the graduate students, parents of undergraduates, the College staff, and the alumni.179

The Council was not a governing body, lacking authority in that regard, but a forum for discussion of issues important to the College community as a whole. Although Council members felt initially that all meetings should be held in executive session, Associate Dean Smith believed that the reversal of this policy, prompted by
its reexamination at the request of one of the undergraduate members, was “one of the wisest actions taken... during the year; for as time went on, it became evident that non-members who attended meetings often had as much to contribute as members and, more important to the well-being of the institution, the Council gave individuals and groups in the student body a very definite access to the initial process by which various college procedures and policies were formed or recommended. In the past this kind of access had never been so simple nor so available.”

For the duration of its existence, the Council remained in an advisory capacity to the president, making recommendations for action on policy and administrative procedures, such as guidelines for the confidentiality of student records, which were adopted by the College, and a proposal for the appointment of undergraduate trustees, an innovative idea not taken up by the Board. By 1974, issues such as the quality of dining facilities, the need for an addition to the College library, and recommendations on how the College could respond to societal and global issues, including hunger, were coming before the Council. It soon ceased to play a major advisory role, and gradually fell into disuse.

During the spring of 1968, the 12-man Commission on Regulatory Procedures had begun to consider its charge. The Commission consisted of three members each from the student body, the faculty, the administration, and the trustees. A campus-wide student election, held in late May, resulted in the selection of Joseph M. Connors '69, James M. McLaugherty '70, and Robert B. Pippin '70. The Trustees designated G. Keith Funston '32, A. Henry Moses '28, and Seymour E. Smith '34 as their representatives; and President Jacobs appointed Dean Heath, Dean Smith, and John S. Waggett '63 of the admissions staff. The faculty elected professors Frank M. Child III (Biology), Edward W. Sloan III (History), and Murray S. Stedman, Jr. (Government). The Commission’s first meeting occurred on May 27, when Professor Stedman was elected chairman, and Mr. Waggett was chosen secretary. The Commission’s assignment was to develop specific recommendations “for new disciplinary and judicial systems at the College,” and to report through President Lockwood to its four constituent groups by the following September.

The report called for the establishment of a disciplinary board consisting of three members of the faculty, three students, and three administrators. The faculty and student members were to be elected by their respective bodies, and the president was to
appoint the three administrators. All members of the academic community, including students, faculty, and the administration, were subject to the board’s jurisdiction, and “any member of the college could seek redress of an offense committed by any other member . . . , a radical alteration of past practice.” The board would hold a hearing in each case brought before it, with the defendant having the right of due process. The decision rendered could be appealed to the president. Under the terms of the proposed disciplinary board, Medusa no longer had any disciplinary function, and remained only an honorary society for the senior class. In exceptional situations, the Trustees might intervene in disciplinary cases, based on their ultimate responsibility and authority under the College Charter.

Upset with a number of provisions in the disciplinary board proposal, including the lack of tighter guidelines regarding trustee intervention, the student body rejected it in a referendum held in early November. Nor did the faculty favor the proposal, voting against it on November 12. While it was reviewing the Commission’s recommendations, the Trinity College Council undertook a recodification of all regulations governing undergraduate conduct. Completing this effort in late September 1968, the Council largely eliminated the in loco parentis stance that had characterized the previous regulations. The new regulations appeared in preliminary form in the 1968-1969 student Handbook, and called for the Dean of Students to refer serious infractions to the Faculty Committee on Academic Standing and Discipline. This arrangement remained in effect during part of the following year under the revised regulations and procedures, and the Associate Dean for Community Life, a new administrative officer of the College whose position resulted from a reorganization of the Dean of Students Office, became responsible for referring cases to the faculty committee.

In March 1970, the College adopted the Trinity Adjudicative System, similar in many ways to the previously proposed disciplinary board. The System consisted of a Board of Original Disposition, whose three members were drawn from a nine-member Adjudicative Panel. The latter dealt with infractions of certain regulations, and a six-member Special Adjudicative Panel dealt with infractions of other regulations. There was also a six-member Appeals Board, and a set of procedures for amending College regulations and the judicial system itself. The entire system underwent further revision, which resulted in the introduction in the spring of 1971 of a nine-member Board of Inquiry whose powers and responsibilities were part of the “Administrative Procedures in Matters of Discipline and Dispute” of which the College’s Vice President, Thomas A. Smith ’44, was the principal architect.

President Lockwood had originally thought of the Trinity College Council as filling a void in College governance, but its advisory role as well as its function of venting issues vital to all constituencies of the Trinity community nonetheless proved helpful during the early 1970s. Medusa lost its disciplinary function as previously mentioned, and by the fall of 1969, had vanished from existence. An attempt in 1970 to resurrect Medusa as an honor society was unsuccessful due to lack of interest. The influence of
the Student Senate was also on the wane, the victim of student cynicism, and 1969-1970 was its final year as a viable political entity. Lockwood attributed its demise to the loss of budget authority for student activities, a function assumed by the Mather Hall Board of Governors, to domination by student activists, and to a lack of political acumen and coalition-building on the part of its leadership. The Mather Hall Board of Governors emerged as the sponsor of all-College student social functions, and by 1972-1973, was joined by the Student Executive Committee, the Student Activities Committee, and the Budget Committee, the latter two groups involved in coordinating and budget allocation functions. The Student Executive Committee consisted of "all students elected to serve on faculty committees, the undergraduate members of the Trinity College Council, and several students elected at large." Formed in 1971 "to conduct student elections and to fill vacancies in student seats on faculty committees," the Committee received authorization through a student referendum in May 1972 "to exercise broader powers of student government." Since that time, it has continued to serve as the principal form of student government at Trinity.

Coeducation, Long Range Planning, and the Advent of Information Technology

Apart from dealing with the aftermath of the sit-in, President Lockwood had three major concerns in mind regarding the future course of the College when he took office on July 1, 1968. These were a thorough review and restructuring of the curriculum, the need to continue enhancing the institution's financial resources, and the question of whether Trinity "could afford to remain a men's college any longer." As Lockwood later recalled, "the College was poised . . . to move in new directions. I've often felt that the timing was, in a sense, gratuitous, excellent for doing a lot of new things. People were prepared for it. It was, you might say, overdue. . . . I really sat down and said, 'What do we tackle first? How do we move, because it's quite clear we're going to do a lot of things rather rapidly.'" There had been informal consideration of coeducation underway for some time on the part of a number of faculty and students. In March 1966, for example, Professor Donald D. Hook (Modern Languages) expressed his view in the Tripod that, were the College to become coeducational, it "would be the first private men's college (of 'quality') in New England to do this and would thereby create a unique institution for an area extending from north Jersey to Boston and west." Hook then referred to a February 1964 Tripod feature article in which several faculty and administrators spoke favorably of coeducation at Trinity, and concluded that the time had come to "initiate some action." Other colleges and universities were begin-
ning to consider the move to coeducation as well, among them Princeton. In early September 1968, a report that Princeton's Board of Trustees had commissioned concluded that for the University "to remain an all-male institution in the face of today's evolving social system would be out of keeping with her past willingness to change with the times . . . it would also mean that within a decade, if not sooner, Princeton's competitive position for students, for faculty, and for financial support would be less strong than it now is."\textsuperscript{199} The report recommended that the University, which then had an undergraduate enrollment of 3,200, admit 1,000 women undergraduates.\textsuperscript{200}

At the conclusion of his inaugural address on October 12, 1968, President Lockwood drew exclamations of surprise from many in the audience when he announced that the Board of Trustees had "unanimously agreed to begin immediately a study of the feasibility of co-education at Trinity and has approved an exchange of students with Vassar College during the second semester of this academic year."\textsuperscript{201} Under Lockwood's leadership, the College proceeded to embark on a new course that has altered the institution fundamentally. As was the case with the G.I. Bill, the introduction of coeducation marked a profound change in the College, and has had a major impact on every facet of its institutional life, from the size of the student body, the content and breadth of the curriculum, and the composition of the faculty, to student life and intercollegiate athletics.

In a memorandum to President Lockwood, dated September 30, 1968, Dr. Robert W. Fuller, the new Dean of the Faculty, made a persuasive case that the time had come for Trinity to become a coeducational institution. Fuller noted that several institutions with which the College compared itself were either contemplating a similar move or had decided to admit women. Among them were Dartmouth, Wesleyan, Williams, Colgate, Hamilton, Union, Yale, and Princeton. Pressure was even mounting locally, and Dr. Laura A. Johnson, Hon. Hum. D. '75, president of Hartford College for Women, had recently suggested the idea of having its two-year graduates become non-residential candidates for the bachelor's degree at Trinity. The fundamental issue driving the decision to embrace coeducation, Fuller argued, was "the changing social patterns that have developed in the nation over the last several decades."\textsuperscript{202} The majority of American youth were attending coeducational elementary and secondary schools, and the presence of women in white-collar occupations was becoming increasingly felt. Fuller also noted that the report prepared for Princeton's Board of Trustees had called attention to increasing preference on the part of high school students to attend coeducational institutions of higher learning. Trinity's application rate had begun to fall off, a matter of considerable concern. Coeducational institutions, however, had the advantage of selecting from a pool of applicants 10 times as large as the single-sex institutions, whose applicant pool was steadily shrinking. Furthermore, Fuller argued, that shrinking pool contained fewer talented students, and a diminution in the number of exceptional students would lead in the long run to a faculty of lesser quality. In contrast, a coeducational Trinity could
expect to attract more talented students from a much larger pool of applicants. In regard to the impact of coeducation on the curriculum, Fuller maintained that careful selection of women applicants would assure the retention of curricular balance, and that adjustments to demand for new areas of study could be made gradually. In the classroom, he foresaw the advantages of the differing points of view women undergraduates could bring to discussion and debate, and argued against establishing a coordinate women’s college where men and women would be unlikely to mix in the classroom. Coeducation would also enhance the College’s social climate. Financially, Fuller’s view was that the cost of educating women students was equivalent to that of men, although additional dormitories and athletic facilities would have to be provided. He was also confident that alumni, especially those younger in age, would prove enthusiastically supportive. In conclusion, Fuller posed the central question: could the College “retain its level of excellence if it remains all-male? Is Trinity’s future excellence as a national college best assured by its opting for uniqueness in terms of an admissions policy with diminishing appeal? There can be little doubt that the chief concern of those in the Trinity community lies not with maintaining an outpost on the educational prairie but in guaranteeing future excellence.”

If it acted promptly, Fuller asserted, the College could undertake the necessary planning and lay the groundwork for coeducation during the 1968-1969 academic year. The principal reason for swift action was that “If we were to strike out boldly we could skim the cream off the untapped reservoir,” getting the jump on Wesleyan, which was scheduled to become coeducational in 1970. “If we remain cautiously behind Wesleyan and the others, they will get the cream. By seizing this unique opportunity we might well surpass, in one bound, the Little Three schools in the quality of our student body. Few such opportunities are presented in an institution’s history.”

In a letter to President Lockwood written a few days before, on September 24, Dean Fuller stressed the importance of strategy and timing in dealing with the Board of Trustees on the issue of coeducation. “I urge you to play it ‘close to the horns’ for only there lies the chance for a great presidency,” Fuller contended, “and in these times nothing less will suffice. On the other hand, too close, or ill-timed, and there is no presidency at all, and more important, irreparable harm to the entire college.” Fuller went on to maintain that the College could avoid the agony of a prolonged decision-making process, partly because other colleges had already paved the way, but especially because “everyone at Trinity is sick of soul-searching and hungry for a dramatic, progressive move.” By announcing the introduction of coeducation soon, the College could “enlist faculty and student help, and set the whole community working to prepare the way, having freed them from the paralysis of trying to convince the few unconvinced.”

In mid-October, Dean Fuller advised Lockwood on the composition of the joint committee of trustees, faculty, administrators, and students that the president was planning to appoint to study coeducation. Fuller maintained that the selection of particular trustee and faculty members would be critical in swaying the views of several
trustees who, at that point, were either opposed to coeducation or skeptical, chief among them former president G. Keith Funston '32. Among the trustees who could be persuasive, in Fuller’s view, were Barclay Shaw ’35 (VI-23) and the Rt. Rev. Walter H. Gray (VI-24), both of whom were supporters of coeducation. As for the faculty members, Fuller thought the appointment of Professor Edwin P. Nye (Engineering) (VI-25) could prove advantageous. He could reassure trustees that Trinity’s science curriculum would retain its strength under coeducation. In addition, Fuller suggested that W. Howie Muir ’51, the Director of Admissions, be appointed to the committee, recommended the names of several members of the Board of Fellows, and was confident that there were three “sober, mature, presentable students” whom Lockwood could appoint.

Soon thereafter, President Lockwood designated the members of the Committee on Coeducation. William R. Peelle ’44 of the Board of Fellows was appointed chairman. The trustee members were Bishop Gray, Barclay Shaw ’35, and George W. B. Starkey ’39, M.D.; faculty members were professors Edwin P. Nye (Engineering), Kathleen O. Hunter (Government), and Ronald J. Lee (English); administrators were W. Howie Muir ’51 and Leonard R. Tomat, Assistant Dean of Students; and the students were A. Kirk Marckwald ’69, John C. Chapin, Jr. ’70, and Joel H. Houston ’71. While the Committee proceeded to undertake its charge, reactions varied about the possibility that Trinity would become coeducational. As anticipated, some alumni strongly objected, many of them of the older generation, while others were enthusiastic. In early October, before President Lockwood’s inauguration, the Tripod conducted a poll of the student body in connection with the news that coeducation was likely for Williams, Wesleyan, and Kenyon College. The poll sought to determine the strength of support for coeducation at Trinity.

Of the 802 students who participated, 607 responded in the affirmative, many of them urging rapid action. Reflecting this sense of urgency, David Sarasohn ’71, contributor of a feature article in the December 10 Tripod, argued that coeducation had become “a matter of Trinity’s survival.” Other institutions such as Yale, Princeton, and Wesleyan had decided to become coeducational, and “in such company, Trinity might soon be the only all-male college.” There was a growing feeling on campus, he maintained, that “the College must be responsible to its society, and must, to provide a liberal education, reflect the elements of society. Part of that is agitation for more blacks on campus, another facet is the demand for coeducation.” Sarasohn went on to cite an observation by Fred M. Hechinger, education editor of the New York Times, who believed that an important factor contributing to the surging interest in coeducation was “the changed role of women in American educational society. The number of girls who enter graduate school and the professions is increasing. The Victorian concept that some academic areas and disciplines are less ladylike than others is vanishing.” Sarasohn maintained that, in Trinity’s case, “the desirability of coeducation is outweighed only by its urgency,” and proposed, for a brief
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Trinity's first two women engineering majors, Cynthia E. Bromberg, Class of 1975 (left), and Dorothy J. Greenberg, Class of 1974 (right), shown with Karl W. Hallden Professor of Engineering August E. Sapega.
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period, reducing by 100 the number of men in incoming classes, then averaging about 350, and admitting 100 women. In time, the College would gradually expand the undergraduate body, and a better balance would result.\textsuperscript{213}

Details of the Vassar exchange program gradually became available as the fall semester advanced. Responding to the announcement of the program in President Lockwood’s inaugural address, Professor Edmond L. Cherbonnier (Religion) observed that “a century-long era of old-world monasticism and New England Puritanism has come to an end at Trinity.”\textsuperscript{214} The expectation was that about 25 undergraduates from the College would apply for study at Vassar during the spring of 1969, and a roughly equivalent number of Vassar students would come to Trinity. Dean Fuller anticipated that the College would offer new courses in anthropology and sociology, thus reflecting the beginning of a trend to broaden the undergraduate curriculum that was then undergoing intensive review. By late November, the \textit{Tripod} reported that 20 women students from Vassar would be on campus the following semester, and that a similar number of women would be attending Colgate University and Williams College, the other two institutions participating in the exchange.\textsuperscript{215}\textsuperscript{f}

Early in January 1969, the Committee on Coeducation submitted its report, which recommended that the College become coeducational. Citing the quality of the Trinity educational experience, which would be “improved considerably if the complementary perspectives of both men and women are regularly available in the classroom,” the report pointed to the additional benefits of a considerably enlarged applicant pool, an improvement in the “quality and diversity” of the student body and the resulting enrichment of life on campus, continuing adherence on the part of the College to the mission of offering a liberal arts education, and the potential for strengthening undergraduate study of the sciences by attracting larger numbers of students interested in pursuing scientific careers. Central to the report’s recommendation was Trinity’s recent “emergence as a college with a national constituency and, correspondingly, a national reputation. The Committee feels that to protect and to enhance Trinity’s reputation as a \textit{national} college it is imperative that we now undertake the education of women at the undergraduate level.”\textsuperscript{216} The Committee saw the additional costs attributable to coeducation as a minimal problem in view of the benefits gained, and noted that Trinity’s dormitories could accommodate additional occupants and were already suitable for use by women. With respect to the number of women to be admitted and the potential effect on the size of the College, the report recommended that the ratio of men to women be 3:2, while a minimum acceptable ratio was 2:1. In this connection, the Committee was firm in its belief that Trinity “should not let the number of male students fall below the figure of 1000,” particularly in light of the need to remain competitive with Trinity’s sister colleges in intercollegiate athletics. Following the suggested ratios would lead gradually to an expansion of the undergraduate body to 1,600, composed of 1,000 men and 600 women. Finally, the Committee urged that the College introduce coeducation in the fall of 1969 by admitting women to the incoming fresh-
man class. As a result, the undergraduate body would increase to 1,600 by 1973. Most importantly, timing was crucial, and the exchange program with Vassar would help the College anticipate challenges associated with this bold move. By acting decisively, Trinity could assume a position of leadership among its peer institutions that were also contemplating coeducation.

In support of its recommendations, the Committee cited the results of surveys it had conducted among the faculty and the student body. Three-quarters of the 117 faculty members queried believed that the presence of women undergraduates would result in improving Trinity's academic program. Seventy percent held the view that teaching classes with men and women would be more rewarding than teaching only men, while 81 percent favored fully integrated classes within a unified curriculum. In addition, 79 percent of the faculty believed that coeducation would result in attracting better-qualified students to Trinity, and 60 percent maintained that faculty recruitment would be greatly enhanced. Finally, 87 percent of the faculty agreed that coeducation would lead to a more stimulating student social life and to the enrichment of student activities. Of the 732 students responding, 78 percent favored coeducation, and a 50:50 ratio of men to women emerged as the optimum over 60:40 by a margin of eight percentage points. Ninety percent of the students approved of fully integrated classes, and 67 percent believed that coeducation would help attract better-qualified students to Trinity. Finally, 74 percent maintained that the range of extracurricular and cultural activities would expand, while 85 percent held that Trinity's social life would improve. As the early years of coeducation at Trinity unfolded, many of these views were borne out in reality.

Acting upon the recommendations of the Committee's report, on January 11, 1969, the Trustees voted to "approve the admission of qualified women to degree status, effective September, 1969," and also authorized expanding beyond 1,250 the undergraduate enrollment of "men and women in such manner as shall be appropriate to the goals of the College and within its resources so to do, subject to annual review by the Trustees." The admissions staff began to recruit women students aggressively, and W. Howie Muir '51 reported in late February that the response had been "terrific." Interviewing of applicants would be going on "around the clock," and an estimated 600 women were then in some stage of the application process. Encouraging also was the increase in applications from men, which had risen by 200 over the 1,500 the College had received the previous year. Muir expected about 375 freshmen in the Class of 1973, 75 of them women.

On April 12, President Lockwood reported at the Trustees' meeting that, as of that point, Trinity had received 2,045 applications, 1,710 of which were from men, and 335 from women. Furthermore, 40 black students had been offered admission, and the need for additional scholarship funds for all students was becoming a matter of increasing concern. By May 31, the number of applications stood at 2,174. Of the 427 candidates accepted, 269 were men, and 105 were women. In addition, four men and 49
women were transfer students, and 104 members of the incoming class were eligible to receive financial aid. In September, the final count of the Class of 1973, not including transfer students, was 373, consisting of 267 men and 106 women (VT-26). The women were drawn from 18 states, including Alaska, as well as from Bermuda and Belgium. The number of women transfer students remained firm at 49, and there were several women exchange students from other colleges attending Trinity that fall. In addition, the experience derived from the Vassar exchange program the previous spring proved helpful in anticipating certain adjustments the College had to make, particularly regarding the physical plant and support services. In general, Trinity was as well prepared as it reasonably could be for the arrival of women undergraduates in the fall, although there were inevitable instances when quick thinking and resourcefulness were required to address unforeseen problems. As to housing during the 1969-1970 academic year, the administration placed 121 women and 125 men in the South Campus complex, which was well-suited as a coed dormitory. The sixth floor of the High Rise Dormitory was set aside for the women exchange students.

The women undergraduates quickly entered into the everyday life of the College. Twenty-five years later, Thomas A. Smith '44, for many years Trinity's Vice President, recalled that, in preparing for coeducation, the administration engaged in careful planning, but avoided over-planning and a preoccupation with micro-details. In addition, the experience derived from the Vassar exchange program the previous spring proved helpful in anticipating certain adjustments the College had to make, particularly regarding the physical plant and support services. In general, Trinity was as well prepared as it reasonably could be for the arrival of women undergraduates in the fall, although there were inevitable instances when quick thinking and resourcefulness were required to address unforeseen problems. As to housing during the 1969-1970 academic year, the administration placed 121 women and 125 men in the South Campus complex, which was well-suited as a coed dormitory. The sixth floor of the High Rise Dormitory was set aside for the women exchange students.

The first women students were pioneers, blazing the trail for their successors. Over the course of the ensuing three decades, coeducation has become fully integrated into all facets of the College's institutional life, ranging from the academic program and intercollegiate sports to extracurricular activities and social life. Participation in athletics required organizing various women's sports teams. As the decade of the 1970s advanced, the informal and club status of the teams soon gave way to varsity status as women began to make their mark in intercollegiate competition. The first challenge Karl Kurth, Jr., the Director of Athletics, faced was to expand the coaching staff, and in 1971, Jane A. Millspaugh accepted appointment to oversee all women's extracurricular sports activities as well as coach field hockey, lacrosse, squash, and tennis. She was joined in 1972 by Jane E. Fox, and in 1974, Kurth appointed Robin L. Sheppard, M '76 (VT-27) to the staff. Upon Millspaugh's departure, Sheppard continued to promote the growth of women's athletics at Trinity in addition to coaching. Other women coaches continued to join the staff, and in 1991, Sheppard became Assistant Athletic Director. Kurth also oversaw renovations to the athletic facilities, especially the locker rooms and training rooms, and dealt with a number of other concerns such as uniforms for women's teams. By 1998, the College offered 13 varsity sports for women, ranging from basketball, crew, and cross-country to tennis, track, and volleyball. In intercollegiate competition, women quickly began to assert themselves. For example: in 1976, 1977, and 1978, Coach Millspaugh's tennis teams had strong seasons and competed in the New England Intercollegiate Tournament, taking second place each time; in 1971, the women's squash team, under coach Roy
Dath, made Trinity history by competing for the first time in the National Women’s Squash Championships, and in 1979, they captured third place in the Nationals behind Princeton and Yale. In other sports, E. Lanier Drew ‘80 was an athletic standout, excelling in basketball, swimming, and cross-country.  

Women undergraduates also distinguished themselves in regard to the academic program. In 1971, Laura S. Sohval, a French major, was Trinity’s first woman salutatorian, and Joan L. Davies, a mathematics major, was the first woman valedictorian three years later. Previously, at Commencement in 1970, Judith (Judy) Dworin, Elizabeth M. Gallo, Judith A. L. Odlum, and Roberta J. Russell, all of whom had transferred to the College, became the first women to receive undergraduate degrees (VI-28). They shared a distinction as degree recipient pioneers with two high school teachers from the Hartford Public School system, Anne L. Gilligan and Dorothy M. McVay. As noted in the previous chapter, 40 years earlier in June 1930, they were the first women to earn master’s degrees in course at Trinity. Early in the 1970s, the College admitted two students who would become Trinity’s first women engineering majors, Dorothy J. Greenberg ‘74 and Cynthia E. Bromberg ‘75 (VI-29). In addition, Jane L. Veith ‘74 became the College’s first woman recipient of a national Watson Fellowship, which the Thomas J. Watson Foundation provides annually to graduating seniors at a select number of institutions, enabling them to pursue a year of independent post-graduate travel and study abroad. In the fall of 1974, an unusual coincidence occurred when freshman Walter L. Champion, Jr. ‘78, an English and writing major, arrived on campus to join his mother, Mrs. Barbara H. White ‘76, a junior majoring in sociology.

The impact on the faculty and academic departments that coeducation had during the first decade following its introduction is illustrated by examining the declaration of academic majors on the part of undergraduate women. For the Class of 1973, the first to enroll women as freshmen, the six most popular majors, in declining order, were psychology, English, modern languages, religion, history, and art history. For the Class of 1976, the ranking was psychology, English, modern languages, history, biology, economics, and religion. The most popular majors for women in the Class of 1979 were psychology, history, economics, biology, modern languages, and English. Psychology was the predominant favorite as a major among women in these three graduating classes, but interest in biology and economics was on the rise. The number of full-time and part-time faculty in the various departments in question remained relatively steady during the decade, reflecting the College’s financial prudence and President Lockwood’s sense that a conservative posture on the size of the faculty was necessary to allow for a future, and in his view, inevitable increase. By the mid-1980s, the number of faculty in the English Department had increased, but this was due largely to the establishment of an affiliated Writing Center Program. Among the other disciplines, the number of faculty in psychology, history, modern languages, economics, and biology had also increased, but modestly.

Women undergraduates soon began to contribute their time and energy to student
organizations and activities, but it would be several years before male students adjusted to the presence of women in positions of leadership. An early example of such leadership was H. Susannah Heschel '73 (VI-30), who became the first woman editor-in-chief of the Tripod. Adjustment also characterized the development of campus social life for women students. The introduction of coeducation largely ended the long-established male tradition of fleeing the campus on weekends for points north and south. As a Tripod article characterized the phenomenon, “Friday and Saturday nights about half the campus flings itself at illegal speeds toward Poughkeepsie, Northampton, or New London, while the other half sulks in the dormitory and feels sorry for itself.” The fraternities continued to dominate Trinity’s social scene, although interest in fraternity membership among the student body was waning, having declined by the end of the decade to approximately one-fifth of male undergraduates enrolled at the College. By 1980, six of the 11 fraternities in existence in 1970 had closed their doors. The various fraternity chapters approached coeducation cautiously, a few inviting women to join on a social or eating club basis, an arrangement first developed for the Vassar exchange students. One exception was Phi Kappa Psi, which pledged women as early as 1971. Delta Phi, IKA, and Theta Xi followed suit, severing their national ties to allow for the induction of women members, but these three fraternities soon faded out of existence. In the late 1970s, the administration began encouraging the fraternities to become fully coeducational, but encountered strong resistance, the one exception being Delta Kappa Epsilon (DKE), which pledged women in 1980, an act resulting in the loss of its national charter. Two sororities appeared on the campus in the early 1980s: the Beta Omega chapter of Delta Delta Delta (1981), and the Zeta Theta chapter of Kappa Kappa Gamma (1982). In 1984, St. Anthony Hall began admitting women pledges in response to recently developed College policy.

Despite such developments during the 1970s and early 1980s, the fraternity situation did not improve at Trinity in the eyes of many women undergraduates. In the spring of 1990, in connection with the 20th anniversary of coeducation, Professor Noreen L. Chambels (Sociology) (VI-31) conducted a survey of 3,000 alumnae who graduated from the College between 1972 and 1989. The survey was designed to gather views on what the women had experienced in four principal areas: strong memories about being a woman undergraduate at Trinity; fraternities and sororities; the academic program, the classroom, and faculty; and sexual harassment and abuse, security, and safety. For the most part, the women respondents recalled fraternities at Trinity as an unpleasant and distasteful memory. In their view, the fraternities exercised a disproportionate influence on campus social life, and there were no satisfactory alternatives. One alumna who graduated during the period from 1980 to 1984 viewed the establishment of sororities as a matter of little consequence, and believed that they did not add materially to social life for women students. Another respondent who graduated in the late 1980s found “the treatment of women by certain male
groups at Trinity, (for example, single sex fraternities) to be appalling. However, . . . the women are at fault as well," she maintained, "since it is their choice whether to allow themselves to be degraded and treated that way." In her view, the answer was not to abolish fraternities, but to educate women "on how to stop the treatment of themselves and others by not allowing the men to get away with their behavior . . . ." Yet another declared that, in the early 1980s, "there were many sacred cows, not to be questioned, but fraternities were the most sacred of all. Questioning the fraternities meant you were 'militant' or weird. Certainly you'd be isolated, and, of course, you were socially ugly." A few women recalled that fraternities had presented no problems for them. As will be discussed in the following chapter, fraternities came under intense scrutiny during the early 1980s, and their future remains unclear in 1998.

As the decade of the 1970s advanced, the number of women admitted to incoming classes gradually increased. In the fall of 1970, the Class of 1974 consisted of 173 women and 245 men, the 418 freshmen constituting the largest class enrolled up to that time, and also bringing the total undergraduate enrollment to 1,493. In the fall of 1975, the Class of 1979 totalled 394, or 164 women and 230 men; and in the fall of 1980, out of 453 freshmen in the Class of 1984, there were 223 women and 230 men. Although in March 1973, the Trustees voted to retain the 60:40 ratio of men to women, it was becoming increasingly clear that the men's varsity teams were remaining highly competitive, and that sufficient numbers of male undergraduates interested in collegiate sports were represented in incoming freshman classes. Accordingly, in January 1974, the Trustees authorized abandoning the guideline of 1,000 male students, effective with the Class of 1978, "so that the most highly qualified students, regardless of sex, can be admitted to Trinity College." In the fall of 1984, the Class of 1988 was the first to have more women than men, its 515 members consisting of 278 women and 237 men. Twelve years later, in 1996, 266 men and 238 women comprised the 504 members of the Class of 2000, the total undergraduate enrollment by then having reached 2,049.

By the late 1970s, there were still rough edges remaining from the early years of coeducation. Initially, the presence of women in class was not welcomed by some of the faculty, and although they were but a small number, their attitude stood out as an unpleasant memory for several women who graduated in the early 1970s. One alumna of that period recalled in the 1990 survey that "while a number of male students displayed extremely negative attitudes to the female presence, the faculty response was even more disappointing. The professor who announced that no woman in his course would ever receive a grade higher than 'C' stands out in my mind." "In visiting the campus over the last 20 years," the alumna continued, "I have observed that the situation has improved with the increased numbers of women on campus. Trinity's evolution into a co-ed college appears to be a success—but one should not believe that it happened overnight." Another alumna of the early 1970s recalled, "I was the only female major in my class. The chairman of the department made it quite clear that he
did not want women in his department. At meetings, he would address the group as ‘Lady and gentlemen.’ An alumna who graduated in the second half of the decade remembered “a professor who, rather than help me in understanding the course material after class hours and upon special request (by me[,] told me it didn’t matter if I was doing poorly . . . . I belonged back on the farm from whence I came.”

Perhaps the ultimate instance of faculty arrogance regarding women students occurred in the late 1980s, as an alumna recollected: “During my first semester at Trinity I was enrolled in a science class. I remember during [the] lab section of the course the professor would make reference to how a particular lab procedure would be useful to women in the class when we were in the kitchen, and how we should therefore pay attention.” Later in the semester, the professor “advised me not to worry about the class because someday . . . I will be married and this will not be unimportant. He advised me to take ‘nice’ courses in the future. He suggested a language course. That was my first and last science course at Trinity.”

In contrast, a number of alumnae recalled that faculty were extremely supportive and genuinely concerned about the welfare of women undergraduates. In this connection, an alumna of the early 1980s stated: “two faculty members (one male, one female) . . . encouraged me to pursue the topics that interested me and forced me to think critically about the ‘answers’ I found. My work with one of these individuals, Professor [male], led to my selection as a President’s Fellow.”

The reactions of alumnae to coeducation in general ran the gamut from painful to extraordinarily pleasant. A graduate of the early 1980s noted that “I often felt the pervasive attitude of the administration and student body was of an all male school. The feminist perspective was not encouraged and often ridiculed.” Commenting on the College’s facilities, an alumna of the early 1970s maintained that “Trinity was definitely not ready for women when I was an undergraduate . . . . Career counseling was limited; athletic facilities for women were sparse. Women were an invisible minority.”

An alumna of the early 1980s recalled that “My overall feeling is that I was treated fairly and my gender was not an issue. However, I remember the male students making comments when the ‘pig book’ [the Student Handbook] would come out each year.”

Recollections of a positive nature included those of the alumna from the late 1970s who observed, “After spending a semester at Smith I was thrilled to be back in a ‘normal’ environment.” An alumna from the same period noted, “I never felt like a ‘co-ed’ at Trinity—I always felt on an equal footing with the men on campus and thought the relationship between men and women was very natural and healthy.” A final recollection reveals that coeducation, while a difficult experience for some, nonetheless represented an extraordinary opportunity. An alumna of the early 1980s recalled feeling a sense of discrimination, not because she was a woman but because she was “from a working class family.” There were several incidents that nearly caused her to leave the College during her freshman year, but Trinity helped her to ‘toughen up’ and become resolute. “These seemingly masculine attributes enabled me to achieve more than I
had ever hoped,” she noted. “I graduated at the top of my class and represented my major as a President’s Fellow.”267 Her experience as the eldest child encouraged her five sisters and two brothers to pursue their college educations, two of them going on to receive graduate degrees. “Trinity was the first college my family encountered,” she stated, and “Trinity not only opened the door for me, a woman, but also opened up the possibility of achievement for all my siblings, in spite of our economic situation.”268 As the survey reveals, coeducation has touched the lives of alumnae in varying ways, in the process working as well to alter the life of the institution.269

During the 1970s, new organizations developed to accommodate the interests of women on campus, among them the Women’s Advisory Council, the Trinity Women’s Organization, and the Trinity Coalition of Black Women Organization. The Women’s Advisory Council was organized in 1969 to help identify and explore issues of importance to women, and consisted of five students, two members of the faculty, and two administrators. The Trinity Women’s Organization (TWO) emerged in 1972 as a forum for concerns of women on campus, and met regularly to examine the role of women at the College and in society at large. The Trinity Coalition of Black Women Organization was established in 1979 by female members of the Trinity Coalition of Blacks to focus on the needs and concerns of black women at Trinity, and to heighten social and cultural awareness of its members and the community through sponsorship of a variety of events. The Women’s Center, an outgrowth of the Trinity Women’s Organization, was formed in 1977 “out of the conviction that women have special needs, interests, and problems that are not always met in male-dominated culture; the Center is a separate space where Trinity women can gather as women.”270 Located in Mather Hall, during the 1980s, the Center evolved beyond a student-oriented organization to become an advocate for feminist issues, and to serve women on campus and in the Hartford community through “educational, social, and cultural programming, referral services, information resources, events, exhibits, and lectures.”271 One example of this effort was the establishment of the Feminist Scholarship Review in 1991, an ongoing journal published periodically that features contributions by students, faculty, and staff on various topics.

In recognition of the 20th and 25th anniversaries of the introduction of coeducation, the College offered a variety of programs and events focusing on alumnae and their achievements. The 20th anniversary was celebrated throughout the academic year, and culminated on the weekend of April 27 to 29, 1990, with a number of lectures, panel discussions, and a juried exhibit of art by alumnae, while the 25th anniversary celebration, occurring during the 1994-1995 academic year, also featured numerous events and lectures.272 During the 20th anniversary, the College held a convocation in September 1990, at which Trinity’s president, Dr. Tom Gerety, delivered an address entitled “Gender and Selfhood.” “It was the ideal of twenty years ago, and of today,” he declared, “that men and women would integrate fully at this College. Men and women would come together as equals, in conversation, in politics and gover-
nance, in sport, but above all in intellect and aspiration .... I am sure that no one at Trinity thought it would be easy to achieve. I am also certain that no one foresaw just how hard it would be."273 "The women who enrolled in 1969," Gerety continued, "came to Trinity with an adventurous spirit. They had the courage to be the first, to face resistance, resentment, and discrimination. They sought to change Trinity—to develop new, equal and shared traditions of schooling men and women. But they also wanted to prove something about equality and themselves: mixed in, even unequally, with men, they knew they could do just fine, thank you. And they did ... ."274 The president went on to state that the College's ideal of education involved choice, "choice as it builds towards identity and character, towards who you are ...." In Gerety's view, choice and the reaffirmation of self were central acts of life. "You have to be for that self even if others sometimes try to shame you out of it," he maintained, and "you have to choose that self in sustained and repeated acts over your whole life, acts of courage and acts of faith."275 In a general way, President Gerety's thoughts on choice apply to the introduction of coeducation. On the basis of their faith in the College's future, President Lockwood and the Board of Trustees chose a new direction for Trinity, reaffirming its mission as a liberal arts institution, and changing it unalterably.

Prior to President Lockwood's administration, there had been no sustained efforts to engage in continuous and systematic long-range planning that would help point the College to future directions it should be exploring or potential changes it should be anticipating. One exception during President Jacobs's tenure was the 10-year projection that the Trustee-Faculty-Administration Committee on Goals prepared in 1961 (discussed in the previous chapter). For the most part, thinking about the future took the form of personal reflections. One example was an article in the Winter 1966 issue of the *Trinity Alumni Magazine* by Trinity's Vice President, Albert E. Holland '34, in which he shared his views on the future of the small, independent college. Contrasting the latter with the emphasis on graduate education and government-supported research that characterized the major universities, Holland maintained that "the best and most thoughtful students" would continue "to choose a good, small, independent college whose most important concern is their personal and intellectual development and where the emphasis is on good teaching and close teacher-student relationships."276 In his view, to remain small and independent, a college could not acquiesce to mediocrity. "To reach towards greatness a college must continuously remind itself of its purposes and objectives, evaluate constantly its success in attaining these goals, and always be alert to new and imaginative ways of achieving them."277 Such a college would have a creative admissions process, seek inspirational faculty whose focus was on teaching, and let faculty creativity be the foundation for a stimulating liberal arts curriculum. Holland concluded that, if a college were to survive as an institution of quality, it "must think through its purposes and objectives; stand up for its values; be willing to consider innovations and to make use of new technological aids; be willing to use its resources imaginatively; be eager to cooperate in every possible way with other institutions of higher learning;
[and] be eager to offer leadership in its community.\textsuperscript{278}\textsuperscript{†}

President Lockwood maintained that, when he took office at Trinity, many colleges and universities had "not been process-conscious. That is, they have not set up long-range projects where you begin to look at things, and you review it again in two years, and you pick it up and see what's happened and watch the trend lines . . . . I think it is pertinent both to fiscal and non-fiscal issues alike, to develop a way to process what is happening, incorporate it, [and] analyze it."\textsuperscript{279} In November 1968, at Lockwood's request, the Trinity College Council established a Long-Range Planning Committee with three subcommittees. The latter focused on three major issues: whom the College should educate; to what purpose the College should educate; and the College's "relations to its environment — local, national and international."\textsuperscript{280} The Committee completed its work in February 1969, and issued its report on March 29. Chaired by Richard A. Smith, an author and financial writer, former associate editor of \textit{Fortune}, and father of Richard A. Smith, Jr. '65, the Committee and its three subcommittees consisted of representatives of the undergraduate student body, graduate students, the faculty, the administration, the Trustees, the alumni, and parents.\textsuperscript{281}\textsuperscript{†}

At the May 31, 1969 meeting of the Trustees, President Lockwood noted that the Committee's report, which the Board had previously received for review, was preliminary and dealt only with certain aspects of an emerging long-range plan for the College. The Committee had reached three broad conclusions: "(1) Trinity should not become a university; (2) Trinity should not join a public system of higher education; [and] (3) Trinity should not become a community-oriented college but should retain its national character."\textsuperscript{282} The report went on to recommend that, in general, Trinity should hold its course as a liberal arts college, and continue to attract "highly qualified, intellectually aware students," including black students and foreign students. In addition, referring to Trinity's general "detachment" from the community, there was a need for "massive involvement of the College in the surrounding community [. . .] both to expose students to life in an open society and to better meet the needs of the community," an undertaking to be pursued in cooperation with local organizations and citizens' groups.\textsuperscript{283} Furthermore, engagement with the community should be interpreted broadly to encompass not only use of the College's urban setting as a teaching laboratory, but also the inclusion in the curriculum of the study of American black culture and Non-Western cultures. Also important was the need to continue to seek cooperative inter-institutional links on the local, national, and international levels. Finally, the report determined that the issue of College governance, "the effective interrelation of the various components of the college—student body, faculty, administration, trustees, and alumni, to each other," was of such importance that it should become the focus of in-depth study.\textsuperscript{284}

Two years later, in April 1971, the Trustees commissioned two student-faculty-alumni task forces to examine certain areas of concern that had emerged from the planning process: the College's academic program, and student life and physical facilities.
In addition, Professor Ward S. Curran '57 (Economics), recently appointed Director of Institutional Planning, and Dean of the Faculty Edwin P. Nye, prepared accompanying reports, respectively, on financial projections for the College, which was then facing the effects of spiraling inflation, and the academic program. To increase the College's attractiveness to prospective students and faculty, the academic task force offered several proposals, among them: the creation of an intensive study program whereby students could pursue, either individually or in groups, a specific area of study with a faculty member through seminars, tutorials, or research projects; several suggestions to improve recruitment and retention of faculty; enhancement of academic and civic relations with Hartford through the introduction of an urban component in the curriculum, encouraging faculty to live in the immediate neighborhood, and making College facilities more accessible to the surrounding community; the development of an alternate undergraduate degree program, based on examinations and projects; and the recruitment of qualified older students, in an effort to broaden the age range of the undergraduate body. The student life task force made several proposals, among them: the enrollment of more local nonresident students as a way to increase income from tuition; the establishment of a sliding-scale tuition policy to accommodate students from diverse economic backgrounds; an expansion of the freshman orientation program; and improvements in support services for women students.

Professor Curran's report consisted of a 10-year budget projection, and accompanying strategies for fiscal prudence. He argued that to maintain a culturally and economically diverse student body, the College had to find ways not only to reduce per-student operating costs without reducing the quality of services, but also to raise non-tuition sources of income by increasing the endowment and the rate of annual giving of alumni and friends. Nye's report focused on the impact that curricular revision, the increase in student enrollment, and coeducation were having on course enrollments and faculty utilization. One of his findings was that the student-faculty ratio in the classroom had not increased as much as had been expected because of the growth in the number of small seminars and classes resulting from the 1969 curricular revision. The Lockwood administration would soon implement several of the task force recommendations regarding the curriculum and the academic program in general.

In 1978, a joint student-faculty-administration Institutional Priorities Council (IPC), which President Lockwood had created a year earlier, released a preliminary report outlining a number of objectives for the College to accomplish over a five-year period. The report cited a lack of "social and intellectual cohesiveness" in student life that the authors thought improvements in Mather Hall programming, a strengthened advising system, and a revitalized student government could help address. In other areas of the College, the report recommended increasing the cultural and economic diversity of the student body, redoubling efforts to attract students of the highest intellectual and academic potential, and seeking additional adult students. Regarding relations with Hartford, the report called for strengthening the internship program with
local institutions, organizations, and businesses, thus more closely linking the city and the College. Finally, the continued recruitment of a distinguished faculty, renewed efforts to increase endowed funds and annual giving, and careful assessment of the curriculum would assure that Trinity remained attractive and competitive. The IPC urged the administration not to increase the resident student body, enlarge the physical plant, or increase the athletic program or administrative services. The IPC's final report, issued in 1979, reiterated many of these points, and reaffirmed that the College's principal mission was to "offer a top-quality liberal arts education to a primarily residential student body of approximately the present size." Additionally, the IPC recommended: a thorough review of the curriculum; pursuing efforts with Trinity's institutional neighbors—Hartford Hospital and the Institute of Living—to "improve conditions in the immediate neighborhood"; developing objectives and strategies for the academic programs related to or serving Hartford; and improving systematic and cooperative planning throughout the College. Many of these recommendations would receive consideration during the following decade.

The concern about the financial stability of the College and the state of the nation's economy in the 1970s, in particular the effects of inflation, brought home the importance of the federal government's impact on higher education. That impact had dramatically manifested itself in the creation of the G.I. Bill in the wake of World War II, and later in funding for scientific and technical research, issues whose manifestation at Trinity has been discussed briefly in previous chapters. In his study of higher education, David D. Henry points out that "before the sixties [...] funds from the federal government to colleges and universities were for specific federal purposes and services," but that starting in the mid-1960s "a federal policy to assist higher education fulfill its primary purposes" was put into effect through legislation. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 had been aimed primarily at providing tuition aid, thus helping assure access to higher education, and Trinity students had derived considerable benefit from the Act's provisions. Congress enacted additional legislation in the next decade, especially the Higher Education Act of 1965. This and other legislation, however, focused on funding specific programs, special scholarships, and various types of facilities. No legislation was directed at "assisting institutions generally in meeting the financial requirements of their basic operations," or addressed the looming depression in higher education finances that would develop in the following decade. Rising costs in the 1970s threatened the welfare of private independent colleges and universities, and called into question the affordability of the educational opportunities they offered, which were saving taxpayers billions in contrast to the programs of public institutions. Such developments in federal support of higher education in the 1960s and the 1970s helped place Professor Curran's financial projections, previously discussed, in perspective.

One aspect of Trinity's relationship with the federal government during this period was the termination of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps program.
Instituted at the College in 1948, the program reached the height of its popularity in 1953, when 553 students, slightly more than half of the student body, were enrolled. Following the end of the Korean War, interest in the program at Trinity gradually waned, and in the late 1960s, the presence of the unit on campus became the target of student protests, as was the case at other institutions. At President Lockwood's request, during the 1969-1970 academic year, the Trinity College Council studied the question of the AFROTC unit's future at Trinity, as did the faculty.295 By the spring of 1970, enrollment had declined to the point that the Air Force placed the program on a probationary status. The Trustees authorized the president to confer with Air Force personnel on mutually satisfactory ways of bringing the program to an end, and an agreement reached in the fall of 1970 stipulated that termination would occur in July 1971.296

Among the less urgent but nonetheless important concerns President Lockwood had regarding Trinity was its administrative infrastructure. During the 1970s, he made several important administrative appointments, and many of the appointees would remain at the College well into the following decade, and even beyond. As Lockwood later recalled, the College had some administrative and staffing problems that "we had to find better ways of dealing with. We were propelled in some sense by the changes in American society .... The ball game was changing at the same time we were trying to cope with our own local limitations .... we needed to address both our strengths and weaknesses and establish the processes by which we could make the changes and face the staffing problems we had."

In particular, the role and functions of the Dean of the College needed clarification. During his brief tenure as Dean, Dr. Harold L. Dorwart had been of crucial assistance to President Jacobs and to the College, especially in regard to the sit-in, but in many other ways as well. One of the president-elect's first requests to the Trustees was that they authorize a change in the title of the office from Dean of the College to Dean of the Faculty so as to prevent external confusion. As Lockwood noted, at many other institutions, the Dean of the College was responsible for student affairs. The new title clearly indicated principal responsibility as Trinity's chief academic officer, and presaged a more initiatory policy role.298 Dorwart's successor, Dr. Robert W. Fuller, accepted appointment as Dean in July 1968. A physicist, Fuller had received his undergraduate degree from Oberlin, and his master's degree and doctorate from Princeton; he came to Trinity from the Seattle Research Center of the Battelle Memorial Institute.299 Lockwood found Fuller's leadership style a contrast to his own, which he characterized as anticipatory.300 Fuller was "exciting .... His was much more the provocatorial role. That is, cajoling people into trying things .... He really stirred things up .... [and] had closer ties with the students than any Dean of the Faculty I've ever known .... and certainly didn't hesitate to bring things as a sort of representative of the faculty to the administration."301 As previously discussed, Fuller was one of the principal architects of coeducation, but his sights were set on a higher calling, and he left Trinity in the
spring of 1970 to become president of his alma mater, Oberlin.\textsuperscript{302}

Fuller’s successor was Professor Edwin P. Nye (Engineering). Not satisfied with the external candidates for the deanship, President Lockwood turned to Nye. In Lockwood’s view, Nye possessed the requisite organizational skills and administrative aptitude for the post. “The style changed from one that was flamboyant to one that was very even keeled,” Lockwood recalled, “and the administrative task . . . was fairly immense. [Nye] sorted things out and got things in order and developed procedures that we lacked.”\textsuperscript{303} The new Dean faced considerable challenges. “When I took over,” Nye later observed, “the College had just finished two years of deficit operations, student government was in shambles, student protests were endemic, and the Trustees had dictated that the budget be balanced . . . Coeducation was in only its second year, the ‘new curriculum’ was still being implemented, and pressure was mounting for rapid recruitment of black and women faculty members. In short, there was much that needed to be done . . . .”\textsuperscript{304} Following Nye’s resignation from the deanship in 1979 to return to teaching, Lockwood appointed as Dean, Dr. Andrew G. De Rocco (VI-32), a molecular physicist from the University of Maryland’s Institute for Physical Science and Technology.\textsuperscript{305}

Nye was part of a reorganized administrative structure that Lockwood had put in place in January 1969. Four key administrators reported directly to the president: the Dean of the Faculty, the Director of External Affairs (a new position), the Treasurer of the College, and the Director of Development. Under Dean of the Faculty Fuller were: N. Robbins Winslow ’57 (VI-33), Associate Dean for Educational Services, who supervised the admissions, financial aid, counseling, registration, and career advising functions; Dr. Roy Heath, Associate Dean for Community Life, who was responsible for housing, dining, health, student conduct and activities, the athletic program, and security; and Dr. C. Freeman Sleeper, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, who worked with Dean Fuller on the instructional, graduate, and summer programs, in addition to academic planning. Thomas A. Smith ’44, the Director of External Affairs, coordinated the alumni program, the relations of the College with the city, the state, and federal agencies, and public information services (formerly College Relations). The Treasurer, J. Kenneth Robertson, was responsible for supervising the business functions of the College, overseeing physical facilities and maintenance, and carrying out long-range fiscal planning. Finally, Judson M. Rees, Director of Development, had primary responsibility for the solicitation of funds.\textsuperscript{306} Upon Rees’s retirement in 1977, President Lockwood appointed Constance E. Ware (VI-34) as Director of Development, the first woman to become a senior member of a Trinity administration. Mrs. Ware had come to Trinity in 1964, becoming Assistant to the Director of Development in 1970, and Associate Director in 1974.\textsuperscript{307}\textsuperscript{f}

Other appointments of long-term significance included that of Thomas A. Smith ’44, who became Vice President of the College in the spring of 1970. This position was reestablished because of the need to assure that a senior administrative officer,
conversant with the broad aspects of Trinity's day-to-day management, could, in the absence of the president, assume temporary responsibility for the College's operation. The Dean of the Faculty was fully absorbed by the demands of the academic program and the faculty, and could no longer be called upon as had occasionally happened in the recent past. The Vice President at this period served as the undesignated senior officer of the College, and Smith's responsibilities included alumni affairs, community life, admissions, and financial aid. Another important appointment occurred in 1975, when Robert A. Pedemonti '60, M '71 (VI-35) became Treasurer of the College following the death of Clifton M. Bockstoce, who was also Vice President for Financial Affairs. Pedemonti had joined the administration in 1968 as Associate Comptroller and Budget Director, and became Comptroller and Budget Director in 1974. From the beginning of his career at the College, he stressed the importance of fiscal prudence, and with full backing from President Lockwood and the Trustees, introduced forecasting procedures and cost control measures that helped end two years of deficits, and enabled Trinity to return to a balanced budget in 1970. Pedemonti presided over consecutive balanced budgets during the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, and was designated Vice President for Finance and Treasurer in 1984. Throughout this period, he continued to strengthen financial support of the academic program, exercised oversight of the physical plant, and helped increase the endowment through astute investment strategies. Benefiting from Pedemonti's attention as well as from three major fund-raising campaigns, the endowment grew 12-fold over a 30 year period, from $26.6 million to $322 million as of March 1998.

The position of Vice President for Financial Affairs, which Clifton M. Bockstoce held, had been created in 1974, as President Lockwood later indicated, to address the complexities of dealing with "long-range planning, [and] oversight of the endowment, [and] to relate physical plant planning to academic planning," responsibilities that required a full-time commitment beyond that of managing the day-to-day aspects of the College's complicated finances and preparing the budget. Following Bockstoce's death, the position was changed to focus more heavily on planning, as reflected in the new title, Vice President for Finance and Planning. Accepting appointment to this position, effective July 1, 1977, was James F. English, Jr. (VI-36), chairman of the Connecticut Bank and Trust Company (CBT). English would continue to chair CBT's board for a brief period following his move to Trinity. Considered by President Lockwood as one of his most important appointments, English was responsible for overseeing development operations and the endowment as well as for directing long-range financial planning. As Lockwood put it, "his sense of style and experience made it possible for him to deal with the managerial questions in the president's office and know their fiscal implications," thus enabling him to serve as the senior officer of the College in the president's absence.

Vice President English had received his undergraduate degree from Yale University, pursued graduate study at Cambridge University, and later received an
LL.B. degree from the University of Connecticut. Joining the Connecticut Bank and Trust Company in 1951, he became chief executive officer in 1969, and chairman in 1970. A trustee of Connecticut College and the Loomis-Chaffee School, and a member of the Connecticut Commission for Higher Education, and Yale's Council on Priorities and Planning, he was also a director of several business corporations and charitable institutions. At the time of English's appointment, Lockwood noted that the new vice president's demonstrated interest in higher education made him "sensitive to the problems facing independent colleges and universities." Eager for new challenges, and comfortable in the world of higher education, English brought a considerable breadth of experience to his position. The sudden death of Mrs. Lockwood in February 1980, occasioned the president to take a six-month sabbatical leave, during which English served as acting president. He later became Lockwood's successor.

Among other administrative appointments President Lockwood made was that in 1975 of Gerald J. Hansen, Jr. '51 as Director of Alumni Relations (VI-37). Hansen succeeded John L. Heyl '66, who had been responsible for alumni affairs since the retirement in 1970 of John A. Mason '34. In addition, J. Ronald Spencer '64 (VI-38) accepted appointment as Dean of Community Life in 1971. He had been a reporter for the Hartford Times and had pursued graduate study at Columbia University before joining Trinity's faculty in 1968 as Instructor in History. Later becoming Lecturer in History, he also served in a number of administrative posts, including Dean of Studies, and eventually became Associate Academic Dean. In 1976, Dr. David Winer (VI-39), a member of Trinity's psychology faculty for the preceding decade, accepted appointment as Spencer's successor in the redesignated position of Dean of Students.

Another issue of major concern to President Lockwood when he took office was the structure and composition of the Board of Trustees. In keeping with governing boards at other institutions of higher education, Trinity's board played a central role in the life of the College, serving as the ultimate source of authority, and was the body to which the State Legislature granted legal and corporate powers through the Charter. A "Joint Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" prepared in 1966 by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards, outlined the principal responsibilities of governing boards, and provides a context for understanding the critical importance of Trinity's board. The statement declared that while maintaining a general overview, the governing board "entrusts the conduct of the administration to the administrative offices, the president and deans, and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty . . . [It] plays a central role in relating the likely needs of the future to predictable resources; it has the responsibility for husbanding the endowment; it is responsible for obtaining needed capital and operating funds; and in the broadest sense of the term it should pay attention to personnel policy . . . . When ignorance or ill-will threatens the institution or any part of it, the governing board must be
available for support. In grave crises it will be expected to serve as a champion..." In such cases, "the protection it offers to an individual or a group is, in fact, a fundamental defense of the vested interests of society in the educational institution."317†

Although Trinity's Board exercised the responsibilities the Statement enumerated, from his own personal experience as an alumni trustee President Lockwood found it inflexible and rooted in the ways of the past. During President Jacobs's tenure, amendments to the Charter had made possible certain changes in the Board's structure. First, as a way of increasing alumni involvement in major policymaking, the provisions for the election of alumni trustees were changed. Effective in 1962, the number of trustees that the alumni could elect was increased from three to six, and the term of service doubled from three years to six years. As had long been the case, the other trustees served for life, and upon resignation, life trustees were designated trustees emeriti. Also, on occasion, the Board could elect an alumni trustee a life trustee.318 Second, in 1963, the Board strengthened its internal leadership by creating the office of Vice Chairman, whose incumbent was designated annually by election. Previously, the Board's only officer was the Secretary, the president serving as Chairman. The Vice Chairman had "senior rank after the President at all academic ceremonies and occasions...[,]" was "adviser to the President in matters that concern the Trustees[.], and shall serve to advise the other Trustees about internal matters that affect the Corporation."319 In the absence of the president, the Vice Chairman presided at meetings of the Executive Committee as well as at standing committee meetings, was ex officio member of all standing committees, and chairman of the Board's Committee on Committees.320†

Three years later, in 1966, reflecting a desire to strengthen its leadership role, the Board voted to establish the position of Chairman, to be held by a trustee, effective July 1, 1968, or "on the earlier retirement" of President Jacobs.321 During the acting presidencies of Dr. Arthur H. Hughes, the Board had elected its senior member to serve as Chairman until a new president had assumed office. President-elect Lockwood having made clear his unwillingness to serve as Chairman, the Trustees reaffirmed the creation of the new position in June 1968, stipulating that the Chairman be elected annually, and carry out the responsibilities formerly associated with the now defunct Vice Chairmanship. Initially, the Board elected Lyman B. Brainerd '30 as Chairman, and in the years ensuing, other trustees, such as George W. B. Starkey '39, M.D., have had the opportunity to exercise leadership.322

In February 1979, Dr. Harold L. Dorwart, Seabury Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy (Emeritus) and former Dean of the College, prepared a memorandum that contrasted various aspects of the College at that time with the period a decade before. Dorwart noted that there had been an almost complete turnover of the Board's members, not due solely to the passage of time, but to the introduction of "term" trustees who served for an eight-year period, a recommendation Dorwart had made before his retirement as Dean.323† President Lockwood was highly receptive to
Dorwart’s idea, and later recalled that the Board’s static composition was in need of drastic change: “we had to achieve more turnover and we had to function differently. We had to bring the Board up to speed to the changing life around us . . . , and we had to find a process whereby we could bring on and take off people more regularly than we had.” Dorwart’s recommendation in mind, President Lockwood introduced the concept of term trustees who served an eight-year term. He also established a retirement policy for charter trustees, who could remain on the Board from the time of their election until they reached the age of 72, “because we had no retirement age, and we’d begin to get . . . turnover . . . . In many ways that was just in time . . . . We were able to move out and get women, which we needed . . . .”

With Dorwart’s recommendation in mind, President Lockwood introduced the concept of term trustees who served an eight-year term. He also established a retirement policy for charter trustees, who could remain on the Board from the time of their election until they reached the age of 72, “because we had no retirement age, and we’d begin to get . . . turnover . . . . In many ways that was just in time . . . . We were able to move out and get women, which we needed . . . .”

In addition, the manner in which the Board conducted its business at meetings also had to change to allow for full consideration of major issues such as “student affairs, educational policy, and community involvement.”

It took some time to make the transition to the new structure and the changes soon resulted in the first women being elected as trustees. In March 1974, Mrs. Virginia Gray became a charter trustee. She was the widow of the Rt. Rev. Walter H. Gray, who had served as a trustee from 1951 until his retirement from the Board in May 1973. Joining Mrs. Gray was Mrs. James G. Lowenstein, who was elected a term trustee. In the spring of 1979, Emily Holcombe Sullivan ’74 became the first alumna trustee.

The structural and procedural changes President Lockwood carried out reinvigorated the Board with fresh ideas, a new outlook, and a different dynamic of trustee interaction.

One of the three principal issues President Lockwood had identified as needing his immediate attention upon taking office was revision of the curriculum. The process had begun under President Jacobs, and was well underway by 1968. The faculty’s special Curriculum Revision Committee had already engaged Lockwood’s thinking, and he shared his reflections on curricular matters and on liberal arts education in general in a series of three lectures that he gave in November 1968, entitled “Our Mutual Concern: The Role of the Independent Liberal Arts College.” The third lecture, “The New Curiosity Shop,” offered him the opportunity to declare his conviction that an undergraduate curriculum should address five major purposes: first, “students should understand the manner in which we try to retain a sense of the past . . . . Reconstruction of the past through history, anthropology, literature, or science provides us conceptual models for understanding the present”; second, students should be literate in the broadest sense, and should be able “to communicate to others the principles as well as the content of ideas or expressions drawn from many fields,” including the sciences;
third, “all students should work in fields quite unfamiliar . . ., so as to avoid intellectual provincialism and the arrogance of expertise”; fourth, “all students should have an opportunity to perceive the relationship of controlled intellectual inquiry to social problems”; and, finally, “all students should have the opportunity to become aware of themselves and the meaning of their experience.”

Lockwood further maintained that his concept of the curriculum envisaged “the undergraduate career in three stages: the first, introductory or exploratory year; the middle years during which students may interrupt their education, may change their majors, and reach some decision about their lives after undergraduate study; and the final year which may, in effect, serve as a transition to further study, or a bridge to a job.”

Lockwood later recalled that, based on his experience with curricular revision at Union College, where he was Provost in the early 1960s, he found himself “having greater and greater difficulty with the requirement approach. The distribution requirement in particular had always troubled me[,] and therefore I was interested in and generally supportive of the decision the committee [at Trinity] was approaching, namely to do away with distribution requirements.” The faculty had voted to establish the special Curriculum Revision Committee at its March 8, 1967 meeting, and at the April 11 meeting designated the six faculty members who would comprise it: professors Robert A. Battis (Economics) as chairman (VI-40), Richard T. Lee (Philosophy), Robert Lindsay (Physics), the Rev. Borden W. Painter, Jr. ’58 (History) (VI-41), C. Freeman Sleeper (Religion), and Robert C. Stewart (Mathematics) (VI-42).

In addition, three students served on the Committee: Steven A. Bauer ’70, Stephen R. Lundeen ’69, and Eric T. Rathbun ’70. Although aware that student reaction to the existing curriculum had been documented in an undergraduate course evaluation completed in December 1966, the Committee undertook surveys of the faculty as well as of the Classes of 1965 and 1970.

Submitted in November 1968, the Committee’s report fell short of completely overhauling the curriculum, and endorsed in principle the retention of distribution requirements, a feature of the existing curriculum that had come to trouble many faculty. In place of the old requirements, the Committee proposed that all students should take a minimum of three courses in each of two areas of the curriculum outside the major. The report went on to make a number of innovative recommendations, among them: instituting an elective one-term, one-credit freshman seminar, focused on a field of inquiry to be determined by the students and the instructor, and designed to help freshmen develop reasoning and writing skills; establishing a Department of Sociology; developing an “open semester” program to encourage the pursuit of independent study or internships, either on- or off-campus; urging the development of “College courses,” which would be offered outside departments on subjects of special interest to individual faculty members; creating a Trinity seminar program in which students could offer seminars and receive course credit for their effort; establishing a student-teacher program that would enable students to teach
courses bearing pass/fail credit; broadening opportunities for independent study; supporting the development of computer-oriented courses; and strengthening the academic advising system.\textsuperscript{336}

Despite the many innovations the report proposed, widespread dissatisfaction with the retention of distribution requirements led the faculty to request the Committee to go back to the drawing board.\textsuperscript{337} The Committee's final report, issued on February 7, 1969, represented a "middle way between required courses and a totally free elective system," and reiterated many of the proposals previously made, including the freshman seminars.\textsuperscript{338} The major thrust of the report was the elimination of the distribution requirements and the substitution in their place of guidelines for nonmajor courses in four areas: language and other symbolic systems, man's interaction with the natural world, man's social institutions, and forms of culture. The latter would include the study of American black culture and Non-Western cultures, and require the development of new courses. Also recommended was the creation of interdisciplinary programs in such areas as American Studies, Non-Western Studies, and Urban and Environmental Studies; the establishment of interdisciplinary majors; the restructuring of freshman orientation; and, to encourage extended reading and research on the part of students, the scheduling of "open periods" in the College calendar.\textsuperscript{339}

Several years later, President Lockwood recalled that he had requested the Committee to prepare guidelines for nonmajor courses, none having emerged in the second round of deliberations: "There were no guidelines at all as to what constituted an educated person ..., and quite literally I wrote down those guidelines one afternoon, came into the Committee and said: 'Set up some guideline courses or groups of courses. Here are areas which people ought to know about.'"\textsuperscript{340} Ironically, the guideline courses were voluntary and not a requirement, and for the most part were ignored by students and the faculty, and it would not be until the late 1980s that the faculty reinstated general education requirements.

As an outgrowth of the interest Professor J. Bard McNulty '38 (English) took in pursuing the guideline concept, the College instituted the "Horizons" program under his direction during the 1976-1977 academic year. Horizons consisted of weekly, credit-bearing lectures, given in the evening by faculty from 23 different academic departments. As McNulty described it, the program offered freshmen and the rest of the student body "a gargantuan feast in which they can sample dishes never available before." Open to the public, the lectures covered a wide range of topics in the humanities, the social sciences, and the sciences, and attempted to address an increasing over-emphasis that students were placing on courses in a major or those closely related to it.\textsuperscript{341} Another lecture series, directed to the public and known as the "Town-Gown Forum," had begun earlier in the fall of 1967 under the sponsorship of the wives of alumni, faculty, administrators, and friends of the College. The first Forum, held on six weekday afternoons during October and November, featured lectures on the "20th Century — Century of Revolution." Professors George B. Cooper
(History), Rex C. Neaverson (Government), H. McKim Steele, Jr. (History), Jerrold Ziff (Fine Arts), and John A. Dando (English) examined “revolutions” in history, art, architecture, literature, and drama. The Town-Gown Forums were extremely popular with the Greater Hartford community, and continued for more than two decades.

President Lockwood also helped clarify the independent study and internship proposals, and assisted in securing support for faculty adoption of the various recommendations for revision of the curriculum. After reviewing the final report on curricular revision, the faculty approved the new curriculum in mid-February 1969, and on April 12, the Trustees authorized implementation of all provisions the following fall. Many years later, Professor Robert C. Stewart (Mathematics) confirmed the importance of President Lockwood’s involvement in the revision process, as well as that of Dean Fuller. Stewart also acknowledged that the idea of open periods, later known as reading weeks, was one of his contributions, and that, for many years thereafter, his faculty colleagues referred to them as “Bob’s weeks.”

Professor Painter vividly recalled that the exciting part of the proposals was the introduction of “new features such as Freshman Seminars, student-taught courses, [and] open periods in the calendar,” and “the sense of excitement, liberation and experimentation that characterized the changes,” which he believed “served us well until the early 1980s when it was time to change again in keeping with national trends.”

The concept of student-taught courses led to the establishment during the 1976-1977 academic year of a “Free University” in which undergraduates as well as several faculty and administrators served as instructors for noncredit courses of their own design covering a wide variety of topics. The idea of Steven M. Kayman ’77, who had become familiar with Williams College’s more modest version, the Trinity Free University consisted of over two-dozen courses, ranging from “Observational Astronomy” taught by Robert A. Shor ’78, and Kayman’s “Renting: A Guide to Tenants’ Rights,” to “The Elements of Surfcasting,” offered by Vice President Thomas A. Smith ’44. The number of class sessions varied widely, from two up to as many as ten or more.

In the early 1980s, members of the faculty also became involved in the Elderhostel Program, for which Trinity served as a site. Developed by Michael Zoob ’58, among others, Elderhostel enabled people of retirement age to attend week-long educational programs on college and university campuses during the summer. In the mid-1980s, an adapted version of the College’s Rome Program for undergraduates, discussed later in this chapter, served as a model for the creation of several Elderhostel sites in Italy. Another outgrowth of Trinity’s experience with Elderhostel was the “Vistas” program, a five-week series of evening mini-courses on various topics offered by faculty, and held on campus in the fall and spring semesters during the early to mid-1980s.

Trinity’s adoption of an open curriculum placed it in the vanguard of liberal arts colleges and gave it a competitive edge in recruiting talented students. The introduction of coeducation helped the College as well in this regard. Trinity’s open cur-
riculum also had an impact on curricular reform at Brown University. Not long after
the College announced the new curriculum, President Lockwood had a chance
encounter in Washington, D. C. with Ira C. Magaziner, a Brown undergraduate.
Magaziner was then mobilizing support for a new curriculum at his university, and
was much interested to learn about the innovations at Trinity. Not long thereafter,
Brown instituted an open curriculum, which remains in effect as of 1998.350

Many of the changes the College introduced in 1969 are still in place in the late
1990s, among them: freshman seminars, later called First-Year Seminars; open
semesters; student-taught courses; individually tailored, interdisciplinary majors;
reading weeks; internships; and “College courses” on areas of inquiry falling outside
departmental bounds.351 In 1967, Professor Clyde D. McKee, Jr. (Political Science)
(VI-43) established the earliest internship, which came to be known as the Legislative
Internship Program. Other internships that developed during the 1970s looked to the
McKee initiative as a model. Under the provisions of the legislative internship, stu­
dents work for a semester in the office of a Connecticut state legislator at the State
Capitol in Hartford, performing a variety of responsibilities and learning firsthand the
workings of the Connecticut General Assembly. From the outset the legislative intern­
ship has proven popular with legislators, and has become widely adopted by colleges
and universities in Connecticut.352

Other changes in the College’s academic program followed quickly on the heels of
the new curriculum. One contributor of ideas was Professor Richard P. Benton
(English) (VI-44), who, for many years, had strongly urged the introduction of courses
on Non-Western cultures. He believed that the prevailing Judeo-Christian, Greco­
Roman, and Western European traditions had dominated Trinity’s curriculum too
long, and as a member of the Curriculum Committee, argued for the development of
an “Inter-Cultural Studies” program. One of the country’s foremost authorities on
Edgar Allan Poe, Benton also was thoroughly acquainted with the literatures of
Europe as well as those of Non-Western cultures, including China and Japan. His
ideas in the mid-1960s fell on deaf ears, but were favorably received by the Curricular
Revision Committee, as were the views of another strong advocate for Non-Western
Studies, Professor H. McKim Steele, Jr. (History). Following approval of the new cur­
riculum, the faculty authorized creation in May 1969 of a major in Non-Western
Studies (later known as Intercultural Studies, Area Studies, and ultimately,
International Studies), which initially embraced such areas of inquiry as Black
Studies and Asian Studies.353 Professor Steele served as the first director of Non­
Western Studies, and appointments to the faculty in the ensuing years, including that in
1978 of Professor Leslie G. Desmangles (Religion and International Studies) (VI-45),
strengthened course offerings.354

A related effort to enhance the study of world literatures had met with success the
preceding March when the faculty authorized a major in comparative literature, orga­
nized by Professor Michael R. Campo ’48 (Modern Languages). Enabling the study
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of world literatures, partly in the original language and partly in translation, the new
major drew on courses offered by Campo and his colleagues in modern languages,
including Professor Gustave W. Andrian ‘40 (VI-46), in addition to courses taught by
faculty in the English and Classics departments.\footnote{As time passed, interest in other
languages and literatures grew, and by the 1990s, the study of the Chinese, Japanese,
and Arabic languages and literatures had become firmly anchored in the curriculum.
Furthermore, although the curriculum does not at present require a student to
become proficient in a language other than English, a wide variety of languages
beyond French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish, and Hebrew can be pursued
through a self-instructional languages program.\footnote{The curriculum has also benefited over
the years from the introduction of a variety of majors, among them several that are
interdisciplinary, including: Urban and Environmental Studies (later known as Public Policy
Studies), under the direction of Professor Andrew J. Gold (Economics) (VI-47); American Studies, developed initially by Professor Edward W. Sloan III (History), J. Ronald Spencer ’64, Lecturer in
History, and Professor Paul Smith (English), and formalized in the mid-1970s through
the leadership of Professor Eugene E. Leach (History and American Studies)
(VI-48); the computer coordinate, distinct from the major in computer science offered
for several years by the Engineering and Computer Science Department, which later
split into separate departments; the educational studies coordinate created after
the abolition of the Education Department; neuroscience, under Professor Priscilla
Kehoe (Psychology) (VI-49); Women’s Studies, under Professor Joan D. Hedrick
(History) (VI-50); and biomedical engineering in the Engineering Department, under
Professor Joseph D. Bronzino (VI-51). In addition, the faculty approved the establishment
of a sociology major in 1969, an anthropology major in the early 1990s, and a Jewish
Studies major in the Religion Department, to be introduced in the fall of 1998.\footnote{Serving to heighten interest among the faculty in interdisciplinary approaches to
the study of a wide range of topics and issues were the Mellon Symposia, held in three
successive years, and beginning in the fall semester of 1976 with support from the
Mellon Foundation, Coordinated by Professor Milla C. Riggio (English) (VI-52), and
titled “The Search for Values in the Modern World: Interdisciplinary Lessons from
the 19th Century,” the first Symposium brought to the campus a number of scholars
from different fields to “explore in detail problems that arise in each discipline but
whose solutions have important consequences for other disciplines.” Other
members of the Trinity faculty who were participants in the Mellon Symposium’s lectures,
colloquia, and discussions in 1976 were professors Frank G. Kirkpatrick ’64
(Religion) (VI-53), Samuel D. Kassow ’66 (History) (VI-54), and Alan M. Fink
(Psychology). The sessions attracted considerable interest on the part of students.\footnote{One outgrowth of the symposia, in particular the first, was the Guided Studies
Program in the Humanities, begun in 1979, and now known as the Guided Studies
Program: European Civilization. Each year it has afforded a select number of fres-}
men the opportunity to pursue an interdisciplinary sequence of study prior to declaring a major. Among the faculty who have been involved closely with this program are: professors Milla C. Riggio (English); James L. West (History) (VI-55); Frank G. Kirkpatrick '64 (Religion); Samuel D. Kassow '66 (History); John A. Gettier (Religion) (VI-56); Drew A. Hyland (Philosophy) (VI-57); Helen S. Lang (Philosophy) (VI-58); Alan C. Tull (Religion, and Chaplain); and John C. Williams '49 (Classics) (VI-59). Two other sequences, both modeled on the Guided Studies Program, are the Interdisciplinary Science Program, begun in 1987, and The Cities Program, begun in the fall of 1996.360

The result of student interest in two areas of the performing arts, the major in the theater and dance was another development that the flexibility of the new curriculum eventually made possible. Although theater arts became a major in the late 1960s, staffing at that time was at a minimum. Professor George E. Nichols III, who directed the major, held tenure in the English Department, not in a theater arts department. The second faculty position in theater arts was not tenurable, the policy then in effect stipulating that programs, in contrast to departments, could not have full-time, tenured faculty. The situation in dance was somewhat similar, there being no tenurable position despite several years of service on the part of Judy Dworin '70 (VI-60), who brought permanence to the study of dance at Trinity.361

Dean Robert W. Fuller introduced dance to Trinity in 1969, believing that it would accord well with the College's new status as a coeducational institution. He engaged Clive Thompson, soloist with the Alvin Ailey Company, and his wife, Liz, to offer three courses during the year, and the response was enthusiastic on the part of both undergraduate men and women. Dworin came to Trinity as an exchange student from Smith College in the fall of 1969 to study with the Thompsons, and remained to receive her undergraduate degree in American Studies. Under the supervision that year of Professor Alexander A. MacKimmie, Jr. (Education), Dworin designed "a semesterval creative movement program in the first, third, and fifth grades of Annie Fisher, one of Hartford's inner-city elementary schools."362 This independent study became the model for a course later incorporated into the curriculum under the title "Education Through Movement." Dworin's senior thesis on John Brown's 1859 Harper's Ferry raid, co-sponsored by Lecturer in History J. Ronald Spencer '64 and Professor Paul Smith (English), was, as she put it, "part research paper, part performance. A piece about issues of racism, the performance was filmed by Connecticut Public Television and aired nationally. This structure for a thesis—integrating a research/written component with a performance project—has become the standard design for the thesis option in the Theater and Dance Department."363

During the following year, it became increasingly difficult for Thompson to teach at Trinity because of his busy performing schedule, and another dance artist helped out temporarily. Following graduation, Dworin taught dance to students in a special high school program on campus, and worked as a research assistant in the office of the
College's Vice President, Thomas A. Smith '44. Aware of the staffing difficulties in dance, she asked Dean of the Faculty Edwin P. Nye if she could take over responsibility for the program and try to develop it. Nye agreed, and Dworin soon received an appointment as Instructor in Dance. Housed in classrooms in Seabury, the program, Dworin recalled, "moved from having one full-time faculty member to the addition of various part-time guest artists from New York City . . . ." Then came additional part-time positions "for artists living in the immediate region . . . . Curricularly, by 1980, the program had developed from its initial three courses-per-year offering to a program with 16 courses offered on a rotating basis with substantial student interest and participation." 364

In 1981, the College began to address the status of the programs in music, theater, and dance. The trustee-faculty Joint Committee on Educational Policy soon recommended establishing a department of theater and dance in the belief that the joint relationship would work to strengthen the study of each area. The Committee also recommended that there be a separate department of music, reflecting the music curriculum's focus on the history and theory of music rather than on performance. Accordingly, in May 1981, the Trustees authorized creation of the departments, effective September 1. 365 As Judy Dworin has stated, the uniting of theater and dance in one department afforded "an opportunity for each discipline to retain its integrity as an individual field of study as well as engage in a strong cross-disciplinary emphasis with the other area. And, for the first time, students could major in Theater and Dance with a concentration in one of the two fields. How ironic, given the initial justification for introducing dance at Trinity, that the first person to graduate with a major in Theater and Dance[,] concentrating in dance[,] was Tim Martin [Timothy A. Martin '83], who has gone on to be a free lance choreographer and performer in New York City." 366 The appointment to the faculty in 1977 of Professor Gerald Moshell (Music) (VI-61) resulted in introducing an additional component into the performing arts at Trinity. As well as directing the concert choir, he developed a highly successful program of student stage productions drawn primarily from the works of the American musical theater, including several musicals by Stephen Sondheim.

The 1980s witnessed further significant efforts at curricular reform. During 1980-1981, Dean of the Faculty Andrew G. De Rocco's second year in office, a special faculty committee chaired by Professor Borden W. Painter, Jr., '58 (History) reexamined the curriculum and made two recommendations adopted by the faculty. The first was a requirement that every major incorporate some form of senior exercise such as an extended project, a substantial research paper, a thesis, or, in the performing and studio arts, a recital or exhibition of works, respectively. The second recommendation mandated the Curriculum Committee to review all academic departments and programs on a regular rotation, utilizing the assistance of external reviewers. The first cycle of departmental reviews began during the 1982-1983 academic year and was completed in 1997. The Committee has recently undertaken reviews of programs and initiated the second cycle for departments. Associate Academic Dean J. Ronald
Spencer ’64, who has been involved in all of the reviews and directed more than half of them, notes that “they have been beneficial, leading to changes, great or small, in just about every department to be reviewed. [For example,] the review of Classics prompted [the creation of] the Classical Civilization major, and the review of Fine Arts set the stage for ending the art historians’ monopoly of the chairmanship, . . . [which] now alternates between art history and studio art on a regular basis.”

Other changes in the curriculum during this period included a broadening of the Religion Department’s course offerings to include the study of Judaism, Islam, Roman Catholicism, and the religions of Asia, while the range of languages in which instruction was offered expanded to embrace Chinese, Japanese, Hebrew, and Arabic. The faculty who taught these languages held joint appointments in Modern Languages and Area/International Studies.

The second wave of curricular reform grew out of long-range planning efforts initiated by President James F. English, Jr. in the early 1980s. In the spring of 1986, the faculty adopted the Curriculum Committee’s recommendation that beginning with the Class of 1992, which would be entering in the fall of 1988, students had to satisfy writing and mathematics proficiency requirements as well as an “integration of knowledge,” i.e., interdisciplinary minor, requirement. Professor Borden W. Painter, Jr. ’58 (History), who served as Acting Dean of the Faculty during the 1984-1985 academic year, and as Dean from 1985 to 1987, recalls that “the mood at Trinity and nationally had changed with respect to the curriculum and especially with respect to general requirements.” The situation, he contends, called for developing a strong consensus “about the basic nature and scope of a liberal education,” and for reducing to a minimum the risk that students would come to Trinity with the intent of finding shelter in the open curriculum from requirements other colleges and universities were imposing. Painter notes that the introduction of interdisciplinary minors grew out of an idea proposed by Professor Alden R. Gordon ’69 (Fine Arts) (VI-62). The minors were to consist of “six courses drawn from at least three academic fields . . . organized around some common theme or problem.” Diverse in their fields of inquiry, the minors that were developed at the time included: Cognitive Science (computer science, philosophy, and psychology); Law and Society (economics, political science, psychology, and sociology); Light and Color (photobiology, optical physics, and chemistry); Medieval and Renaissance Studies (literature, history, religion, philosophy, and art history); and Computer Technology and Modern Society (engineering and computer science, mathematics, and philosophy).

Overseeing creation of the minors was a newly established General Education Council, a faculty-administration body charged with responsibility for those aspects of the curriculum not related to majors. Commenting at the time the minors requirement was introduced, Associate Academic Dean Spencer noted that “too many students approach their non-major studies with a kind of tunnel vision, rarely giving thought to how a particular course can be related to other courses and espe-
cially to those in other fields. By systematically exploring connections among different courses and disciplines, the minors should help counteract this piecemeal approach to learning.”377 Dean of the Faculty Painter held the conviction that the minors would offer students a “structured means of learning how the insights and methods of diverse disciplines can be used to elucidate complex subjects and issues . . . .,” thereby better preparing them “for life and work in a complex society that increasingly demands interdisciplinary solutions.”378 Although encouraging faculty to establish connections between their own areas of specialization and those of their colleagues, the minors added considerably to the complexities students faced in fulfilling their curricular obligations, and the requirement was discontinued in 1997.379

In 1987, the second major curricular change occurred with the introduction of a five-part distribution requirement under which students had to complete “at least one course in each of the five major areas in the curriculum — humanities, arts, social sciences, natural sciences, and numerical or symbolic reasoning.”380 The distribution requirement replaced the four guidelines that the 1969 curriculum had set forth to help students and their faculty advisers select courses other than those in a major. Over the years, the guidelines had largely been ignored both by students and faculty, and the Horizons Program devised by Professor J. Bard McNulty ’38 (English), discussed previously, had attempted to address this situation. Under the open curriculum, furthermore, many students had preferred taking courses in the humanities and social sciences, and when possible, avoided the study of the natural and physical sciences.381 The distribution requirement challenged undergraduates to broaden their outlook, and there were many courses in each of the five areas from which to select, including a significant range of offerings in the sciences, which faculty had recently developed with the requirement in mind. Commenting on the curricular revisions, President English noted that the action of the faculty demonstrated a growing conviction “that the current generation of students would benefit if their freedom were tempered by the introduction of some degree of structure into the non-major course of study.”382 He also indicated that the administration and the Trustees had agreed to a slight increase in the size of the faculty before the end of the decade, a reflection of the growing number of courses in the curriculum designed to meet the distribution requirement.383

Although the undergraduate program was undergoing strengthening and diversification during the 1970s, the graduate and summer programs were experiencing difficulties. Beginning in the late 1960s, their popularity began to wane. The strength of the graduate program had been the large number of secondary school teachers in the Hartford area who had looked to Trinity for a quality program, together with interest in graduate study in mathematics and physics on the part of employees from local industries, especially United Aircraft Corporation. Many teachers in Greater Hartford by that time had already received their graduate training at Trinity or elsewhere, and local school systems were hiring fewer new teachers. In addition, the rise of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute’s Hartford Graduate Center, and the increasing popularity of its
specialized programs, were diverting students from Trinity. Colleges and universities, furthermore, were gradually abandoning core requirements in their undergraduate curricula, and summer programs were dwindling. Ivan A. Backer (VI-63), Director of Graduate Studies and Community Education during the mid-1970s, recalls that an advertising campaign to promote the College’s programs proved disappointing. As a means of attracting graduate students, Backer and Professor Andrew J. Gold (Economics) worked with the University of Connecticut School of Law to develop a master’s program in public policy. Enrollments in more traditional areas of graduate study at Trinity such as French, Spanish, political science, and physics, as well as Latin literature and classical civilization declined to the point that the Trustees voted in the spring of 1978 to phase them out.\textsuperscript{384}

The decline in the graduate program’s fortunes had its effect on the Education Department, under whose supervision many master’s degree candidates pursued their studies.\textsuperscript{385} As graduate enrollments decreased in the early 1970s, the department’s contribution to the academic program began to come into question. Furthermore, as the decade advanced, the College continued to tighten its finances in the face of national economic uncertainty and double-digit inflation, sought ways to utilize faculty to the utmost, and engaged in reductions and reallocations of faculty positions. President Lockwood later noted that several departments and their offerings came under review, particularly the Education Department, because it was “largely linked to the graduate programs . . . [and] as the need for master’s degrees among teachers in the region . . . sloped off, despite the quality of the program, it was quite clear that Education was running into some troubled waters.”\textsuperscript{386} Another consideration was that the size of the faculty had increased to 141, six above the Trustee guideline of 135 full-time equivalents (FTE) set in 1969, and the faculty’s Educational Policy Committee and the Joint Educational Policy Committee began to consider ways of achieving the desired reductions.\textsuperscript{387}

The Education Department’s fate was determined in the late 1970s when the administration reached the decision to reduce the faculty’s size to the Trustees’ guideline by the 1981-1982 academic year. The decision was a response to the College’s financial situation, and realized President Lockwood’s objective of creating flexibility to accommodate a future increase in the size of the faculty, which he believed would inevitably occur as the result of coeducation and the opportunities the revised curriculum offered.\textsuperscript{388} His concern, moreover, was that the faculty take responsibility for accomplishing the reductions rather than have the College achieve the same ends through administrative fiat. Working through its Educational Policy Committee and the Joint Committee, the faculty eventually made a number of recommendations that the Trustees approved in the spring of 1979.\textsuperscript{389} Effective September 1982, the Trustees authorized a decrease in the size of the Education Department from four positions to one, a change in status from that of a department to a program, and the elimination of “its graduate program and teacher certification program.”\textsuperscript{390}
As the curricular patterns of the past changed, opportunities for innovation presented themselves. The sense of exciting potential the new curriculum offered gave rise to two programs that have proven highly successful, and have immeasurably enhanced the distinctive character of a Trinity education: the Individualized Degree Program (IDP), and the Rome Program. Originally known as the Alternate Degree-Program (ADP), the IDP concept grew out of one of the recommendations made in 1971 by a Trustee-commissioned student-faculty-alumni task force on the academic program whose general findings were previously discussed. The task force recommended that ways be devised to attract older students to the College in the belief that they would help diversify the undergraduate body, heighten the educational experience of the typical college-age student through interaction with more mature and experienced students, and increase the College’s revenues from tuition without putting pressure on residential facilities. Many colleges and universities were then exploring ways of providing students with flexible options for pursuing an undergraduate degree. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education had released a study in 1971 entitled Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School, which, according to the report of the faculty’s ADP Planning Committee, “articulated much of this evident desire [for options] and urged institutions of higher education to undertake experiments to develop various non-traditional modes of study. A wide variety of new forms are now being tried. They dot the spectrum all the way from modest variants of the lecture/course ‘standard’ to . . . ‘universities without walls or campuses.’”

The academic task force proposed instituting a program in which “certification for the B.A. is not based on course requirements and which can be completed by students in varying numbers of years . . . . A student can complete the program in three years, but may take more than the traditional four . . . .” In November 1971, the Curriculum Committee presented to the faculty an outline of the ADP program and recommended its implementation. Receiving the faculty’s approval, the ADP proposal was forwarded to the Trustees, who authorized the faculty to work out the details. A special Alternate Degree-Program Planning Committee, consisting of 20 members of the faculty, including professors Borden W. Painter, Jr. ’58 (History) and Frank G. Kirkpatrick ’64 (Religion), presented its report on May 16. The report received the approval of the faculty at its meeting that same day, and on May 27 the Trustees voted to implement the program.

Initially, the IDP program had three distinct components: the nonmajor phase, entailing the successful completion on a self-paced basis of a number of faculty-designed “study units,” each unit the equivalent of approximately one-third to one-half of a standard one-semester course, pursued in the manner of a tutorial, and linked with other units to assure distribution relationships across a range of disciplines; the major phase, consisting of regular course work, and laboratory work if necessary; and the culminating “integrative project,” an interdisciplinary undertaking equivalent to a thesis. The IDP program was sufficiently flexible to accommodate “the working
adult as well as the highly-motivated undergraduate student,” and the first 14 nonresident students matriculated in April 1973. The following spring, there were 20 students enrolled, ranging in age from 21 to 58. Professor Kirkpatrick, the IDP’s first director, noted at the time that 13 of the students had undertaken some college work before enrolling at Trinity, that there were more women than men, and that the students’ occupations ranged from housewife to secretary, construction worker to newspaper reporter.

As the IDP’s third anniversary neared, President Lockwood noted that the program “represents Trinity’s unique approach to the need for continuing education. Its flexibility and its rigor distinguish the IDP from other programs.” By the winter of 1976, 35 students were enrolled, with about half that number residing in the Greater Hartford area, the remainder commuting from other areas of Connecticut. That same year, recognizing that many students interested in the program might be deterred by the cost of attending Trinity, the administration reduced the IDP tuition to two-thirds that of regular tuition costs. The following year, at the request of the Joint Committee on Educational Policy, the Trustees made it possible for IDP students to take courses in the regular curriculum. This enabled fulfillment of the requirements for a baccalaureate degree by combining individual study and regular course work, and made the degree more readily attainable for IDP students.

Aware of the importance the program had in helping strengthen ties with the Greater Hartford community, the College began in 1982 to intensify recruitment of IDP students, then numbering about 100, with a goal of doubling enrollment by 1984. Louise H. Fisher ’73 (VI-64), the IDP director, noted that the program had relied for growth largely on referrals from the students themselves, and that the College was prepared to undertake an aggressive and continuing promotional campaign. A further reduction in tuition charges for the program strengthened efforts to attract students. Instituted in 1984, the new rates were 75 percent of the regular tuition for classroom courses, and 50 percent for study units. IDP enrollments gradually increased, and by June 1997, 391 men and women had graduated from the College under the program’s auspices. Many of the IDP alumni have pursued further education, among them D. Holmes Morton ’79, M.D. (VI-65), to whom the College awarded an honorary Doctor of Science degree in 1990. Coming to Trinity after a brief career as a merchant seaman and service in the U.S. Navy, he went on to receive his medical degree from Harvard University. A devoted pediatrician and ground-breaking geneticist, Morton has developed new forms of diagnosis and treatment of hereditary afflictions in Amish children.

The second distinctive academic program the College developed during the 1970s focused on Rome. The inspiration of Professor Michael R. Campo ’48 (Modern Languages), whose involvement with the Barbieri Center has previously been discussed, the Rome program grew out of the new curriculum and the opportunity for innovation it offered. In the fall of 1969, Dean of the Faculty Robert W. Fuller
reported to the Trustees that, with the enthusiastic approval of the faculty, the College would be instituting the program the following summer. Study abroad was becoming increasingly popular among undergraduates nationwide, and opportunities were then being developed at various overseas sites by a number of institutions. Under the program, members of Trinity's faculty in conjunction with other scholars would teach courses in such areas as: Italian history and culture; Italian literature, language and civilization; fine arts; studio arts; music; and classical archaeology. Students would be drawn from Trinity as well as from the collegiate exchange with which the College had just become affiliated. Housed at the Convent of the Camaldolese Sisters (VI-66), the program offered the many advantages and attractions of study in the Eternal City, "a natural center for such a learning experience because of its wide range of objects of interest in art, music, literature, history, and religion, in addition to its many contemporary cultural attractions."

The first summer was an extraordinary success despite a variety of challenges ranging from health problems of students and inadequate accommodations for several faculty and their families, to antiquated plumbing and a balky slide projector. Undaunted, indefatigable, and resourceful, Professor Campo persevered, and established the program on a firm foundation over the course of the following two years. Distinguished faculty from other colleges and universities enjoyed teaching at the Rome Campus, and several younger faculty such as archaeologists William L. MacDonald and John A. Pinto of Smith College later achieved prominence during their academic careers. Enrollment in the summer of 1971 was 98, with 25 from the College. The following September, the Rome Campus began its schedule of fall and spring semesters, followed by the summer term. A number of resident directors have managed the program effectively over the years, including professors Gertrude Hooker, Patricia de Martino, and Livio Pestilli. In 1975, the College revised the legal aspects of the program, establishing it as a separate corporation designated the Barbieri Center, Inc., thus permitting more effective functioning within the structure of Italian law.

Now known as the Trinity College Rome Campus program, it has been a great success for the College and has achieved distinction as a model of its kind. Hundreds of Trinity undergraduates and a sizeable number of the faculty, as well as many students from other colleges and universities, have enjoyed their involvement with the program. It has afforded faculty the opportunity to develop specialized courses such as those on international relations offered by Professor Albert L. Gastmann (Political Science) (VI-67) during the spring of 1979 under the Intensive Studies Program. Another innovation associated with the Rome Campus grew out of the College’s involvement in the early 1980s with the Elderhostel Program. One summer, while Mather Hall’s dining facilities were undergoing renovation, the College turned to the Rome Campus as an Elderhostel site. Based on the success of this experiment, Professor Campo enlarged Trinity’s Elderhostel program to include a number of
Italian cities, and was later joined in the effort by Professor Borden W. Painter, Jr. '58 (History). In the late 1990s, an estimated 3,500 people annually were participating in nine programs in 11 cities, including Assisi, Siena, Florence, Palermo, Rome, Sorrento, Padua, Venice, and Verona, as well as Lake Garda. As the 20th century draws to a close, the Rome Campus program is also serving to spur reflection on ways in which Trinity can develop new curricular options and programs at a variety of "global learning sites," with a "world cities" emphasis, resulting in a network that builds on Trinity's distinctiveness as a liberal arts college in an urban setting.

A major new direction in the curriculum and in the life of the College involves computers and information technology. In the early 1950s, as part of the evening study program, upperclassmen could enroll in a mathematics course, "Numerical Mathematical Analysis and Machine Methods," taught by Stuart L. Crossman and Walter A. Ramshaw, visiting faculty who were on the research staff at United Aircraft Corporation in East Hartford, Connecticut. An innovation of Dr. Harold L. Dorwart, Seabury Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, the course allowed students access to the facilities of United Aircraft's Research Department Computing Laboratory, including a massive IBM mainframe machine and associated computer punch card equipment. One undergraduate who enrolled in the course was Roy Nutt '53 (VI-68), who, as Professor Robert C. Stewart (Mathematics) recalled, soon turned his attention "to the kind of mathematics and its applications" he discovered as a result. Later, Nutt became a computer software pioneer, and was a principal developer of the FORTRAN language. A devoted alumnus, he and his wife, Ruth, became generous benefactors of the College.

By the late 1960s, Professor August E. Sapega (Engineering) was developing courses on computers in conjunction with the new curriculum. The early 1970s witnessed the establishment of a link to Dartmouth's computer system, and in the fall of 1976, Trinity's new Digital Equipment Corporation PDP 11/34 computer, featuring 12 terminals for simultaneous use, facilitated tie-in with a national data network and improved remote access to Yale's computing facilities. These developments enabled faculty and students in such diverse disciplines as economics, education, engineering, political science, and sociology to utilize various kinds of data sets in their research. The incorporation of computers into the curriculum, particularly in engineering, had reached such an extent by the end of the decade that the National Science Foundation hailed Trinity as a model for other colleges and universities. In the mid-1980s, students interested in computers as a subject of study could pursue a computer major through the redesignated Engineering and Computer Science Department, and in 1995, growth in computer science as a discipline resulted in the establishment of a separate academic department whose first chair was Professor Ralph E. Walde.

During the 1970s, N. Robbins Winslow, Jr. '57, Dean for Educational Services, and other administrators introduced computer applications in regard to administrative data. Based on previous experience as Provost of Union College, however,
President Lockwood was cautious about investing too heavily in computer systems, especially in light of the College’s need to budget expenditures carefully. Early in the following decade, President English presided over an upgrading and expansion of Trinity’s administrative data systems, and what emerged was a single, integrated system encompassing business and financial records, alumni data, Registrar’s data, and other kinds of information. In the ensuing years, information technology has had a major impact on higher education, transforming the way in which scholarly information and administrative data are accessed, delivered, and utilized in teaching and learning, and in administering colleges and universities. The use of powerful computers smaller than mainframes has grown widespread, and the personal computer—whether IBM-compatible or Macintosh, workstation or portable lap-top—has become indispensable in faculty and administrative offices, the dormitory room, the library, the workplace, and increasingly, the home.

Trinity has taken the lead among small liberal arts institutions in installing a sophisticated campus network for accessing and disseminating electronic data in various forms, including electronic mail. From the dormitory, the office, the library, or the home, the network also facilitates research use of full-text, graphic, and bibliographic electronic databases, as well as of the Internet, and has enabled the development of a wide array of computer applications in the teaching-learning environment, ranging from on-line course syllabi and supporting documentation, to interactive critiques of term papers and the incorporation of digitized images into electronic databases. Trinity has established and maintains a home page, which serves as a public relations vehicle as well as a means for linking on- and off-campus users with a variety of College-related information and external resources available through the Internet. A computer center staff under Dr. John A. Langeland (VI-69), Director of Information Technology, provides technical support. In 1997, Dr. Bernard L. Hecker, Director of Academic Computing, became responsible for overseeing the “Learning Technology Project,” an initiative of the College supported by a grant from the Charles E. Culpeper Foundation, designed to explore imaginative ways of harnessing the potential information technology holds for enhancing instruction and learning at Trinity.

Regarding library automation at the College, in 1984, President English approved Trinity’s participation in forming a consortium with Wesleyan University and Connecticut College to establish a joint on-line automated library system. Under the leadership of College Librarian Ralph S. Emerick (VI-70), Trinity’s library staff collaborated with their colleagues at the other institutions in laying the groundwork for the “CTW System,” which became a reality in 1986 with support from the W. M. Keck Foundation and the Charles E. Culpeper Foundation. The system enables library users at each of the colleges to conduct on-line searches of bibliographic data for research material held in the three libraries, as if they comprised a single library collection at a major university. Also, borrowers at any one of the three institutions can obtain books and photocopies of journal articles from the libraries of the other two
through a special delivery arrangement. In the 1990s, Emerick's successor, Dr. Stephen L. Peterson (VI-71), has further developed the library’s electronic resources and capabilities while continuing to build its research collections in print, positioning it advantageously for the future.

Many years earlier, Vice President Albert E. Holland '34 was instrumental in strengthening the library’s poetry resources, and his keen interest in poetry led him to develop initial funding support for a program of poetry readings and lectures that eventually evolved into the College’s Poetry Center. In 1952, when he was Assistant to the President, Holland gave the library his collection of first editions of works by contemporary British poets, in honor of Paul and Marie Reif, close friends, and provided funds to continue developing the Reif Poetry Collection. In the early 1960s, the Hartford Jewish Community Center approached Holland to inquire whether Trinity would co-sponsor a series of lectures and readings by poets the Center was offering while it relocated to new quarters. He was enthusiastic, and the series was well-received both on- and off-campus. Among the poets visiting Trinity during this period were Richard Eberhart, Howard Nemorov, and Karl Shapiro. Each visit lasted up to three days, and featured public lectures and readings, visits to classes, and informal meetings with students. The series was coordinated initially by Holly Stevens, the daughter of Wallace Stevens, Hartford’s internationally recognized Bollingen Prize-winning poet, and later by Amelia G. Silvestri (VI-72), for many years a member of Trinity’s Public Relations staff and a well-known actress in local drama companies who often appeared in Jesters’ productions.

In the 1970s, with the support of English Department faculty members Stephen Minot and Hugh Ogden, an acclaimed poet, Amelia G. Silvestri expanded the poet-in-residence program, extending the period of residence to a week, and introducing an element of community outreach by arranging for the poets to conduct poetry-writing workshops on campus for high school students from Hartford as well as for English teachers from those schools. Workshops and individual conferences were also held for Trinity student poets. In 1978, the program adopted a more formal structure and became known as the Trinity College Poetry Center, with Silvestri serving as its first Executive Coordinator (later Director). In the ensuing years, the Center has continued to bring to the campus nationally recognized poets such as John Berryman, Philip Levine, W. D. Snodgrass, Dabney Stuart, Lucille Clifton, and Wendell Berry, to sponsor readings by student poets, and in general to encourage undergraduate interest in poetry.

While the poet-in-residence program was being modified and strengthened, the College was experiencing alterations in other areas of its life. In particular, the faculty was undergoing a number of changes ranging from broadened diversity in gender and race to increased involvement in College governance. Regarding the latter, Dr. Clark Kerr has noted that one of the major manifestations of campus unrest during the late 1960s and early 1970s was the determination on the part of activist students and
junior faculty members “to ‘reconstitute’ the university internally and particularly in the direction of ‘participatory democracy.’” In order to influence discussion and change, the faculty became more assertive in closely examining many aspects of College policy, particularly such matters as promotion and tenure, faculty recruitment, the chairmanship of departments, the allocation of faculty positions to departments, and the size and composition of the faculty. Faculty committees underwent revitalization and began to exert greater influence, especially the Appointments and Promotions Committee, the Educational Policy Committee, and the Curriculum Committee.

In December 1968, the faculty redefined the position of its principal elected officer, strengthening the Secretary of the Faculty’s role as a conduit for internal and external communications. In addition, the Secretary assumed greater responsibility for establishing faculty meeting agendas, and held the chairmanship of the newly created Faculty Conference. The Conference was established to “ensure that major proposals are placed before the appropriate faculty committee, or in the absence of such committee, to study, evaluate, and make recommendations on such proposals . . . [as well as] strengthen the meeting and the committee structure by facilitating faculty discussion informal or otherwise.” The Conference made certain that issues of concern to the faculty received full consideration.

In connection with departmental chairmanships, the prevailing practice under which a senior full professor served as chairman until his retirement gave way during the Lockwood administration to the periodic rotation of the chairmanship among all tenured members of a department. Over time, different members of a department exercised responsibility for administering its affairs and brought varied points of view to this function. Dr. Jan K. Cohn (VI-73), Dean of the Faculty during the late 1980s and early 1990s, and the first woman to hold this office, moved to strengthen the authority and range of responsibility of department chairs, revived a Caucus of Chairs that met monthly to discuss matters of interest, involved the chairs more directly in evaluating department members for annual salary increases based on merit, and introduced procedures for departmental evaluations of the chairs.

When President Lockwood took office he discovered that the decades-old policy of granting de jure tenure to full professors remained in effect, associate professors having de facto tenure based on custom. Following standards promulgated by the American Association of University Professors, the College, in Lockwood’s words, “blanketed in everybody who was entitled under AAUP standards to tenure,” and began to “work through with the faculty the standards according to which we would [thereafter] make decisions of tenure.” The standards also applied to promotion, and consisted of demonstrated effectiveness in the classroom as a teacher, evidence of attainment “as a mature scholar . . ., recognized by others as a scholar in that field,” and “conspicuous service to the College.” The College began to encourage greater involvement in research and publication as well as in professional activities in
a faculty member's discipline, and gradually made available funds for travel and the support of research, initially through grants from the Mellon Foundation, and later through a faculty research fund that appeared as a line item in Trinity's annual budget. In President Lockwood's view, these efforts helped develop a greater professional self-consciousness on the faculty's part.425

The procedures for recruitment, reappointment, promotion, and the granting of tenure were tightened and formalized. By the late 1980s, these procedures had taken the form they retain in the late 1990s, and involve the central role of the faculty's Appointments and Promotions Committee. The Committee consists of three full professors elected by the faculty, with the requirement that one of the professors must be from mathematics, engineering, or one of the sciences. The president and the Dean of the Faculty are also members of the Appointments and Promotions Committee. In addition, the faculty members, joined by three trustees, constitute a Joint Committee on Appointments and Promotions, which reviews and forwards favorable recommendations made by the faculty Committee to the full Board for action.426 Assembling a candidate's dossier in connection with either tenure and promotion or pre-tenure reappointment is the responsibility of the particular academic department. In contrast to the relatively brief information previously gathered, dossiers have expanded considerably under the policy of thoroughly reviewing a candidate's qualifications, which includes obtaining the views of colleagues and those of external specialists in the discipline as well as full documentation of scholarly activity.427

Another issue regarding the faculty is the relationship between teaching and the pursuit of research, a long-standing concern at institutions devoted primarily to the education of undergraduates. At universities with well-developed graduate programs, the emphasis among the faculty is on research and work with graduate students, the teaching of undergraduates often becoming a secondary priority. In contrast, at the small liberal arts college, the major concern traditionally has been teaching. Beginning in the mid-1970s, Trinity and other colleges began placing increased emphasis on research and publication as criteria for academic advancement, recognizing that such activities often stimulate creativity in the classroom. Faculty members at Trinity prior to World War II generally were teacher-scholars, broadly prepared in their disciplines and capable of specialization, yet well-read in related fields. Their successors in the ensuing decades of the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s largely followed this pattern. By the 1970s, the state of graduate education had changed, reflecting in part the emergence of new dynamics within disciplines. Younger faculty tended to reflect narrower preparation than previously, were more tightly focused on a particular specialization within a discipline, and were less well-grounded in collateral fields, a phenomenon of the rapid expansion of the knowledge base. In the early 1980s, when Dr. Andrew G. De Rocco was serving as Dean of the Faculty, the College increased its expectations for faculty involvement in research and publication, and during the decade took several steps to encourage scholarship. These included: a reduction in the teaching load from
six courses per year to 10 courses over a two-year period, beginning in the fall of 1987; the establishment of paid research leaves for junior faculty; increased annual funding for faculty research in general, coupled with the creation of a Faculty Research Committee to oversee allocation; and the facilitation of access by faculty to research grants from external sources through a grants office. In addition, in the late 1970s, foundation support led to the establishment of the nondisciplinary Charles A. Dana Research Professorship, which is awarded for a period of three years to a tenured member of the faculty. Under its terms, a reduced teaching schedule allows greater flexibility to pursue research.

The balance between teaching and scholarship characteristic of younger faculty has resulted in opportunities for collaborative research and publication with students, especially in the sciences, but increasingly in the social sciences and humanities. As Professor Craig W. Schneider (Biology) (VI-74) has observed, “during the Cold War years, the volume of information in the sciences in general exploded . . ., [and] scholars were forced to be more ‘narrow’—no one could possibly be fluent in all of the disciplines within biology,” or other major scientific fields. “Newer faculty who have come on board [in biology],” Schneider notes, “are deeply devoted to their specialties, and bring innovative research programs tailored for involvement of undergraduate students . . .”

Of considerable interest to a number of Trinity faculty over the past two decades has been involvement in interdisciplinary teaching, introduced in the 1970s in American Studies and in the Guided Studies Program in the Humanities, previously mentioned. Some Guided Studies courses featured joint instruction, usually by faculty from different departments. Another interdisciplinary program established in the late 1980s was in neuroscience, directed by Professor Priscilla Kehoe (Psychology). This program encompasses disciplines ranging from engineering to philosophy. In addition, in early 1997, the College established a Center for Collaborative Teaching and Research. Its director, Professor Drew A. Hyland (Philosophy), is exploring ways in which faculty in the arts, humanities, social sciences, and sciences can collaborate in developing innovative and distinctive approaches to interdisciplinary instruction.

In recognition of the primacy of teaching at Trinity, two awards have been established honoring members of the faculty, who, in the eyes of students as well as colleagues, are distinguished by their contributions in the classroom. The Brownell Prize for Excellence in Teaching, made possible in 1986 through the generosity of an alumnus who wished to remain anonymous, and awarded every other year, recognizes excellence in teaching among faculty who have nine or more years of service at Trinity. In the late 1980s, a gift from G. Keith Funston ’32, former president of Trinity, to honor Professor of Modern Languages (Emeritus) Arthur H. Hughes, who had also served as Vice President and Dean of the College as well as acting president, enabled Dean of the Faculty Cohn to create the annual Arthur H. Hughes Award for Achievement in Teaching. First conferred in 1990 in recognition of the contributions of junior faculty,
the award was later open to all faculty with fewer than nine years of service.\(^{432}\) An important way of calling attention to the distinctive contribution faculty make in expanding the intellectual horizons of students, the Brownell Prize and the Hughes Award honor accomplishment that lies at the heart of Trinity's educational mission.\(^{433}\)

During the 1970s and 1980s, the College strove to develop a faculty inclusive in both gender and diversity, and sustained efforts continue in the 1990s. In March 1973, confirming the critical importance of this objective, the Trustees passed a resolution endorsing a recommendation from the Board of Fellows on the selection of faculty. The resolution declared that, while “intellectual excellence is and should be the paramount criterion used by the College . . . , women [and] racial, religious, and ethnic minorities should be represented” on the faculty.\(^{434}\) Trinity had already made some progress in this regard. Resulting from the initiative in 1956 of Seabury Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy Harold L. Dorwart, chairman of the Mathematics Department, Professor Marjorie V. Butcher (VI-75) became the first woman to accept appointment to the faculty. A specialist in actuarial mathematics, Professor Butcher had been a member of the actuarial department of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Company in Hartford before joining the mathematics faculty at the University of Michigan. She and her husband, Robert W. Butcher, moved to Hartford upon the latter's acceptance of an actuarial position with the Travelers Life Insurance Company. A part-time Lecturer at Trinity for many years, Mrs. Butcher was promoted to the rank of Associate Professor in July 1974, and appointed Professor in 1979.\(^{435}\)

In 1964, Dr. Florence S. Jones, Lecturer in Astronomy, became the second woman member of the faculty. Two years later, Juliette M. R. De Gardony (Modern Languages), accepted appointment as Instructor in French, and became the first woman to teach on a full-time basis. In 1967, Marylin C. Wilde was appointed Instructor in French, as was Anastasie Ferrari.\(^{436}\) Other women joined the faculty soon thereafter, and among those appointed during the first decade of coeducation who have become tenured was Professor Dori Katz (Modern Languages) (VI-76), whose distinguished career at the College began in 1969 and has been marked by a number of “firsts”: the first woman on the faculty to hold a tenure-track position; the first to be granted tenure; the first to be elected to the faculty's Appointments and Promotions Committee; and the first to chair the Appointments and Promotions Committee.\(^{437}\) Other women who accepted appointment to the faculty during this period include professors Judy Dworin (Theater and Dance), 1971, as noted previously; Noreen L. Channels (Sociology), 1972; Dianne Hunter (English), 1972 (VI-77); Andrea Bianchini (Modern Languages), 1973 (VI-78); Milla C. Riggio (English), 1973; Sonia M. Lee (Modern Languages), 1973 (VI-79); Diane C. Zannoni (Economics), 1975 (VI-80); Helen S. Lang (Philosophy), 1978; and Diana Evans (Political Science), 1979 (VI-81). These faculty members have proven to be highly supportive of women undergraduates. In the ensuing decades, the number of women on the faculty increased considerably, and in the 1997-1998 academic year, women
During coeducation's first decade, the College began sustained efforts to recruit women faculty members, who found themselves breaking new ground and encountering uncertain, sometimes hesitant responses on the part of their male colleagues. For example, Professor Dori Katz (Modern Languages) recalls feeling that, as "one of so few women faculty, I was always treated like company. People were very nice to me. They would rush over and help me with my coat and open doors[,] and I was invited to many cocktail parties and so on—but I always had the feeling that 'isn't it nice to have you around and have you as a guest.'" She also encountered the "token woman" phenomenon in regard to service on committees, and "felt constant pressure to advocate the traditional 'woman's viewpoint.'" Professor Mila C. Riggi (English) remembers "having to serve on every major committee as 'the woman.'" Professor Judy Dworin recalls that, as a woman faculty member in the early 1970s, Trinity did not offer her a particularly hospitable environment. "I was the youngest person on the faculty; I was a woman; and I was teaching Dance, which was received at best with enormous skepticism. Perhaps because of my age and discipline, I did not feel a support system from the few other women on the faculty at that time. I found our attempts to build any kind of solidarity as women to be somewhat artificial and forced. I chose to focus my attention on building the foundation for dance, a true stepchild, and on envisioning the ways in which it could be integrated as a viable and valued field of study... it provided a vehicle, a sense of personhood, for many women students at Trinity facing a culture that very slowly was evolving a truly coeducational atmosphere." The College was also beginning to recruit minority faculty members. The earliest appointment brought Dr. John H. Bennett of United Aircraft Corporation to Trinity in 1965 as a part-time Lecturer in Mathematics, and for several years he taught graduate courses in advanced calculus and advanced numerical analysis. During the 1969-1970 academic year, Charles S. (Chuck) Stone, a black author and journalist, served as John T. Dorrance Visiting Professor, and in the fall semester gave a course on black politics. The following year, the Rev. Dr. Herbert O. Edwards came to Trinity as Assistant Professor of Religion and Assistant Dean of Community Life. The first black woman to serve on the faculty was Linda T. Nailer, Instructor in History and Intercultural Studies from 1971 to 1973. In 1972, professors John E. Simmons III (Biology) (VI-82) and James A. Miller (English, American Studies, and Intercultural Studies) (VI-83) became the first black members of the faculty to hold tenure-track positions. The number of black faculty members gradually increased, and by 1997-1998 there were five men and two women in tenure and tenure-track positions. Throughout the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, the College has striven to intensify efforts in this regard, and has also appointed four Asian and six Hispanic faculty members. As Dean of the Faculty from 1987 to 1994, Dr. Jan K. Cohn undertook several initiatives to diversify the faculty, and facilitated filling three new positions for minority
faculties that the Trustees had authorized during the 1988-1989 academic year with the support of President James F. English, Jr. An ad hoc trustee-faculty Minority Faculty Recruitment Committee was created to explore various ideas for further diversifying the faculty as well as the curriculum, and it supported establishment of the Ann Plato Fellowship, which brings to the campus for a year a minority doctoral candidate who is completing a dissertation, and affords the opportunity to teach a course and benefit from association with the Trinity faculty. Named after the 19th-century black Hartford poet, essayist, and teacher, the Plato Fellowship has achieved national recognition and is highly prized. In the mid-1990s, under the leadership of President Evan S. Dobelle, the College allocated an additional seven positions for minority faculty.446

Among the major concerns that President Lockwood began to address upon taking office were, as previously discussed, his sense that the College should move toward coeducation, and the urgent need to revise the curriculum. Lockwood’s third concern was Trinity’s financial strength, both short-term and long-term. In the face of rising costs and targeted federal support for higher education, he maintained that private colleges and universities would have to rely more heavily on foundations, resulting in increased competition for their resources. In addition, there would be greater emphasis on seeking corporate funding, a trend that had already begun to develop. Support from the corporate sector was leading colleges to rely more heavily on developing matching gift and challenge programs, and corporations began to expect the establishment of linkages between their support and focused program development on the part of colleges and universities.447

President Lockwood’s initial actions included scrutinizing costs, insisting on the development of tighter financial management and budgeting practices, and instituting short-term and long-term financial planning. In an effort to avoid runaway increases in financial aid commitments, he also moved to augment funding for this purpose gradually. In addition, the College introduced a number of cost control mechanisms, curtailed or reduced the growth of the faculty, the staff, and a variety of support services, carefully monitored expenditures on maintenance of the physical plant, and reduced the size of the administration. Trinity experienced a small deficit in 1969 and a somewhat larger one the following year, but thereafter the budget was in balance. The most serious problem, however, was the size of the endowment. As noted in the previous chapter, the Ford Challenge campaign of the late 1960s had not resulted in significantly increasing the endowment, and in Lockwood’s view, “ended up giving us very little loose change.”448 As the size of the student body gradually grew with the introduction of coeducation, the income per student from the endowment decreased proportionately. The president sought ways to improve investment strategy so that the yield from the endowment would increase, and moved to “build up reserves and resources that we never had at this institution.”449 He also avoided raising tuition costs at a rate matching that of comparable institutions. This made Trinity more
attractive to prospective students and reduced reliance on tuition income as a way to balance the budget, a practice some institutions regularly followed, and that Lockwood believed would, if continued from year to year, ultimately weaken the College’s competitiveness. As a solution to the endowment predicament, in January 1972, the Trustees unanimously voted to undertake a capital campaign. As planning for the campaign progressed, its goals became more clearly defined. The fund-raising target was $12 million. At the campaign’s kickoff, held at Trinity on January 18, 1975, Robert M. Blum '50, national campaign chairman, reported that just over $4 million in advanced gifts and pledges had been received, noting that “these gifts, totaling just over a third of our goal, are certainly a great expression of confidence in Trinity, especially in light of our nation’s unfavorable economic situation.” Designated the “Campaign for Trinity Values,” the drive had as its aim to raise: “$5 million endowment for faculty and for academic program; $2.5 million endowment for scholarships; $1 million endowment for campus improvement; $1 million endowment for the library; and $2.5 million for construction of the new library wing.” President Lockwood declared that “it is imperative that we now increase the endowment base supporting our academic programs and facilities . . . Endowment funds . . . provide an annual income yield which supports the operating costs of current programs.” Noting that endowment income, tuition, and annual gifts were the three major sources of revenue in Trinity’s annual budget, the principal source being tuition, he went on to state that “endowment, however, is an essential resource which enables Trinity to maintain enduring programs of high quality without at the same time putting the costs of these programs beyond the reach of most students.” Reflecting the stock market’s recovery from a pronounced decline, in June 1975, Trinity’s endowment stood at $29.7 million, while that of Wesleyan was $114 million, Amherst $75 million, Oberlin $69 million, Williams $58 million, and Swarthmore $52 million. The timing of the campaign was something of a risk, as President Lockwood observed at the kickoff ceremonies: “We recognize that economic conditions are not favorable for launching a campaign of this magnitude. But, in a real sense, we have no choice. As our campaign motto points out, this must be ‘an extraordinary effort’ on the part of many people ‘to sustain the values of a Trinity education.’ Trinity’s needs are intractable needs, and we must act now to meet them. We believe our goal is realistic in light of its importance to Trinity, and, by implication, to the community at large.” Completed in 1978, the campaign proved highly successful, exceeding its goal by $1 million. The resulting funds, in combination with improved investment strategies, a balanced budget year after year, and prudent expenditures, contributed to increasing the endowment to $47 million by the end of President Lockwood’s administration in 1981.

A major event in the history of the College, the 150th anniversary of its founding, occurred in 1973, and the celebratory spirit surrounding the occasion carried over
into the Campaign for Trinity Values. The culmination of the observance took place during a week of festivities preceding Commencement on May 20, when the College awarded baccalaureate degrees to the 386 members of the Class of 1973, the largest class to graduate from Trinity up to that time. Among the highlights of the week were: a festival celebrating the arts, which involved a large number of undergraduates; the appearance in The Hartford Courant of an extensive multi-page color insert on Trinity's history, growth, and its ties to the Hartford area; a ceremony on Charter Day, May 16, in the office of Connecticut Governor Thomas J. Meskill, Jr. '50, at which he signed a proclamation in recognition of the College's anniversary (VI-84); and also on Charter Day, the reading in the U. S. Senate by Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff of an anniversary citation, which appeared in the Congressional Record, and the noting of the anniversary in the U. S. House of Representatives by William R. Cotter '49, Representative from Connecticut's First District, which also appeared in the Congressional Record. Other events included: the celebrating of Honors Day on the Quad for the first time; a faculty-student, 150-mile, 24-hour marathon race on the Jesse Field track, in which the student team emerged victorious; an afternoon convocation on Saturday, May 19, entitled the "Future of American Higher Education," featuring a panel discussion by President Barbara Newell of Wellesley College and Fred M. Hechinger of the New York Times editorial board, formerly education editor; and on Saturday evening, a concert by the Hartford Symphony Orchestra, under the baton of maestro Arthur Winograd, held in the Ferris Athletic Center because of inclement weather. The College also commissioned Professor Hugh S. Ogden (English) (VI-85), an acclaimed poet, to compose a 150th anniversary poem, which he entitled The Diary. 459

The success of the Campaign for Trinity Values gave the College the financial flexibility to proceed with a number of construction projects, including a new president's house, a new dormitory, and a major expansion and renovation of the library. Previously, in the early 1970s, gifts to Trinity had resulted in the construction of formal gates at two entrances to the campus, and the installation in the Chapel of a new organ, and a screened gateway leading to the Chapel of Perfect Friendship. Dedicated on October 10, 1970, the gates at the intersection of Vernon and Broad Streets, known as the Johnson Memorial Entrance, were the gift of Glover Johnson '22. 460 The gates at the driveway leading into the campus from Broad Street past the Memorial Field House were the gift of a friend of the College, Dr. Karl F. Brown, a retired Hartford optician, and were dedicated as the Karl F. Brown Entrance on October 24, 1973. 461 The Chapel organ (VI-86), built by Austin Organs, Inc. of Hartford, and located beneath the Rose Window, was the gift of Mrs. Newton C. Brainard in memory of her husband, a trustee of the College for 41 years. Clarence E. Watters, Honorary College Organist and retired Professor of Music, gave the dedicatory recitals on January 21 and January 22, 1972. 462 Following his appointment in 1977 as College Organist, John Rose (VI-87) relied on the new instrument as a prin-
ciples means of strengthening the Chapel's music and concert program. Dedicated on November 4, 1973, the wrought iron gateway at the entrance to the Chapel of Perfect Friendship (VI-88) was presented by former Trinity president G. Keith Funston '32 in memory of his mother, Genevieve Keith Funston.463

The president's house project was linked to the growing need for office space, particularly for academic departments and programs. The Trustees decided to convert the existing president's house into office facilities for the English Department and the newly created Writing Center, and authorized construction of a new president's house southwest of the faculty residence that would later become the Smith House. Work began in 1977, and the residence was ready for occupancy by President and Mrs. Lockwood in the fall of 1978 (VI-89). Work also was proceeding on a 97-bed dormitory in the South Campus area adjacent to Wheaton, Smith, and Jackson Halls. Designed by Kilham, Beder & Chu, successors to O'Connor & Kilham, the architectural firm responsible for the adjacent dormitory units, the new facility was completed in the fall of 1978. The first in the state, if not in the nation, to be fully equipped for handicapped access, the dormitory was designated Funston Hall by vote of the Trustees in 1982, honoring former Trinity president G. Keith Funston '32.464

The expansion and renovation of the library began in 1977, and the $3.5 million project was completed in January 1979, under the leadership of College Librarian Ralph S. Emerick. The facilities of the 1952 building had become overtaxed by a student body that had more than doubled in size in the intervening 27 years, and the library's collections had outgrown the existing shelving capacity. The renovated and expanded facility (VI-90), featuring a five-story addition with 42,000 square feet of space, was designed by Cambridge Seven Associates. Capacity for the book collections increased to a million volumes, made possible by the inclusion of compact shelving for lesser-used materials. Study space for readers increased substantially, as did office and work space for staff. In addition, the Watkinson Library, formerly housed on the third floor of the 1952 building, occupied new quarters, which included a spacious reading room, attractive exhibition areas, curatorial offices, and an expanded stack area.465

The Watkinson Library's augmented shelving capacity was especially welcome, and provided the flexibility to accommodate the gift in 1984 of a major collection of materials on natural history, principally ornithology, formed by Ostrom Enders, Hon. '76, retired chairman and chief executive officer of the Hartford National Bank and Trust Company, and a former trustee of the College. Of national significance, the Enders Collection complements a small but exceptional collection given to the College at the turn of the century by Gurdon W. Russell, Class of 1834, M.D., of Hartford. Chief among the works in the Russell Collection is the engraver's copy of the four-volume folio set of John James Audubon's The Birds of America (1827-1838).466

Another major gift to the library during this period was the collection of books and manuscript materials on Sir Walter Scott presented by Professor Norton Downs (History) in 1979, housed in the Sir Walter Scott Medieval Room on the
library's second floor. The Scott Room is adjacent to the Walton Room, which contains books on angling and other sporting pastimes as well as the collection on Sir Isaac Walton presented by Sherman C. Parker '22 in 1965. 467

During his administration, President Lockwood moved to establish cooperative links with a number of colleges and universities as well as with various organizations in higher education. He was convinced that such efforts would benefit Trinity, and that national and regional perceptions of the College would be enhanced. In 1970, the Joint Committee on Educational Policy began to explore suggestions for cooperative ventures beyond those with Vassar, which, in the spring of 1969, had brought women undergraduates to the campus for the first time during an academic year, and with the 10-College (later 12-College) Exchange Program. On January 17, 1970, the Trustees authorized the administration to pursue "opportunities for interinstitutional cooperation at all levels..." 468 Based on preliminary arrangements for student access to courses at the University of Hartford's Hartt College of Music, and the graduate program at the Hartford-based Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Connecticut, more extensive cross-registration in courses among the area's institutions of higher education helped further cooperative relationships. A grant from the Hartford Foundation for Public Giving in 1972 led to the establishment of the Greater Hartford University Consortium, later known as the Greater Hartford Consortium for Higher Education. 469 The College played a leading role in forming the Consortium, the other institutions initially consisting of the University of Hartford, St. Joseph College, and Hartford College for Women. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Connecticut, St. Thomas Seminary, and the Hartford Seminary Foundation would later become members. There was initial skepticism on the part of Trinity faculty regarding the academic quality of the programs at the other institutions and whether access to them was of any real benefit. However, courses in fields of study not offered at Trinity were available at Consortium institutions, and semester hours of cross-registration began to increase. In time, interinstitutional courses were created, a shuttle bus service was begun, the libraries established cooperative arrangements for access, and there were coordinated efforts to improve the range of graduate courses. 470

Cooperative linkages with other institutions extended as well to intercollegiate athletic competition. In 1971, Trinity joined with several colleges and universities in New England and New York to establish the New England Small College Athletic Conference (NESCAC). Consisting of Amherst, Bates, Bowdoin, Colby, Hamilton, Trinity, Tufts, Wesleyan, and Williams, the Conference was modeled on a 1955 agreement among Amherst, Bowdoin, Wesleyan, and Williams. Its basic aims included keeping participation in intercollegiate sports and the policies governing athletic competition in harmony with the fundamental educational purposes of each institution, and coordinating such matters as eligibility rules for undergraduate athletes, out-of-season practice, post-season competition, and limits on recruitment activity and financial aid awards. Each institution was to retain scheduling autonomy although
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conference members, many of whom were traditional opponents in various sports, would be scheduled in competition where possible. Strengthened over the years by the addition to their number of Connecticut College and Middlebury, NESCAC members agreed in 1998 to reduce conflicts with academic schedules and priorities by becoming a playing conference within Division III of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in all sports eligible except football. In addition, NESCAC would create necessary mechanisms to determine conference champions in all sports where practical, send only the conference champion to post-season competition (usually NCAA Division III), and cease to participate in Eastern College Athletic Conference (ECAC) competition unless in certain instances such competition was deemed more appropriate than NCAA national competition.

NESCAC’s creation was among the factors during the 1970s that facilitated the development of women’s intercollegiate sports at Trinity as previously discussed. In men’s sports at this period, new records continued to be set, with many Bantam opponents coming from the NESCAC ranks. In 1972, for example, the tennis team achieved its first undefeated season in 30 years, establishing Roy A. Dath’s coaching career record at 110 wins and finishing fifth in the New England Intercollegiate Tennis Championship. Two years later, the squash team, also coached by Dath, compiled a 15-2 record, the best since varsity competition in the sport began in 1932. The team went on in 1976 to enjoy an undefeated season, the first in the sport’s competitive history at Trinity, and finished fifth in the National Intercollegiate Squash Championship. On the gridiron, the 1970 football team compiled a 7-1 record, the best finish since the unbeaten season of 1955, and was ranked number one among New England colleges, Donald G. Miller enjoying the designation of New England Coach of the Year. In 1971, Trinity shut out Wesleyan, the first shutout victory in football since 1964 and the first against the Cardinals since 1936.

President Lockwood firmly believed that links with other types of regional and national organizations in higher education were also important for the College. In his estimation Trinity had been “inactive in national circles. We needed to play a role [ , . . . and to get the name out into circles that could help us. I also felt that we probably had as an institution about as much intelligence as one could rally when it came to issues before higher education.” Among newer organizations was the Consortium on Financing Higher Education, founded in 1974, which originally consisted of a small number of independent colleges and universities in the Northeast devoted to lobbying and research on such issues as admissions, financial aid, and the financing of undergraduate and graduate education. The Consortium soon began to expand its membership, and as President Lockwood recalled, “Trinity was in that first group who were invited when they [the Consortium] decided to reach out and get the rest of the Ivy League involved, with Stanford, Northwestern, Chicago, and Duke . . . . We were invited, not knocking on the door, and we have played a good role, an important role in that cluster. I think that was recognition from the outside, to me very important . . . .”
President Lockwood also accepted the principal leadership role in the Association of American Colleges, “the major spokesman for private and public colleges and universities of the liberal arts and sciences.” Having served as a director of the 800-member organization since 1973, he was elected chairman in February 1976, and led negotiations on the AAC’s behalf for the establishment that year of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, which was to serve as a lobbying group in Washington for independent institutions of higher education. Lockwood later recalled that he was “pleased when I was asked to become the chairman [of the AAC]... it brought Trinity out there. People got to know Trinity and I think that was important for the College.”

He also served on the American Council of Education, and was a founding member in 1978 of the Business Higher Education Forum, a small group of the chief executives of Fortune 500 companies and the presidents of major institutions of higher education. Regarding the Forum, President Lockwood noted that “it illustrates what we needed to do as an institution, which I think you can’t underestimate. Trinity is involved [...] and I agreed to serve on that business forum with the presidents of Ford and General Motors and Pfizer ...”

Finding ways to promote recognition of the College on a national level was extraordinarily important in Lockwood’s eyes: “We had obviously become a national institution after the Second World War, and yet it’s true of any institution, except for the very largest and most prestigious universities, every college is somewhat regional in both its student population necessarily and its immediate influence. But it seemed to me that we had to break away from feeling too regional, ... and think nationally [...] and recognize that it is a national institution ...” All of these activities taken together “had the consequence of making Trinity a better-known institution.”

As its horizons continued to expand nationally, the College, however, did not lose sight of its urban location, and the challenges and advantages that it presented. A residential college seeking to recruit as geographically diverse an undergraduate body as possible, Trinity in the early 1970s was far removed from the city-oriented institution it had been more than a half-century earlier in the pre-World War I era. The recently created University of Hartford had a strong local as well as a growing regional orientation, and was perceived as directly contributing to the community. Many, on the other hand, increasingly thought of Trinity as an institution having, at best, little to do with the city. Furthermore, the previous generation of alumni who had become prominent Hartford civic leaders and served as trustees of the College had largely passed from the scene. As efforts to strengthen the structure and composition of the Board of Trustees moved ahead, President Lockwood’s appointment in 1977 of one of the city’s most respected banking executives, James F. English, Jr., as Vice President for Finance and Planning, in part signalled a refocused sense of concern on how Trinity was approaching its relations with the city.

The College’s principal strategy in this regard had begun to take form in 1969 when the administration established the Office of Community Affairs with support from the Hartford Foundation for Public Giving.
Ivan A. Backer, who undertook to develop a community affairs program, worked closely with Thomas A. Smith '44, who then had general responsibility for Trinity's external relations. Their collaboration resulted in several initiatives that represented a fresh effort to reach out to the community. 481

Based on the principle of mutual benefit "to the city and its people, as well as the College and its students," the initiatives included: systematically recruiting students for volunteer and field service positions in schools and other community agencies; creating a variety of community-oriented, credit-bearing internships and open semester opportunities; instituting a summer recreation program, including sports camps for city youths utilizing the College's athletic facilities; and establishing an academic program in urban and environmental studies under the direction of Professor Andrew J. Gold (Economics). Work advanced on carrying out the initiatives, and although grant support ceased in 1971, the College continued to fund the community affairs effort. Trinity undertook other programs, including a series of community forums on education, under the sponsorship of an Institute for Community Education established by Trinity and the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute of Connecticut. Directed primarily by Professor Gold and Ivan A. Backer, the program involved several Trinity faculty members, focused on educational trends and innovations, and helped facilitate debate on a number of issues, including school integration. 483 Backer also was successful in obtaining federal funding in 1973 for the joint establishment by Trinity, Manchester Community College, and Mattatuck Community College (Waterbury) of the Twin Valleys Upward Bound program. Staff in Hartford worked with students from the city's three high schools, and until loss of federal support for Upward Bound in the mid-1990s, a large number of the local students studied on campus each summer. 484

By the mid-1970s, the College adopted a new approach to community outreach prompted by the success Hartford Areas Rally Together (HART) was having in neighborhood-based community organizing. Under Ivan A. Backer's leadership, Trinity, Hartford Hospital, and the Institute of Living, which had previously commissioned Doxiadis Associates to explore ways of community renewal in the late 1960s, formed a coalition in 1976 to work with residents of the immediate neighborhood on developing a common community agenda. This initiative led to the formation of the Southside Institutions Neighborhood Alliance (SINA). 485 Robert E. Pawlowski became SINA's first director, and its initial program emerged from his conversations with the three institutions and members of the neighborhood. Among SINA's early accomplishments were: the creation of The Southside News, a free biweekly community newspaper, serving as a vehicle for expression of neighborhood points of view and for the exchange of information; the formation of a Park Street merchants' organization; the establishment and continued support of the Park Street Festival; and the formation of the Broad Park Development Corporation for the purchase, rehabilitation, and management of low-income housing, an endeavor that, as of the late 1990s,
has resulted in making available approximately 400 housing units. The latter program was essential in beginning to address the problems of inadequate housing for residents from low-income minority groups who were moving into the neighborhood, and a deteriorating housing stock occupied in the previous generation by tenants or owners who had moved to the city's suburbs. Following Robert E. Pawlowski's resignation in 1980 to become full-time publisher of The Southside News, Ivan A. Backer assumed executive leadership of SINA, which, under his leadership, carried out several community-based initiatives in the ensuing decade.686

During the 1970s, Trinity continued to rely on alumni, not only for financial support but also for involvement in many aspects of the College's life. The alumni affairs program was vitally important in developing and maintaining ties with Trinity graduates, whose numbers were beginning to increase substantially as the result of coeducation and the gradual expansion in size of the incoming classes. Under the imaginative leadership of Gerald J. Hansen, Jr. '51 as Director of Alumni Relations, the program has enjoyed remarkable success in strengthening the relations of alumni with their alma mater. A successful businessman, and active as an alumni volunteer, he had gained considerable experience in administration, sales, and marketing before becoming president of a textile corporation. Hansen believed the primary objective of his new position was to be "a salesman for the College" with fundamental responsibility for establishing "closer relations between Trinity College and its alumni." He sought numerous ways to increase interest on the part of the alumni in Trinity, and developed an alumni program mutually beneficial to the institution and its graduates. Hansen later assumed responsibility for other facets of College relations, including public relations and community relations, the summer program, and special events such as Commencement. In 1995, he was named Secretary of the College, a position previously held by Professor George B. Cooper (History).

One of the most important aspects of Trinity's alumni program is reunion, which prior to the late 1960s had taken place in conjunction with Commencement. In June 1967, the College broke ranks with tradition and scheduled reunion the week following Commencement. The previous year, final examinations had extended through noon of the Saturday preceding Commencement, with the result that accommodations on campus for alumni were unavailable, many students still occupying their rooms. In addition, finding space for the customary class headquarters in Jarvis Dormitory proved extremely difficult. The scheduling conflict was expected to continue for the foreseeable future, and as John A. Mason '34, then Alumni Secretary, noted, separating reunion and Commencement "was considered a physical necessity." By 1969, widespread preference among alumni led to recombining reunion with Commencement, the scheduling problems having been overcome.689

In the following decade, a change in the timing of reunion once again occurred, and for several years it took place in conjunction with Homecoming Weekend in the fall. The need to broaden the range of events occurring at reunion prompted further
consideration of its scheduling, and after a thorough study, the National Alumni Association's Executive Committee submitted a report to President Lockwood in January 1980 recommending that reunion be held in the spring, following Commencement. The principal reasons that led to implementing this recommendation in 1981 were the opportunity to strengthen reunion giving and the desirability of incorporating an academic component, thereby affording alumni intellectual stimulation through mini-courses, seminars, and lectures offered by members of the faculty. As Hansen has noted, in the years ensuing, reunion became the occasion for family vacations, "revived class spirit and identity, and ... brought alumni closer to the College." A spectacular success, reunion has proven extremely popular with alumni who now number about 20,000, and annual attendance has markedly increased. In 1997, more than 1,600 alumni and family members attended reunion, a 120 percent increase over attendance in 1981, the first "return to spring" reunion. In addition, the increase in reunion giving has been substantial, and now accounts for 30 percent of the annual alumni fund contributions.

Another aspect of the alumni program that has proven highly beneficial to the College and contributed to informing alumni more effectively about Trinity accomplishments and needs is the annual Volunteer Leadership Conference, begun in the fall of 1985 by the National Alumni Association's Executive Committee under the leadership of William H. Schweitzer '66. The Conference consists of a one-and-one-half-day program in which alumni leaders, class agents, decade chairs, reunion gift and program chairs, admissions volunteers, and area club presidents gather on campus for training and information sessions. In 1987, the National Council for the Advancement and Support of Education designated Schweitzer as the National Volunteer of the Year in recognition of his leadership of the Alumni Association and his creation of the Volunteer Leadership Conference. The Alumni Office also developed an admissions support program in which over 800 alumni nationwide are involved, and in 1976 the College began a highly successful admissions exploration program for the sons and daughters of alumni and faculty. Other initiatives undertaken since 1975 include the alumni/parent career advisory program, the undergraduate class identity program under which each graduating class has its own officers, and the Alumni College, which focuses on a topic of contemporary interest and often involves travel overseas with Trinity faculty to some city or country. In 1972, the College began a program enabling alumni to audit courses on a noncredit basis. In addition, the Trinity area clubs situated in various cities across the country have increased to over 20, with the major strength in the Northeast corridor and California. Each club hosts a visit by the president, a senior administrator, or a faculty member at least once a year, the more active clubs scheduling multiple events annually. In the years following the introduction of coeducation in 1969, women graduates of Trinity have assumed leadership positions in area clubs and on the National Alumni Association's Executive Committee, and several alumnae have become trustees of the College.
With strong alumni support during the 1960s and 1970s, Trinity continued to pursue excellence as a distinguished liberal arts institution, and established a firm foundation for the innovative accomplishments that would characterize its development in the final two decades of the 20th century.
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