Odds are the letters GHCHE are meaningless to you. Yet they may play an important role in your life as a student at Trinity College.

GHCHE stands for the Greater Hartford Consortium for Higher Education—a group of five colleges, including Trinity, who have cooperative programs, give their students credit for taking courses at the other participating colleges, and so on. The Music department’s cooperative program with the Hartt School of Music at the University of Hartford is an example of one of the things the Consortium has done so far.

Some people, however, want the GHCHE to go beyond its present scope. They are talking about eliminating entire departments at some of the schools involved and having the students at that school take their courses at another school in the Consortium. Meanwhile, the school that had one of its departments eliminated would have another department expanded.

So, in the big view these people put forward, there would be little duplication among the participating colleges, few extra expenses, and more areas of course offerings. Several specialized institutions would help each other out—strengthening, broadening, and saving money for each of them.

Another idea these people are suggesting is moving faculty people around all the various colleges—sharing the wealth, as it were. Instead of just teaching English at University X, a professor would teach at Universities X, Y, and Z. Everybody would benefit then from the teacher’s knowledge.

To make either of these ideas work, of course, would take a mobile and cooperative faculty. And so, on November 30, 1972, Dr. Robert Vogel, the executive secretary of the Consortium came to Trinity and told the faculty they might expect to have a clause in their contract, at some future time, requiring them to teach at several institutions. A Trinity professor might have to teach at any of the five colleges in the GHCHE—Trinity, University of Hartford, St. Joseph’s College, Hartford College for Women, and Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Graduate Center.
What’s At Stake?

By Matt Moloshok

If it were a political cartoonist, I’d draw a picture of students looking at Bishop Browne’s statue on the Quad. His finger points in some direction as if he wants you to go there. And as they journey in the direction in which he’s pointing, I’d ask them in my caption “Quo vadis?”

But you wouldn’t know.

A lot of students don’t about the Greater Hartford Consortium for Higher Education for example. No Robert Vogel, executive secretary of the Consortium, came to tell us little people (seen but not heard) what this thing is. Few faculty people confide to us what they think about it. And administrators don’t discuss it.

From talking with various faculty and administrators I gather there are other advantages which come from grouping colleges together. Additional professors and pooling facilities, additional professors, and pooling permits students and faculty to take courses in the other schools. They could improve their graduate offerings by chipping in on research facilities. Additional professors, and pooling all their talent together.

You can make up your own mind. But who’s going to make up Trinity’s mind?

We might broaden that question and ask, “Would Trinity get into this as an institution—as students, faculty, and administrators?” We should also ask, “Would this be a good thing? What could we benefit from it?”

To answer these questions will be one of the most important tasks we will have to perform in the next few years—because at stake is nothing less than the existence of Trinity as we know it. Whether we are going to get an Administration viewpoint on the Consortium—why should we share what we’ve augmented and refined and shaped into a new program?

The whole problem here is nobody really knows what’s going on. When Dr. Vogel told his students in his classes that they could save money on administration and maintenance costs, they could take advantages of economies of scale, say, in ordering books or food. They could improve their graduate offerings by chipping in on research facilities. Additional professors, and pooling all their talent together.

So I’ve had given to me at least ten times—these questions, so it’s just as well you know about them before you read what he has to say.

The first question is the one I started this essay with. Where are we going? Why are we going there? Is it consistent with our philosophy? Is it consistent with what most of us came here for? I’ve heard some faculty people say—and heard about it. We’ve heard said—that if Trinity professors had to teach at other schools, no one would want to teach here.

We get a lot of pressure for teaching positions now because we offer a particular curriculum say, as Dr. Vogel suggested, expand English, but eliminate physics. You have to give the go ahead on eliminating departments—if ever? Who’s these people assert his life would be vastly different. He would lose his job. He would have difficulty scheduling office hours. He’d be out trying to get your side of the matter. We aim to find out students’ viewpoints on this issue. So I hope some faculty will write their thoughts about it, now that they’ve heard from President Lockwood. (Incidentally, an administrator couldn’t do it—there and there were others we just couldn’t get hold of.)

We offer this INSIDE as only part of the debate: it’s raw material to be augmented and refined and shaped into a decision. From here, it’s up to you.

Others are worried about the shape of the college. We say we are a liberal arts college—and that implies certain things. We have to offer a broad spectrum curriculum—say, as Dr. Vogel suggested, expand English, but eliminate physics. You have to give the go ahead on eliminating departments—if ever? Who’s these people assert his life would be vastly different. He would lose his job. He would have difficulty scheduling office hours. He’d be out trying to get your side of the matter. We aim to find out students’ viewpoints on this issue. So I hope some faculty will write their thoughts about it, now that they’ve heard from President Lockwood. (Incidentally, an administrator couldn’t do it—there and there were others we just couldn’t get hold of.)
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especially as we seek to keep available a
college—-we all have a stake in that.

If anything is going to change and (maybe) make us reverse our decision to come and give you our money then the least you can do is let us in on some of the talking. We’ve got a stake here ourselves. We’ve got to wander with you on whatever road the college takes.

If you read President Lockwood’s statement, you’ll find he does a sympathetic to my position—after all, I’m very sympathetic to theirs. I, too, am angered and upset by the whole handling of the Consortium question. It seems to me that a good many things Dr. Vogel was talking about strike at the very heart of academic freedom and tenure. If fully tenure faculty members have to agree to a clause in their contracts that they will teach at another school then tenure is meaningless. If a contract which has to be renewed can be broken by instituting new conditions, then tenure is worthless. And if academic freedom doesn’t extend to working under the academic conditions of one’s choosing, then I’m not sure what it extends to. I think that’s in a classroom, what hours you have to keep, what subjects you have to teach are pretty basic to the whole meaning of academic freedom. If we are not careful—if we let the Vogels of the world change all that—then we may as well kiss certain ideals all to protect these liberties and at the same time get the advantages of the Consortium will be a futile proposition. (Maybe a faculty union is an answer. But that’s your decision.)

The same thing is true for us—the students. We came here for a variety of reasons but the point is we came here and not UHart. True, we wanted (and many of us take advantage of) options at other schools, but we came here. We wanted a small school; one that could put us into a reputable graduate school; one where academic standards were tough; one where we could get a job; one where we could get to know the faculty, one where we could be near museums and concerts. Maybe we came here because we’re snobs; we came here, nevertheless.

So, if anything is going to change and (maybe) make us reverse our decision to come and give you our money (or to take yours) then the least you could do is let us in on some of the talking. We’ve got a stake here ourselves. We’ve got to wander with you on whatever road the college takes. If someone asks “Quo vadis?” we’d like to be able to answer “I know where. There, where the Bishop’s pointing. (I think it’s a pot of gold.)”

Statement Of The AAUP, Trinity Chapter

Be it resolved that: The Trinity chapter of the AAUP takes offense with and is appalled by the manner in which the idea of a consortium was presented to the faculty. And be it further resolved that: This Condemnation in no way expresses the scope of our concern with and opposition to the suggestion that policy has been made with regard to Trinity College by a group wholly outside this institution, as we believe that the faculty should be consulted about and approve any arrangement that will affect the educational environment, for example, faculty work load. Read into the minutes of the faculty December 12, 1972.

Why Did We Join?

By Theodore D. Lockwood, President

Because I was away when questions concerning the Greater Hartford Consortium for Higher Education arose, I thought it might help to write this letter in advance of the next faculty meeting. I welcome this discussion, for it will focus attention on the long-term best interests of Trinity College. First, some background information.

Historical Background

The last five years have seen a number of problems arise in higher education and some affect the independent college acutely. According to statistics for the fall of 1972, enrollments in private four-year colleges fell off 1.7%. Finances remain critical, as it is long-term observers at the pricing of private colleges wrote recently, “Tuition and fees charged have been rising annually some 5%, more than general price levels in the economy; projected prices for the end of the decade far exceed what might be considered affordable for middle-income students.” Particularly worrisome is the growing price differential between private and public education.’ Although Trinity is in better financial condition than most, it is not immune to these factors, especially as we seek to keep available a sufficiently broad curriculum to attract students. Attracting able students has become much more difficult. The pool of talented applicants who can afford our cost has shrunk perceptibly and competition is tougher. Outside pressures are real and often contradictory. State and federal money is not as plentiful as it was, but the demand for statewide and regional planning is stronger than ever before. Foundations are less interested in individual institutions than in new, cooperative approaches to use existing facilities more efficiently. Even the most prestigious colleges are reviewing strategies that will enable them to retain their vitality at a time when these present constraints seem likely to persevere for the balance of the decade at least. The acceptance of coeducation by so many independent institutions has been one response; the entry of a large number of institutions into mutually advantageous cooperative efforts is another. Like coeducation, it has been sudden and dramatic.

At the time of our first long-range planning effort in 1968-69, one of the conclusions of the faculty-student-parents-alumni-administration committee was that we should not overlook cooperative educational opportunities in this area. When the future of the music program was discussed, the College specifically considered the pros and cons (and there are both) of a relationship between Trinity and the Hartt School of Music at the University of Hartford. Fortunately, we were able to work out an agreement that substantial numbers of students here have found advantageous. This arrangement has had the effect of annual review by all parties immediately involved. Similarly, we extended cooperation with the RPI Graduate Center to include faculty interchange. During that same period some of us held extensive discussions about even closer collaboration among RPI, the University of Connecticut, the University of Hartford, and Trinity in our engineering programs. Although from those numerous conversations came no concrete proposals for consideration by faculty committees, they did lead to speculation about other forms of cooperation, with three results.

I took to the Joint Educational Policy Committee the general proposition that interinstitutional cooperation might permit us to offer a broad spectrum of academic
trials, we were concerned that we not depreciate the excellence of its academic offerings as well as their attractiveness to prospective students. The Joint Educational Policy Committee unanimously approved the concept of the Consortium. 2. On the invitation of President Babbidge as their attractiveness to prospective students, the Hartford area institutions (Hartford College for Women, Trinity College, Hartford Foundation for Public Giving, and the University of Hartford) might cooperate in areas where joint interests existed, one institution's capabilities academically, where graduate programs at individual colleges were weakly developed. Thus, Trinity became one of the founding members. In the original proposal we had listed two "expected benefits": (1) the economy in the use of scarce resources; (2) the opportunity to talk, and in some cases it seemed possible to coordinate our efforts. Since then science faculty have discussed the feasibility of such collaboration. Therefore, for those colleges that might wish to explore joint involvement in continuing education. In each of these areas the Consortium project with the collaboration of the State of the Consortium Today

The Consortium has come into being less than a year ago. During the spring of 1972, when Mr. Vogel and I were consultants, the presidents of the member institutions did three things: we extended the cross-registration; we concluded pilot projects in the four institutions; and we established ourselves as a separate corporate entity to handle funds. We worked together to bring our calendars into closer harmony to facilitate cross-registration. Mr. Cullen met with people in government, business, education, public relations, theatre arts, and computer science, and in this way we were able to convince ourselves of the possibility of closer coordination of the graduate offerings in the independent colleges in the region. Hence, he has drawn up an initial proposal concerning the feasibility of such collaboration. He also concluded that, unless a Consortium came into being, it would not have the power to implement programs. Unless each faculty approves its own proposal, it will have a voice in approval. The Council would make suggestions, review proposals, and serve as a clearing house for ideas. It would then come to the Trinity faculty and trustees for their deliberation. (This process is similar to the one in which the proposal for a Rome campus came to the faculty.) In this regard the Greater Hartford Consortium operates similarly to the most of the other, roughly 70 consortiums in the country. As I remarked at a faculty meeting, whenever an idea which might involve the responsibility of one institution for its own funds. Otherwise, despite what some persons may have seemed to imply, the Consortium cannot be the vanguard of those seeking to combine their efforts. We cannot afford to ignore the possible advantages of such regional cooperation, however, I have concluded that, unless a Consortium came into being as an experiment, we would waste our time and our potential. We cannot afford to overlook the community's interest in our participation in this effort. I have concluded that the Hartford Consortium has been able to justify a full-time addition. We can no longer afford to have someone with full-time responsibility to carry on studies and to talk with various faculty and administrative groups. Mr. Robert Vogel joined us in August, as Executive Director. Since then the board of the Consortium has met four times to discuss what we might consider. It has encouraged Dr. Vogel to meet with faculty, to present the Consortium proposals, and to review the results achieved by cross-registration and busing. The board did not wish to invite the Hartford Foundation Center to the Consortium since Trinity, in particular, already had a cooperative program with R.P.I. The board met on September 26, 1972 and sent to all faculty and administrators summarized the current status of the Consortium.

Some Particular Questions

1. What is the purpose of the Consortium Board? Its purpose is to bring into existence the kind of experimentation the faculty had adopted; AND/OR explore closer relationships with colleges which Wesleyan; AND/OR review institutional cooperation in the Hartford region. Otherwise, despite what some persons may have seemed to imply, the Consortium cannot be the vanguard of those seeking to combine their efforts. We cannot afford to ignore the possible advantages of such regional cooperation, however, I have concluded that, unless a Consortium came into being as an experiment, we would waste our time and our potential. We cannot afford to overlook the community's interest in our participation in this effort. I have concluded that the Hartford Consortium has been able to justify a full-time addition. We can no longer afford to have someone with full-time responsibility to carry on studies and to talk with various faculty and administrative groups. Mr. Robert Vogel joined us in August, as Executive Director. Since then the board of the Consortium has met four times to discuss what we might consider. It has encouraged Dr. Vogel to meet with faculty, to present the Consortium proposals, and to review the results achieved by cross-registration and busing. The board did not wish to invite the Hartford Foundation Center to the Consortium since Trinity, in particular, already had a cooperative program with R.P.I. The board met on September 26, 1972 and sent to all faculty and administrators summarized the current status of the Consortium.
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Before anything further happens, all those concerned will have ample opportunity to reject, revise, or reformulate any proposal,-funded or unfunded. The College is in a strong position. It is not a question of survival.
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spelling out his obligations. This provision does not, and would not, influence all faculty contracts. If, but only if, the Consortium members find close collaboration at the graduate level, for example, advantageous individually and collectively, some faculty based at one institution might offer instruction at the graduate level in another institution, as we do now with RPI. The RPI model is precisely what the board recognized might be possible in other areas. It does not affect full-time appointments to one institution.

The Future of the Consortium

I hope that the length of this explanation does not preclude relating the remarks above to other issues before Trinity.

First, this discussion is worthwhile because it focuses on the question of what is best for Trinity in the years ahead. If I did not share that concern, I would never have expressed any interest in the Consortium. The College is in a strong position. It is not a question of survival. We can choose how to respond in the face of the numerous and obvious constraints now being reflected in independent higher education. But it may become a question of what moves permit us to avoid contractions in programs and personnel. For today the emphasis is, as the titles of numerous national studies suggest, "Higher Education with Fewer Teachers."

"The More Effective Use of Resources," and "Less Time, More Options." As president I feel obligated to ponder these developments, and in light of them I have brought to the faculty many observations about what seemed promising.

This fall the Joint Educational Policy Committee has held two fascinating discussions as to what is central to a Trinity education. Never before, in my knowledge, has the faculty been so directly and collectively involved in thinking ahead about the College's academic posture, and never before has that involvement been so necessary. You have reviewed tentative statements about college goals; formulations of such statements is a continuing process stipulated in the actions which the faculty has taken concerning certain curricular proposals. How does Trinity best maintain its excellence and assure itself of sufficient flexibility that it may gain strength over the balance of this decade? It is to this kind of question that I address myself continually: that is a prime administrative responsibility. But increasingly it is a responsibility which the faculty must share. In the long run, institutional vitality is dependent upon faculty consensus. For that reason I welcome this opportunity to place the Consortium in perspective as one part of the continuing study of alternatives. It may or may not prove helpful to Trinity: that is what we must determine together. I also recognize that differences among the institutions may well limit the areas in which they can collaborate. As always I will be happy to have and will continue to seek faculty opinion on these developments.

Second, I recognize that to some this discussion raises questions of faculty power as well as mistrust of the administration. I shall not soften my opinions on this score. Neither the Trustees nor I seek to abridge the faculty's role in determining the academic policies of this college. As I mentioned earlier, the faculty now participates more fully than ever before in the determination of those priorities through the allocation of faculty manpower and discussions of long-term educational decisions in the Joint Educational Policy Committee. It may well be possible that the Education Policy Committee report more fully and regularly at faculty meetings. Recommendations can properly come from other quarters. At the same time I am charged by the Trustees to look out for the future well-being of the institution. Inevitably that means talking with others -- faculty, trustees, presidents -- about alternatives. Sometimes the discussions do not attain a sharpness or relevance that elicits extensive response. That we have now reached a stage in discussions about the Consortium that offers the opportunity for considerable debate is encouraging. I can only regret that the questions arise as they did when I was away.

I am proud of the faculty's response to the very difficult issues we have faced during the last five years. Trinity's position in the community and in the world of higher education has improved because of all that we have done. It is clear that we face equally difficult problems ahead, ones which we have from time to time discussed. We will need more discussion, even as we know how everbearing that can sometimes be. Fortunately Trinity has a small enough community that we can talk through these matters, and I fully intend to share these concerns with both the appropriate faculty committees and the faculty as a whole. And I hope the foebn has passed through.

What's In It For Us? (A Lot.)

By Robbins Winslow, Dean of Educational Services

Perhaps the most visible activity of the Greater Hartford Consortium for Higher Education (GHCHE) is the Intercampus Registration Program. This program was instituted in March 1969 for implementation the following fall. Since its inception Trinity-Hartford Seminary Foundation, St. Joseph and University of Hartford. The Consortium was formed by Trinity, University of Hartford, Hartford College for Women and St. Joseph early in 1972 (RPI joined later), the cross-registration program was launched.

The resources of the various institutions have been integral to the academic programs of a growing number of Trinity students. The wide variety of courses, theory, composition and music history courses enrolled in at Hartt College of the University of Hartford by Trinity students is well known. University of Hartford offerings in many other areas have been selected by Trinity students, and in the past year the following sample range of courses has been approved for credit at Trinity by Trinity faculty advisors: education, photography, peiology, ceramics, computer science, mathematics, Hebrew, black studies, accounting, and advanced finance. In each case the course was not offered at Trinity: less so perhaps was unavailing at Trinity for a particular student due to scheduling conflicts. It is clear that this variety of courses has increased the choices which Trinity students can make in building their academic programs.

To the options provided by the University of Hartford curriculum should be added the engineering courses at RPI selected by advanced Trinity students in this discipline. Although Trinity faculty students engage in the elementary education courses at St. Joseph, but since the formation of the Consortium the program leading to elementary and special education certification for Trinity students has been developed at St. Joseph. Trinity's relation with Hartt College has enabled the College to offer courses in all of the above areas to prospective students. The Admissions Office believes that this academic program is identifiable as bringing good students to
The Faculty's New Tenure Plan

By Lindsay Mann

The faculty approved a new tenure policy last month, that only slightly modifies the present tenure system.

At its December 12 meeting, the faculty approved a new tenure policy. The new tenure policy will take effect this spring semester.

The faculty also approved the addition of the Tennessee and the Michigan tenures. The new policy will allow for the evaluation of candidates for tenure on the basis of their teaching, research, and service.

The policy will be administered by a new committee, the Tennessee and Michigan Tenure Committee. The committee will consist of three members, one from each university.

The committee will evaluate candidates for tenure on the basis of their teaching, research, and service. The committee will also review the candidates' performance in the classroom, the quality of their research, and their service to the university.

The new policy will take effect this spring semester.
Announcements

12 College
Applications for the 12-College Exchange for 1973-74 are available in the Office of Educational Services. Applications from present sophomores who wish to spend their full vacation from January 1 through February 1973 are preferred, but others may apply. Applications are due in the Office of Educational Services no later than Thursday, 12 February 1973. All applications, even those for the second term of 1973-74, are due then. On or about Monday, 12 February 1973, each applicant will be notified whether he or she can be accommodated for exchange at the college of his or her first choice.

Car
An automobile for student use in local Inter-Institutional Study Programs and for other academically-related purposes will be available during the Trinity Term 1973. Students interested in using this auto on a regular basis for classes are asked to meet with Dean Winslow on Wednesday, 21 January 1973, at 3:30 p.m. in Seabury 19. As far as possible, a mutually advantageous schedule for all concerned will be worked out at that time. Even if your personal class schedule is not complete by the 17th, it will be to your advantage to attend this meeting to have the chance of obtaining filming privileges once the initial auto schedule is set. Other students may make arrangements for the use of this car on an ad hoc basis on or after 18 January.

Each student driver must be individually approved by the Window Office. This requirement is to be approved before January 1973 and must have a special deposit of $15.00 with the College at the time of approval. Use will then be charged against that deposit. Unused balances will be refunded.

Philippines
Projects through the Open Semester option may be proposed by students interested in a term of study under the auspices of Trinity College in Quezon City, the Philippines. The academic term there is late June through early November, and this period would replace the Christmas Term at Trinity College. Those interested should contact Dean Winslow or Professor Steele as soon as possible, but no later than 31 January 1973.

Maritime
Vacancies exist for next term in the American Maritime Experience Program (see page 48 of the Catalogue) under this Intensive Study Program (Option A) and through a modified version (Option B).

Option A
1. American Maritime History: 1600 to the Present
Weekly seminars will be held in Mystic Seaport. Credit for 1 course credit.

2. Anglo-American Literature of the Sea
Weekly seminars will be held in Mystic Seaport. Credit for 1 course credit.

Option B
This is available to those interested in the seminar and/or the lecture course but who do not wish to live at Mystic Seaport from 2 April through 9 May. 1 course credit.

Help
The Hartford area is now being serviced by a new help-line, AMICUS. AMICUS provides an ear for those with a personal problem or question and a referral service for those calls that so warrant. Its telephone number is 563-9777 and its hours are from 5 p.m. to 10 p.m., seven days a week. The help-line has both a young person and an adult, both a man and woman, on the phone whenever possible. All of the operators are trained volunteers familiar with area services. The location of the exchange, however, is kept secret as AMICUS is not equipped as a drop-in center.
Groups Plan Inaugural Protests

"While no demonstration is, in itself, likely to end this war, massive outpourings of protest will tend to limit Nixon's military and political options—and that may save many lives."— Prof. Michael Lerner

A massive anti-war rally has been planned for Saturday in Washington to coincide with the second inauguration of Richard Nixon as president.

The demonstration will protest the recent bombings of Hanoi and Haiphong and will call for the immediate total and unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Indochina.

The noon time, inauguration day protest is being sponsored by the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC), the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice (PCPJ), and the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC).

As a result, Nixon's military and political options—and that may save many lives."

One of the Trinity organizers, Michael P. Lerner, instructor in philosophy, told the TRIPOD, "Having won re-election on the pretext that 'peace is at hand,' Nixon has engaged in the most massive destruction of civilian targets in the ten years of the Vietnam War. The demonstrations in Washington are a first step towards a response."

"It is not adequate to know in your heart that Nixon is wrong," he continued. "You must do something to show your opposition and give it a political expression. No American who remains silent in this period can claim that they couldn't do anything. If they fail to use any and every channel to show how angry they are they become accomplices in the murder."

"While no demonstration is, in itself likely to end this war," he concluded, "massive outpourings of protest will tend to limit Nixon's military and political options—and that may save many lives."

This Week

Tuesday, January 16
8:30 a.m.-12 noon and 1:00-4:00 p.m. - Registration - Washington Room.

All Day - Coop Book Exchange - Senate Room.

7:30 p.m. - Film: Sometimes A Great Notion - Cinestudio.

9:40 p.m. - Film: Slaughterhouse-Five - Cinestudio.

Wednesday, January 17
CLASSES BEGIN FOR GRADUATES AND UNDERGRADUATES.

11:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m. - Coop Book Exchange - Senate Room.

4:00 p.m. - TCC - Wean Lounge.

7:00 p.m. - MHBoG - Alumni Lounge.

Thursday, January 18
11:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. - I.D. Photos - Wean Lounge.

11:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m. - Coop Book Exchange - Senate Room.

8:00 p.m. - SIMS - McCook Auditorium.

4:00 p.m. - Film: Seduced and Abandoned, Italian (English subtitles) - McCook Auditorium.

Friday, January 19
3:30 - 4:30 p.m. - Hillel - Shabbat Service and Kiddush - Goodwin Lounge.

8:15 p.m. - Organ Recital: Jonathan Reilly, Instructor of Music, College Organist, Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut - Chapel.

8:15 p.m. - Varsity Basketball - N.Y.A.C. Hall.

8:20 p.m. - Film: 8-1/2 - Cinestudio.

Saturday, January 20
8:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. - ETS Exams - L.S.C. Auditorium and McCook Auditorium.

8:30 p.m. - Fantasticks (as Fri.) - Cinestudio.

Sunday, January 21
10:30 a.m. - The Eucharist - Chapel.

1:15 p.m. - Newman Apostolate Mass - Alumni Lounge.

7:30 p.m. - Folk Dancing - Wean Lounge.

8:00 p.m. - SIMS - Senate Room.

7:30 p.m. - Film: The Red Balloon - Cinestudio.

8:20 p.m. - Film: Eighty One - Cinestudio.

Monday, January 22
7:30 p.m. and 8:20 p.m. - Films (as Sunday) - Cinestudio.

Trustees Meeting - Luncheon - Committee Room.

2:00 p.m. - Hockey - Fairfield - Home.

2:30 p.m. - Freshman Basketball - Kingswood - Away.

3:00 p.m. - Varsity Squash - Colby - Home.

8:30 p.m. - Fantasticks (as Fri.) - Cinestudio.
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The first edition of the Trinity TRIPOD for the new semester will come out a week from today, January 23, 1973.

In order to get it ready, all TRIPOD staff members should come on down to the office during the week. Assignments are ready and waiting for you.

There will be a photographers meeting tonight at 7:00 pm in the Tripod office.