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The Merrill Person

Who is the Merrill Person? This is the question we had in mind when we began our research. Arriving at an answer was hardly easy. Attempting to make generalizations about anything is, at best, a questionable endeavor. Could we find the "Merrill Person" from a data sheet in the Registrar's office? Was the "Merrill Person" quietly eluding us at he sat in the dining commons eating his lunch? Or was the "Merrill Person" really a group of common expectations, goals, and fantasies of the ideal college life? Did students become Merrill people after their arrival on campus, or did it just happen, through college propaganda and admission procedures, that everyone who came to Merrill was already a Merrill person? We will attempt to demonstrate some of our still-questioning conclusions, adding a few recommendations as we go along. In no way do we present this report as a conclusive study. Rather, to us, the most interesting and constructive thing about this project was the questions that it raised for us; questions that must be pondered by all members of the Merrill community.

Obviously, there are sections of the other groups' reports that will shed light on our subject. We have tried to eliminate unnecessary overlap, but please forgive us if we haven't been totally successful.
Admission to UCSC and Merrill College

The procedure for admissions to UCSC seems to be a logical starting point for our discussion. Our information on this subject was furnished by John Isbister, a member of the admissions committee, to whom we express our gratitude.

Members of the admissions committee are selected by the Committee on Committees, and are appointed for two-year terms. This fact is important inasmuch as the committee is not chosen by the Chancellor, but is a faculty committee. It is the task of the admissions committee to read all applications of students seeking admission to UCSC.

The credentials of each prospective candidate arrive in a fairly standard form consisting of the following materials:
1) High school transcript - this is a record of high school grades, and may also include scores the student received on tests not required by UC, such as the American College Test, and the National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test; 2) College Board Scores - in every case, these will include the Scholastic Aptitude Scores and, in some cases, the scores from additional achievement tests, or, perhaps, a writing sample; 3) Standard University of California application form - this form is used by all nine campuses of the University. Candidates use this form to provide personal data such as their fathers' occupations, and to list their interests and high school extra-curricular activities. A major part of the application form consists of an essay about the applicants' expectations of college life, and why he thinks he would be happy at Santa Cruz.

Since all members of the committee could not possibly read all of the application materials for each prospective candidate, some general guidelines have been set, though each member may choose to
stress certain aspects of the application materials more than others. Since Mr. Isbister was our informant, we will examine his point of view toward reviewing applications.

The first area to come under scrutiny is the candidate's academic record. What courses did he take? Was his high school program solidly academic and well-rounded? Was he consistent in his grades? If not, did his grades degenerate, or did they show improvement?

Perhaps the most carefully examined area of the application is the essay. A student who writes a down-to-earth essay conveying a personal picture of himself and his goals will be taken more seriously than one who writes an ethereal few paragraphs about his visions of utopian education.

In the forefront of the mind of the application reviewer is the idea of fairness in admission. For instance, a student whose father has a Ph.D. was probably raised in a highly literate atmosphere, and may appear well prepared to function in an intellectually challenging situation. However, there are highly talented students suffering from cultural disadvantages. It is only fair to attempt to seek out these students and give them a chance to develop themselves at UCSC. In the same vein, many students attended high schools with high academic reputations. Should those student be favored, or should each transcript be viewed relative to the student's ability to function in the environment he found himself in?

After the application reader has answered these questions for himself, he marks the application with either an "A" for "accepted," or an "N" for "not accepted," keeping in mind that there is room for
one third of the applying candidates and that those accepted should represent the spectrum of intended majors. Each folder is read by two members of the committee. If there is still room for more students after all the candidates who received two "A" ratings are accepted, the entire committee reviews those folders which received one "A" rating and one "N" rating.

After admissions have been made for the entire UCSC campus, the new students are assigned to colleges. This procedure is fairly straightforward. The most important single criterion for college assignment is the student's first college preference. The overwhelming majority of Merrill students listed Merrill College as their first choice. This fact seems terribly significant to us, inasmuch as it would seem to support the contention that the "Merrill Person," if there is such a person, exists before each year's freshman class even arrives on campus. The "Merrill Person" is the person who was enthusiastic about what he conceived Merrill to be; enthusiastic enough to choose Merrill College.

This, at least, has been the admission picture to date. However, a profound change in admissions policy has occurred, which will undoubtedly have great implications for the composition of the student body at UCSC, and of Merrill College. Last year, UC Davis admitted students on a random basis. That is, after determining which applicants would be able to function academically at Davis, the admissions committee chose the entire entering class at random. This action resulted in the rejection of some students whose parents were highly displeased; some of these highly displeased parents held high state offices. The official reaction to Davis' new admission procedure was a new policy which is now
in effect for all nine University of California campuses. Next year, fifty percent of the entire freshman class will have been chosen strictly on the basis of their high school academic performance. We are not sure what effect this will have on UCSC and Merrill. Time will certainly tell.

Who goes to Merrill?

After reviewing the admissions procedures, we visited the Office of the Registrar in search of information about the ethnic backgrounds of Merrill students compared to those of students at the other UCSC colleges. The figures for the 1971-72 academic year were not available in time for this report. Our figures are those for the academic year 1970-71. All data in the following tables was voluntarily supplied by the students as part of their registration data, and includes full- and part-time students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Oriental</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Chicano</th>
<th>Cauc.</th>
<th>Total Regist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Oriental</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Chicano</th>
<th>Cauc.</th>
<th>Total Regist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CROWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fresh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STEVENSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fresh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COWELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fresh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MERRILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fresh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the event that the previous tables were too detailed for our readers, we have consolidated them into the following table, which represents all classes of each UCSC college:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third-World Students</th>
<th>Caucasions</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Merrill has a substantial lead over all of the other colleges in terms of the number of Third World students in attendance. What made these students select Merrill? Is it possible that the factors influencing a Third World student's choice of Merrill could also contribute to the sort of Anglo student who would be interested in Merrill? It would now seem logical to examine what make a certain high school senior or junior college student interested in Santa Cruz and Merrill. We will make some recommendations in this area.

What makes students choose Merrill?

Perhaps the first official UCSC publication seen by the student shopping for a college or university is the recruitment brochure sent out to all prospective students. First impressions can be very important, and a prospective student could either become very interested in UCSC and Merrill on the basis of this brochure, or he could become very intimidated and decide not to apply at all.

Merrill's aims as a college stressing studies of the Third World are expressed as follows in the recruitment brochure, "The Colleges of
U C Santa Cruz:

Change is an essential feature of the world that concerns the College. If that concern is to be intelligent, and lead to useful action, it will call for disciplines student of the liberal arts and sciences. If problems of change and intelligent action are to be understood, it will be useful to experience them.

Philip Bell concludes his article on Merrill by stating, "Merrill has a wide tolerance for types of concern, but a rather narrow degree of tolerance for the lack of concern at all." (emphasis Bell's)

From this brochure, it seems to us, a student could form the impression that Merrill is a very intense place indeed. While there is nothing inherently wrong with the statements made in the brochure, we are concerned lest some student decide on their own before investigating further that they would not perform well in the Merrill environment. The statements made in the brochure are accurate. What we are recommending is simply that some statement of encouragement be added for the benefit of people who may be able to make important contributions to Merrill, but for cultural or other reasons have been persuaded that they might not be able to "make it" at Merrill College, or at any university.

This very simple criticism could be applied to the UCSC campus in general. It seems to us that greater diversity in the student body could be achieved if the entire institution were de-mystified. Our propaganda should be geared toward encouraging all kinds of students to apply, rather than emphasizing how difficult it is to be admitted, or how terribly clever all the student already studying at UCSC are. Obviously, encouraging brochures won't change the fact
that it is difficult to be admitted to UCSC. We only wish to see that all steps are taken to insure that everyone who has a chance for a successful career at Merrill will apply. Were this to happen, it seems that everyone at the college would benefit.

A very important person in terms of his influence on students' academic plans is the high school counselor. Perhaps more diversity at Merrill could be gained with his help. Academically rigorous high schools in upper middle class neighborhoods have counselors who encourage their student to apply to well-known universities, supplying them with information and statistics. The student at a poor high school may be advised to take industrial courses to that he will be able to get a job. College may not be presented to him as an alternative at all. By way of remeding this situation, a study could be made of high schools in California from which no student have come to Santa Cruz, or which are very poorly represented. Counselors at those schools could be sent literature about Santa Cruz, along with information about such things at the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP). Occasional recruiting trips to these schools could be made by Merrill students and the recruitment would take the form of group discussion. High school newspapers are also potential recruiting instuments to which articles about Santa Cruz could be sent. Recruitment of poor and minority students seems important enough to us that it be added to the duties of the College administrative officers.

Our statements in this section of the report have proceeded from the assumption that diversity in the racial and economic backgrounds of the students is desirable. Now we will attempt to make some state-
ments about the students presently at Merrill. The question arises, should we seek more diversity in our student body, or should we try to emphasize the diversity that already exists? Do we want to create a certain type of community, or is it desirable to try to become a microcosm of the outside world?

The students at Merrill

Having arrived at Merrill, do new students find what they expect to find? Do older students remain enthusiastic? Do any stereotypes exist at Merrill? These questions seem impossible to answer in a concise, factual way. However, we gained some interesting opinions on these subjects from student we held informal discussions with.

One large problem seems to stem from the fact that there is a gap of nearly a year between the time a student applies to Merrill and the time he arrives on campus. Several students told us that, while they were still enthusiastic when they arrived at Merrill, their interests had changed since the time of their application. For some students, courses taken early in their college careers started them in a whole new direction of academic interests. A junior girl reported coming to Merrill with a major in Sociology, and then becoming interested in Environmental Studies. This phenomenon seems very natural to us, and is certainly not a negative thing. However, peoples' changing interests between high school and college could have implications for the college. We make no recommendations as far as this point is concerned, but it seems valuable to present it as a possible explanation for a certain type of disenchantment among the student.
Even more important than changing interests between high school and college as an explanation of some unhappiness was the conflict of the reality of life at Merrill as opposed to the fantasies students created about it before arriving. This point was raised again and again in discussions with students. "I don't know. It just wasn't what I thought it would be," was a familiar lament. Several students attributed the discrepancy between their fantasies and reality to their own naivete. Filled with visions of Pass/Fail and freedom from the rigorous grading of high school, students often found themselves piled down in their first year with work near the end of their initial quarter at Merrill. Many of them seemed to feel that, despite all that they conceived of as "promises," Merrill and UCSC were still part of an academic institution making demands on them. Even though they were not really surprised at this in the final analysis, we detected a note of disappointment that, basically, Merrill would always be like any other "institution" in some important respects.

Another source of disappointment stemming from naivete on the students' part was found in the social sphere. Having formed the impression that Merrill was a close-knit residential community, some students were faced with the realization that they were responsible for making their own friends, and were further surprised to find themselves associating mainly with the other members of their dorm unit. (See the report of the Merrill Residential Life Committee) These sources of disappointment seemed to us to be, at least in part, problems that any new student would encounter at any college. There are some situations which must be worked out by
everyone who ever left home and went to college; hence, we prefer not to find fault with Merrill College itself for the kinds of disappointment among students that we have mentioned here. The students themselves seem to feel that their own naiveté was to blame for a large part of their unhappiness.

The question of whether or not a stereotypical Merrill student could be said to exist was an intriguing one. A junior transfer told us, "I came here because I thought there would be a lot of freaks. I heard it was a really freaky place." A senior girl who has attended Merrill since it opened defined the following three groups for us. Of course, we present them as the opinions of one person, in her own words:

1) A small group of fraternity-sorority types. They miss that kind of social life when they get here.
2) The naive, idealistic hippy Earth-mother type.
3) Heavy freaks, into doing dope and wierding everybody else out.

A few other students seemed to support those categorizations, saying that stereotypes did exist. However, even though most students were able to identify what they felt were stereotypes, no one was willing to include himself in any of them! This hardly seems surprising, but would appear rather as an inherent flaw in any attempt to generalize about a group of people. An alumna of Merrill College who spent her freshman year at a conservative and prestigious Southern college, had an interesting outlook toward her role at Merrill: "It was up to me to make it work. At first I was unhappy. I am not interested in drugs. I like to dress well every day and take part in school activities. I felt out of place at Merrill and thought of leaving. But I then realized that if Merrill was ever going to be a place where
all kinds of people could be comfortable, it was up to people like me to stay."

The recommendations that we wish to make are aimed at easing the problems of adjustment for new students. In the academic area, detailed and factual information about major programs and their requirements should be more obviously available. The process which one must follow to obtain an independent study should be clarified. Even continuing students attempting to arrange an independent study for the first time are often mystified by this. Finally, we must re-examine the present advisor system. Many students complain that they can never visit their advisors, or that they only go to see them when they want to see their evaluations. A common complaint is that the advisors don't seem to know anything either. One simple step that could be taken to let the students and advisors both feel less harrassed would be to make evaluations available in the college office and thus end the mystique of the "confidential" nature of these comments. We have not spoken to a single student who was not enthusiastic about this idea. The financial situation of the University makes other recommendations that we could suggest unworkable, so we shall omit them.

In the area of social life, we recommend that interest groups be made more visible, and in this as other recommendations, we suggest taking existing mechanisms into account. Students already fill in forms about their preferences in roommates. It seems a simple matter to question people about their interests on these forms, and then distribute to the students a listing which includes interests as well as their names and addresses. Along the same lines,
students could become more aware of each other if college
talent were used for College Night presentations. We heartily endorse
any program which make the students more visible to each other.

Some important questions take shape as we examine the
situation of students at Merrill: is it the role of the college
to facilitate interpersonal relationships among the students? If
so, is it the fault of the college if some students feel unhappy?
Is it really even possible to make everyone happy? If not, is
there any way of discerning a satisfactory "happiness level" for
the college? Although we have no answers to these questions, it
seems clear that it is up to all of us to create the community, and
up to all of us to decide what direction we want the community to
take.

We have attempted in this report to present ideas and make
recommendations. We have tried to avoid making unrealistic
proposals. However, we find ourselves faced with a question
about the nature of higher education in general which looms large
indeed. Are changes in the bureaucratic, academic, and social apparatus
of the college really going to make a significant difference? Is
the apathy of the student (see report of the Merrill governance
Committee) due to inherent flaws in Merrill College, which we have
only to discover to solve? Or are we the collective victims of a
larger situation which robs us of idealism? Even if we change
Merrill College in fundamental ways, it will still be a college
awarding degrees and keeping young men out of the army. Perhaps
this point is unimportant, but we believe it isn't. Making a workable
and creative community is the task of everyone at Merrill. We can examine the situation and make recommendation for change only when we strike the barrier these larger question pose. Perhaps we should be realistic, and face the idea that some members of the Merrill community are here because they don't know where else to be. We feel that this statement need not be disheartening to those of us interested in improving Merrill. Apathy and cynicism in an individual represent that person's response to life. What can this person do for the college? What can the college do for him? Most important, whose responsibility is it to make any institution function?

The report of the other groups working on this project have made us hopeful that constructive change will be made; that bureaucracies will be oiled, and that valuable guidelines have been set in the search for a new Provost. No one pretends that the job of revitalizing the college will be easy. It should be interesting.
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AUTHORS' NOTE

The authors of this report unwillfully, but quite conciously, produced a work that is perhaps representative only of the white middle-class members of the college, if we may claim to be that. We wish that we were capable of producing something not strongly influenced by race and status, but because of the sheer differences in numbers among races living at Merrill, to attempt to achieve a completely unbiased report along these lines would have proven exceedingly difficult.
INTRODUCTION

To answer the question of what Merrill College is, is only to answer the question of what Merrill College thinks it is, for if, as the college catalogue boasts, "one of the most pervasive features of the college is change," then those conceptions and ideals present in the faculty, administration, and student body ought to be a very strong indication, if not what the college is, then what it will be.

Hopefully, Merrill is not an institution, but people, dynamic and sensitive, as an institution cannot be. It is for this reason that the bulk of the information gathered was collected in the form of interviews. Because of the faultiness of the human memory a few details may be a little fuzzy and a seemingly inappropriate highlight may glare out here and there. No effort has been made to correct any but a serious distortion of reality, with the feeling that these accounts are part of the actual legend-culture of the college, and that they project a clearer and more realistic view of the college than the presentation of documented fact.

To give a little roundness, and perhaps, a better understanding of what Merrill is, we will provide a cursory history of how Merrill came to be at all for those unacquainted: I) Merrill, then known as College IV, was to be an international studies college. Paul Seabury, a political scientist, was chosen to be provost. He spent some time in Santa Cruz in '66-'67 during which time it became clear that a happy relationship between him and the university just was not in the cards. II) Philip Bell, fresh from Africa, accepted the position late fall or early winter of '67, on a few conditions: among them that he be able to construct the college around a theme of non-
western civilization, not to say Third World. He envisioned, so the history relates, a Peace Corps type institution, sending out its ranks to take up the white man's burden and aid in the development of the underdeveloped nations of the world. The Field Program was invented for this purpose. The core courses were planned as a sequence of courses dealing with 1) Africa, 2) China, and 3) Latin America. The first turned out "poor"; the next two, "rocky". Enter here the most interesting, and probably the singly most important event, events, or bit of lore, as the case may be, in Merrill's history. Some say that it was Herman Blake at one of the core lectures on Africa; some say that it was a member of the Santa Cruz ESU at a teach-in. If two disagreeing parties discuss it long enough they usually conclude that it was both. What these gentlemen did was to literally destroy the entire concept of the white man's burden, the Peace Corps, and that entire mentality: politically, racially, philosophically, forcefully, and bitterly. It would seem that all the dreams and plans of that host of idealists congre-gated on this hill disintegrated.

And Merrill College, what was left, entered into phase III. A thematic type of introductory core course was developed, which dealt in a much less heavy-handed manner with problems of the Third World. Being brand new, it was, of course, not a shining success. It lacked unity to a large extent, but was considered a step in the right direction. The original courses were retained, but were less emphasized and were redirected. Their enrollment fell off for a number of reasons. Some two years older is the present Merrill College, matured somehow along these lines, still definitely in Phase III.
INTERVIEW WITH THE PROVOST*

Originally Merrill College had an international outlook, stressing the study of languages. But as stated in the introduction, Provost Bell, from his experience in Africa, considered the most important international problems to be those concerning the Third World and its economic and social development. And so Merrill's emphasis has evolved to accent the study of Third World cultures in preparation for work in some capacity in these societies in order to benefit both the society and the student. While the study of languages is still important at Merrill, it is not an essential ingredient in the academic program.

The provost reiterated the original definition of Third World, that is, those countries which were "non-aligned" and which were "newly emergent and re-emergent civilizations and cultures, especially those of hitherto oppressed, neglected, or under-privileged groups." This has come to include countries in Africa, SE Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, India, and China, as well as minority groups in America which may identify with these cultures. Merrill has stressed the study of the international Third World in order to relate this study to minorities in the U.S. In many ways though, the study of American minorities has taken on a greater emphasis as Merrill has aged. Provost Bell, however, would rather concentrate more completely on the problems of the presently emerging civilizations. He feels that as College 7 opens, with its focus on minority difficulties in the U.S., Merrill might better accomplish its original intentions.

The provost hopes that Merrill will eventually have a more comprehensive academic program and possibly a college major concerning the economic

*A list of questions for this and all other interviews can be found in the appendix.
and social development of those countries that Merrill has concentrated on. A newly devised major, Latin America Studies, reflects the direction a major program could take, and is in fact in the process of becoming a college major.

In the beginning, Provost Bell had hopes that the Merrill undergraduate base would attract a large number of students, from, as described in early correspondence, "so-called culturally deprived or underprivileged backgrounds in California," and that Merrill, in co-operation with the university admissions office, might have sought out high school graduates who had the potential for college but might not have ordinarily considered it. Unfortunately, the limited EOP program at the UC campuses, the lack of funds, and the limited number of minorities who meet UC requirements have made the minority population at Merrill and other colleges minimal, which is well below the level Provost Bell would have liked to have seen.

The provost has had hopes of Merrill being more reflective of third world cultures in its social life as well as in its academic program. Occasional social events have taken place that related to Merrill's theme, i.e. ethnic dinners once or twice a year. Provost Bell feels that the burden of responsibility for activities of this kind rests on the students. Likewise, the students should take it upon themselves to create a better college in general.

Although Provost Bell would like to see a great majority of the students participate in field work, he does not feel that it should be required. Because not every student at Merrill is interested in field work in particular or the third world in general, he thinks that these areas should be optional in order to maintain the diversity of the Merrill community.
Because of the nature of Merrill's emphasis many feel that it should be a politically active school. But, the provost thinks that political activism should be de-emphasized. In his opinion, a university is not the place for political activity.
JOHN ISBISTER AND TERRY BURKE

John Isbister and Terry Burke work, it seems, as closely as any two Merrill fellows. It is hardly coincidence, therefore, that their two concepts of what Merrill is or ought to be are practically identical. They feel that people with basically three types of needs come to Merrill, and that Merrill must be able to reach them all. These categories form three concentric circles. Within the first and largest circle are those people who came to Merrill to gain a little exposure to the world. They are primarily liberal arts or natural science majors. Merrill should be able to show them the differences between and commonality of the peoples of the Third World and the American minorities.

Within the second circle are those whose interests in society are more well defined. These are primarily social science people. They will do a couple of quarters of field work, and will be able to relate it to their interests and formal education and will benefit greatly from it. They are perhaps thinking of entering into law or social work, and Merrill should provide them with a broad base from which to work.

The third and smallest circle (from 15-20 people in a graduating class) are made up of primarily Community Studies, Latin American Studies, and African Studies majors. These people feel a real commitment to the outside world, and will do at least a year of field work away.

Merrill must seek to serve and to fulfill all of these people. The African studies major should be developed, but so should the core and liberal arts areas of Merrill.
FRESHMEN

Because Merrill literature in catalogues and the like, is directed at incoming students to a major extent, we felt that interviewing freshmen about their reasons for coming to, and their reactions to, Merrill were of particular importance. Obviously, college life is a major step in anyone's life. Realizing this, our group believed that the initial responses to Merrill from freshmen, before they had become settled into their life here, would provide a perceptive starting point for discussing the theme at Merrill; even if that commencement was based largely in ignorance and indecision, for these qualities are as equally important as knowledge and forethought in assessing such a situation.

In general the freshmen have some interest in the "Third World" for a variety of reasons. Some have travelled in other parts of the world and some students find that this particular subject relates to their major. For instance, one student is an environmental studies major concerned with population problems, many of which exist in non-western countries.

While the freshmen seem to understand Merrill's definition of the term Third World as involving recently evolving, non-western nations, there is a universal feeling that the phrase also encompasses minorities in this country. All the students interviewed feel that Merrill should continue in its present direction and also believe that the college could become "more" Third World if larger numbers of minority and foreign students from Third World countries attended Merrill.

Nearly all those interviewed are taking Merrill I. The others are not as a result of schedule conflicts and disinterest developed at the intro-
ductory lecture. Those students who are taking the course have mixed feelings. It is important to note that the interviews were done only halfway through the quarter and reactions to the course may have certainly altered. But in any event, some students like the course because it gives them an opportunity to prepare for the reading and writing load of other college courses. However, several students strongly dislike the course for a number of reasons. Some felt that reading and discussing a series of literary works was inadequate as an introduction to the Third World. And others do not believe that the lectures were comprehensive enough. But, in many ways, their reactions seem to correspond with the relative success of their seminars.

Even though most of the students are taking Merrill 1, only one student believes that the course should be required. He maintains that the college might attain a better feeling for its emphasis if all students were required to take a one quarter course. The other students would argue that those students uninterested in the Third World should not be forced to take a class concerning it.

Most of the students interviewed did not seem to have thought too deeply about taking any other Merrill courses, most specifically the seminars (the \( \Delta \Delta \)'s and \( \Lambda \Delta \)'s). Several students, though, voiced the opinion that the other classes "look pretty good" and think they may take more Merrill courses. Related to this was a general reaction that Merrill 1-8 are comprehensive enough in their dealings with the Third World but additions, such as courses on Cuba or American Indians, were suggested.

Most of the students had rather similar expectations about Merrill college and Santa Cruz in general. They tended to expect a constantly thriving intellectual community. One girl said that from everything she had heard,
Santa Cruz was a "heaven" of sorts. The freshmen also rather universally anticipated more minority students and more students of a politically active nature in attendance at Merrill. In a sober light, though, the freshmen realized that their expectations were probably overly idealistic.

Among those freshmen interviewed there is a general interest in field work, although the Field Program tended to be of only minor influence in their coming to Merrill. Some students who expressed little interest in field work seemed to be reacting to what they deemed was a "Peace Corps trip". The most important element of this discussion is that, no matter degree of interest, the students knew little of the Field Program, what it offered, or to whom they could direct their questions. The interviewing took place before the Field Program newsletter was distributed so that there was a feeling of very little communication about the Program.

Concerning non-academic life, most students perceived little social activity at Merrill and felt that they were largely responsible for making it active. While believing in the virtues of unplanned events, particularly faculty-student get-togethers, the students did not seem eager to strike out on their own to partake of such a venture. They seemed to prefer unplanned activities to planned, but generally liked the idea of College Nights and similar predetermined events.

It was found that the freshmen, particularly those in Merrill 1, knew their advisor because a system was established to have their seminar leaders become their advisor.

Finally, the freshmen by-and-large, knew their preceptors, but except for relatively rare cases, had seldom come into contact with them. This, however, is a subject that is further, and more appropriately, dealt with in the study of residential life at Merrill.
THE SENIORS

The seniors are quite benevolent in their attitude toward Merrill, and analysis of their comments for a general overview has been difficult, but highly interesting: difficult because of the diversity and the tendency of people to say exactly the opposite things about the same situation; interesting because the commonality was there, the differences coming from varied approaches to the same problem, and sometimes seeing different elements as problematic. The goals and deeper recognition of fundamental causes are invariably the same.

There are even particulars upon which they all for the most part agree. Though some are satisfied with the diversity, they all feel that the l柳州 seminar do not reflect to a great extent the theme of the college (whatever that is), nor do they reflect necessarily, student interest. They are for the most part based upon the interests of the particular professor, and in this capacity fulfill perhaps a very important need. Perhaps profs could be inspired enough with Merrill that their interests would be actually more specifically related to the college; perhaps not.

The seniors feel that field work is very important and that is should in fact be greatly encouraged. Most seniors believe that neither it (the field program), nor anything else at Merrill (i.e., the core course) should be required. They do feel that there is a very serious failure in utilizing those who have returned from field experience. They come back filled by the experience, and often feel intense frustration in having
no channels through which to share what they have learned. It is interesting to note that some of the most interesting field studies that were accomplished were taken outside of the Merrill field program, either through a board of studies, or by dropping out temporarily. The point being that the presence of the field program points out to the students that there are important non-academic aspects to becoming knowledgable.

To deal more in generalities and overview, the interviews reflected the attitude that you come to Merrill to leave, that one of the things that Merrill, within the university structure, should recognize and stress, is that academia is not what life is all about. People come to Merrill because they are interested in people and want to do something based upon that interest. Regarding field work, Merrill should, and apparently does to a great extent, teach students that they cannot walk into another person's life and be the boss. You have to wait to be asked and if asked, must approach with respect, to serve and not to lead. If the only something that you do for your fellow-man is to educate yourself to know this, you are accomplishing something of value. This does not rule out all action nor attempts of one race to help another, but does demand absolute respect for the intelligence, cause, and culture of that people.

A very common sense of loneliness and alienation has always existed for the seniors, at Merrill. One senior addressed the problem specifically. He felt that if Merrill had less of a sense of community than other colleges (which it may or may not) it is very much because of Merrill's basic orientation, that is, toward the rest of the world and doing field work in it. Merrill is trying to look in and out at the same time. Community is trying to be established in a situation where transiency is the norm: people taking leaves of absence, dropping out, and leaving for field study.

There is, however, something distinctly Merrill. The turn outs in
elections are always poor, but the student control and involvement in
the decision-making processes of the college, however inadequate, is extreme
in comparison with other colleges. The discovery of the power wielded
by other provosts and certain university officials regarding seemingly
strictly student affairs seem to shock the Merrill student acclimated
to governance at Merrill. If the provost acts against the will of and behind
the back of the students, he may expect no help or support in the matter
from any other sector of the college. "Merrill has always been the
leader in co-op, co-ed, and sin in general." Contrary to the irresponsi-
sibility that that line may seem to project, it is in fact the proclamation
of self-reliance that seems to have been a trademark of this college
since the beginning: the taking of responsibility for one's own education
being one part; the taking of responsibility for one's own conduct being
the other. Not complete violation of the rules, but complete disregard
for them as an attempt to regulate those parts of a person's life falling
completely within his own jurisdiction. (There is a story they tell
about a young man (this story definitely belongs within parenthesis) who was
reported by a workman, putting the cable into his D-dorm room, to the
police for growing marijuana in his typewriter case. The police called
the provost, and the provost responded (so the story goes) by going
himself to the young man's room, his first entrance into the dormitories.
On his way in he was encountered by a group of riotously (righteously?)
inebriated young men, carrying considerable amounts of assorted alcoholic
beverage on their person. Perhaps it was his original intent, perhaps this
latest incident influenced him, but he now proceeded to the room of the R.A.
of the young man in question, perhaps to work it out through him. Knocking
on the door and being told to enter, he found the R.A. in bed with his girlfriend. Our narrative, claiming not the slightest essence of truth, will here come to a close, claiming only to be representative of student attitudes, being one of the most cherished pieces of lore. Obviously, whatever Merrill is, it is not the student handbook.)
STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
THE MERRILL THEME

The strengths of Merrill's theme are not readily obvious as a result of its nebulous nature. But the focus on non-western societies is unique, not only among Santa Cruz colleges, but seemingly among colleges and universities in general. More important however, is that most students, while not necessarily greatly involved with Merrill's direction, do find it interesting and stimulating. And finally, Merrill is the only college at Santa Cruz that is fundamentally concerned with looking out away from the college and into the world around us: hence the extensive Field Program.

Probably the greatest weakness is that very same nebulousness of the theme, the difficulty in concretely defining it. The term Third World has, in the past, meant many things to many people. This has probably been one of the most significant factors in the growing emphasis on domestic minorities. A questionnaire distributed last year contained a list of possible themes for Merrill. Included in the list were most of the aspects of the current emphasis at Merrill. The overwhelming response was for the catch-all phrase Third World. What seems to have developed then is that Third World, in the minds of students, means every aspect of non-white society, domestic or international. But to many faculty and administrators the term has a much more specific meaning, namely the international aspect. The first step in remedying this crisis in definition has been to de-emphasize the phrase in question. This has been done to a certain extent as we were surprised to find that several freshmen "didn't know Merrill was supposed to be Third World." How this has been accomplished is rather unclear as there has been no significant reduction in the use of these two words in Merrill
literature. To speculate, this de-emphasis could be a result of the growing dissatisfaction at all levels for a phrase so hazy in meaning. Possibly then, this has tended to manifest itself in the minds of incoming students. Whatever the cause, it is still used and there are large numbers of people who consider Merrill the Third World College (as have the writers of this report). What might be best for Merrill would be to phase out the usage of Third World.

But while removing the grounds for contention, it is apparent from the reaction of most people at Merrill, that the college should continue in the direction its momentum has carried it, at least for the present. That is, Merrill should persevere in its concern for non-western and newly emergent societies struggling to come to terms with the difficulties of self-determination in the 20th century, and with co-existing emphasis on minorities and their problems in the U.S. Hopefully the termination in usage of our controversial label will better enable Merrill to find itself within its collective frame of reference, rather than be stymied by phraseology so ill-construed. Having once alleviated this obstacle, Merrill can better deal with the most important element inherent in its theme: change. While this feature of change was believed given, often it has become a reality only after long battles. But changes have been, and are being, attempted. The class that sponsored this report is one example of a sincere effort to alter the life at the college. But what this commitment to change implies, however, is that if Merrill, as a community, truly wishes to move away from its present concerns to some alternate direction, then that transformation should take place.

In order for Merrill to engage in its own self-determination it is necessary for the college to continually recognize where it is and where it is
going. In the past this has not always been the case, as all literature and other informational outlets, for three years, continually reiterated the same material. Students tended to become greatly disenchanted for they did not feel that the content of this information adequately represented life at Merrill College and were, in fact, myths. What occurred then was that a college dedicated to change had actually remained static in the discussion of its hopes and inclinations.

But for the first time since Merrill began, this too has begun to change. Merrill's literature is slowly starting to reflect the realities of life at the college while still maintaining faith in the founding principles. It would seem then, that a constant reassessment of "where Merrill is at" is necessary to paint a realistic picture of the college. In keeping with this assumption we suggest that the Steering Committee, or a similarly composed group under the direction of the Steering Committee, take part in this assessment of Merrill near the end of each school year. The evaluation by this group would entail working with present standing committees concerned with Merrill's life to decide whether the college should continue in its then present mode. This would necessarily involve the academic program, and to a lesser extent the Field Program and the myriad other factors that compose Merrill. With the evaluation accomplished it would be the group's duty to write and re-write the Merrill literature to illustrate, as best as possible, what paths the college has found itself following during the year and what directions it may be expected to pursue in the coming year. In this manner, Merrill may discover a terminology that satisfactorily represents its direction at that point.
THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Core Course

The core course has been discussed briefly in the introductory history. We'd like to look at it a little more closely now, bring the history up-to-date and propose a few possibilities for the future. In the winter of '70, Merrill 1-B (American culture), was added to the second-year thematic Third World course. It was, from what we understand, pretty much of a flop. Being the first endeavor, however, it was given a second chance, was taken in hand to a certain extent by John Schaar, and once more flopped. It should be pointed out, that although the course was listed alongside of Merrill 1-A, the relationship existed almost entirely in the catalogue. The second made no attempt to build on the first, and was taught by a completely different group of people. The idea was, we believe, to develop an idea of how America developed the consciousness from which it views the Third World today, a very worthwhile subject. However, if anyone is qualified to teach a course in American political consciousness, it is Mr. Schaar, and he failed. No third attempt will be made in the foreseeable future.

This year, the core is listed thus:

1. SOCIAL CHANGE IN THE THIRD WORLD. F

Social change and modernization in the Third World overseas. The course concentrates on individuals, and groups of people outside the United States who are involved in situation of traditionalism, colonialism, revolution and independence, neo-colonialism, and economic development.

Because the information for this report was gathered in the middle of the fall quarter, it is not too accurate a measure to weigh the success of the
course this year by the freshmen reactions to it; the general consensus of sophomores being that their core course was in fact very valuable. Few people indeed claim that they had never taken it, but it is pretty unanimously agreed that if one is asked his opinion mid-way through the course, his reaction is generally poor. The freshmen this year, it would seem from their reactions, find the course little changed. One very revealing comment was made on the fact that the freshmen have at least found a common unifying ground in their dissatisfaction with the course. They do feel, however, that there is one group excluded from this unifying force: John Istibser's section, who thoroughly enjoy the course and are at least very strongly united with each other.

Perhaps we may draw from this other things besides accolades for John (which we may freely draw anyway). John has been up to his neck in the core course since its inception. He gets excited when he talks about it, and has visions, mystical or otherwise, for it. It's not likely that we could dream of developing that, or anything much like it, in the rest of the faculty at Merrill, but maybe we can see that unless a plan for changing the course sparks something vaguely similar in those who are going to teach it, we can count on the failure of that plan.

When we interviewed him, John did have a plan of sorts for the core, or perhaps just for the academic plan in general. Realizing that among the services that the college can provide to the undergraduate would be to help him fulfill his breadth requirements, because these are something that give trouble to all people, a sequence of 5 or 6 courses might be set up to satisfy the breadth requirements; these courses being organized into a socially relevant theme, which would be more appropriate to Merrill college, and would definitely be more in keeping with the idea of breadth. Instead of leaving the student with an unrelated mess, it would give him
an idea of how all three disciplines effect him, each other, and the world.

There is an obvious failure potential in this plan, seen most clearly in the previous abilities to relate two courses successfully, and the necessity of building a course around the interests of the faculty and students, and not vice versa. Nevertheless, the plan is certainly a beautiful one although a little beyond Merrill's capabilities at the moment.

What we are about to suggest is related very much to other topics, but perhaps most closely to the core course. The first suggestion, perhaps most important, and certainly most easily employed, is that seniors and juniors who have taken full-time field study, either through the field program or one of the boards, or whose experience is deemed to be valuable for whatever reason, participate in one of each of the sections of the core, participate in the discussions of the core section leaders, perhaps work with students on papers, making more effective that remedial aspect of the class, and help to plan the development of the core in general. The fruits to be gathered from this action we feel would be remarkable:

1) giving a job in the arm to the core, 2) giving those students who have knowledge and experience to share a chance to do so, 3) giving seniors and freshmen a chance to meet and develop hopefully something more than superficial relationships which would help the freshmen establish themselves in their new environment, and help people who have been away on field study re-enter the Merrill Community, something which is usually hard to do. It would in short take the two most widely separated parts of Merrill and draw them together, working for the considerable advantage of everyone, 4) finally, it would possibly give those seniors who are planning on entering a teaching career a chance to gain a little experience, which an amazing number of newly arrived assistant professors lack.
The second suggestion is: that the core, following the direction we might see it going with the implementation of seniors and juniors, become not only representative of the theme of Merrill, but also, to the extent possible, representative of the community; more specifically, that the world being in a constant state of change, the subject of the core will change, or be brought up-to-date every year, and that therefore the subjects with which it deals ought to be not only of interest to those individuals in the class, but to all of the college, and in fact, to all the university; that therefore, the core ought to receive funding from sources that might go to student activities to draw speakers and films of relevance to the entire college; that the presence of these speakers and films ought to be thoroughly made known to the college, and that as many discussions as might be deemed interesting by any members of the college ought to be made open to them. This whole idea was prompted by the overwhelming response to the film, "The Battle of Algiers", which was not advertised to any extent, but was immediately recognized by large numbers of people as being important. Hopefully, this would be an enormous factor in building some meaningful sense of community at Merrill.

The third suggestion is that John Isbister's over-all plan be set as a goal, and a long, well thought out, graduated plan of implementation be drawn up and adhered to as far as reason dictates.

Seminars

The main strength of the Merrill seminars is their diversity, which the majority of students interviewed found favorable. However, some felt that the seminars do not reflect student interests and needs as much as they should. They now tend to follow faculty interests to a large extent. There have been
overwhelming responses to some Merrill seminars (Man and His Interaction with His Environment last spring), but other courses show only minimal student interest. Courses with minor student appeal should only be offered after major student wishes have been adequately fulfilled.

A questionnaire last spring to which approximately 130 students responded included a question (#7) concerning the types of courses that should be offered at Merrill. There were thirteen specific varieties of classes rated under three categories: offer less, offer more, must offer more. Combining the results of the two latter categories the list of preferred subject areas was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ethnic minorities</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>science for non-majors</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecology</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crafts (weaving, pottery, etc.)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specialized seminars for majors only</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studies in white America</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fine arts</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far East--China and Japan</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparation for field work</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the preceding list may not be a statistically valid indicator of student desires, it does point out that some wants and needs are not being met by present course offerings. The results of this questionnaire, as well as our interviews, indicate that there is a definite need for additional Merrill seminars that satisfy the natural science requirement for non-science majors. In the present catalog there are only three seminars listed that are open to all Merrill students. The remaining natural science seminars are very restrictive in their prerequisites. Thus, to direct its attention to non-science majors, Merrill might attempt, as partly suggested earlier, to develop a group of science courses that are relevant to social and economic problems of
developing countries. But, whether related to the theme or not, Merrill should create more courses designed for the non-science major to enable these people to satisfy their breadth requirement.

As shown in the questionnaire there are several areas that seem strongly unfulfilled. The college should be involved in rectifying these discrepancies. Besides simply offering more courses in the suggested areas, the college can initiate a facilitating process that would provide students with the opportunity to create courses to fit their desires. This would be similar to the now defunct Group Independent Study. A group of students having a common academic interest would form a workshop of sorts and could create their own course with the advice of a faculty member or graduate student. A course of this nature would be limited to the students who created it, if they so wish.

The course description and syllabus would be approved by the Steering Committee in the same manner as Student Directed Seminars (Merrill 192). At present, Merrill 192 is the only channel through which students can create group courses. However, the type of course recommended would hopefully include a faculty member as an active participant but would not be taught by any one individual. Rather, the course would be a common effort throughout the span of the quarter.

Once included in Merrill's repertoire of course offerings, these workshops should be encouraged; and any bureaucracy involved in student created courses should be toned down to enable students to take an active role in their education. Finally, students must be provided with knowledge (possibly included in the faculty picture book) of faculty special interests so that when forming their course, the workshop will know which faculty members they should seek as advisors.
THE FIELD PROGRAM

The Merrill Field Committee is one of the main strengths of the Field Program, largely because they realize their weaknesses and seem to be concerned about, and greatly involved with, the constant reassessment and evaluation of the present Field Program and its policies. Thusly, the program tends to reflect the interests of the students.

In the recent newsletter concerning field work, Nick Royal states, "I have assumed that field work as a part of one's university education is an extremely useful way of learning something about the larger world and of uniting that learning with what takes place at UCSC."

The Field Committee also reviews and approves the students' petitions for field work, encouraging as much innovation as is desired on the part of the student. This leads into another dominant strength of the Field Program; the very existence of field work, its potential, and its ability to be as creative and worthwhile as the student wishes.

Field work was originally based on the participation in such programs as the Peace Corps, Volunteers in Asia, and Crossroads in Africa, geared toward assisting communities in developing nations through the use of skills learned from our technologically advanced society. The Field Program has now partially shifted its emphasis, reflecting student interests, towards community work within the United States.

Most of the seniors interviewed participated in field work sometime during their years at Merrill and thought that these experiences were valuable to them. However, many seniors felt that returnees from field work were not utilized. They did not relate their experiences back to the students
at Merrill, which represents a definite weakness. Students returning from field work could be used on panels and to lead discussions that would better inform and encourage the incoming students to participate in the Field Work Program.

Another weakness of the Field Work Program, which relates closely to that previously mentioned is that the vast majority of freshmen interviewed were uninformed about field work. Most thought that they might be interested in field work, but seldom did responses include a specific field work project. The newsletter that was distributed was interesting and immensely valuable, in that it sets forth problems, weaknesses, and suggestions. But, such a document should be circulated at the beginning of the year, during orientation week.

More encouragement and information are needed concerning field work. Newsletters denoting current developments in field work should be issued at least once a quarter. Discussions and panels using the resources that field work returnees offer should occur during orientation week and at least once a quarter and hopefully more often.

The field program was thought to relate to the theme of Merrill by most students. But it must be considered here that the students that responded this way were mainly from white upper-middle class backrounds, and more than likely have biased viewpoints.
NON-ACADEMIC LIFE

The discussion of social life was originally based on its relation to the theme. It was difficult to separate this brand of social life from any other, as both are only two sides of the same coin. Thus, what follows is a quick look at non-academic life with some references to the theme. For a more indepth discussion of the same issue consult the report on residential life.

The strengths underlying Merrill's social life is primarily its freedom. Most students feel that they have the opportunity to initiate activities that they wish to stage. But the students also enjoy planned activities like College Nights and those faculty-student get-togethers that have taken place.

And yet, nearly all students contend that there really is no social life at Merrill. Thus, the weaknesses are myriad and paradoxical. While students find the freedom pleasant they do not take advantage of it to any great extent. But they still believe that unplanned, rather than planned, events are the most rewarding. Further complicating the matter, it was found that students see a need for more planned events. Those desired activities most often named were speakers on various subjects, more informal College Nights, College Night entertainment relating to the theme, but also, entertainment from within the college, and finally they express a desire for movies and other light entertainment.

The social life at Merrill would certainly be enhanced if more planned activities were in the making. Hopefully then, students might begin to feel that Merrill was a community in a very real way and would start to take that
social initiative they believe is present. And so we recommend that the Activities Committee co-ordinate and expand activities at Merrill. They should arrange for theme oriented entertainment for College Nights, as well as entertainment from within the college. Less informal College Nights, like the sit-on-the-floor dinners that have taken place, should occur more often.

Speakers, not only concerned with the core course, should be encouraged to come to Merrill at different times throughout the school year. The Activities Committee might assist the Non-Profit Film Club in showing more films of a less academic nature than those previously suggested.

In general then, the Activities Committee should not only originate activities at the college but also provide assistance and an information outlet for activities sponsored by various groups within the college.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Following is a delineation of those recommendations suggested in the body of our report.

Theme

Merrill should begin to phase out the term Third World as a label for the college theme. The Steering Committee, or a group similarly composed and under the direction of the Steering Committee, should consult, near the end of each year, with present standing committees concerned with Merrill life. The purpose of this consultation is to evaluate Merrill's then present direction, determine what changes, if any, should be made, and what paths Merrill feels it should follow in the coming year. It would then be this group's duty to write and re-write all Merrill literature (i.e. catalogue descriptions of the college) to adequately represent the realities and hopes for the college at that time.

Academic Program

Juniors and seniors who have partaken of full time field work should sit in on core course seminars to (1) better facilitate discussion in seminars; (2) provide an outlet for field work returnees to discuss their experiences; (3) allow freshmen and field work participants an opportunity to create more than superficial relationships with another segment of the Merrill community, thus better cementing each's place in the community; and (4) provide valuable teaching experience for those students involved.

Attempts should be made to make the core course relevant to the entire college. The core course leaders, working in co-ordination with the Activities Committee, could bring speakers and films to the college that not only re-
late to the core course but would be of interest to the entire community. We recommend that the comprehensive plan set forth by John Isbister to satisfy breadth requirements be gradually developed and implemented into the academic program. More immediate, however, is the need for natural science seminars designed for the non-science major.

Finally, Merrill needs a process whereby students of similar academic interests can come together into workshops for the specific purpose of creating a course. The course would involve a faculty advisor and would be approved in the same manner as Student Directed Seminars. However, the course would be taught by no one individual and involvement in the course could be restricted to its creators if they so wished.

Field Program

The Field Committee must take it upon itself to constantly inform the community on what is taking place in the Field Program. A newsletter should come out during orientation week largely for the benefit of new students, and then at various times throughout the year. Field work participants should be given full opportunity to discuss their experiences, not only in the core course, but in seminars and panel discussions that should occur at least once per quarter.

Non-Academic Life

The Activities Committee should originate and co-ordinate activities at Merrill. Besides working with the core course to bring speakers to Merrill, the committee should invite speakers from time to time. Movies of various types should occur more often. Theme oriented and also college based entertainment is warranted for College Nights. And finally, there is an expressed need for less formal College Nights.
INTERVIEW WITH PROVOST BELL

1. How did Merrill get its theme? There is evidence that the study of and adequate preparation in a foreign language would have been greatly emphasized at Merrill. What happened to this emphasis?

2. In your opinion what does "Third World" mean? Does Merrill, as it is now, reflect that definition? If so, how? If not, why?

3. How does Merrill differ from your original expectations?

4. Do you think any minority groups are under-represented at Merrill? If so, what are the causes of this?

5. Would you have liked to have seen Merrill as a politically active school oriented toward the Third World—rather than basically community help oriented (for example—just studying and then working in Third World communities)? What kind of action and political involvement would you have liked to have seen?

6. Was life at Merrill intended to be reflective of Third World cultures—rather than just in the academic sense? If not, why not? If so, why hasn't it?

7. Since Merrill's beginnings has the basic theme been altered in your mind? If so, in what way? Have you seen any changes in the core course? If so, in what way?

(From what I've read, Merrill's original emphasis was basically geared towards the study of underdevelopment in non-Western societies and the utilization of Western technology to help them improve. But now the emphasis seems to have shifted towards more study of U.S. minorities, although non-Western societies are still very important, and more observational community work—with the concept that Third World cultures are as valid as our own. Is this how you see it?)

8. Originally, there were thoughts of making field work required. What happened to this idea? Do you think it should be required? Why or why not?

9. In your opinion, is Merrill achieving its original goals? If not, how and why has it failed?
want to go? What would you want to do?

3. In your mind, how is the Field Program related to the Merrill Third World theme?

4. Do you think field work should be required? Why or why not?

D. Non-Academic Life

1. Have you ever talked to your advisor? How often? About what?

2. Do you know your preceptor? Have you ever had occasion to meet with them socially? When? Would you like to?

3. Have you ever met with other faculty or administrators socially? Do you think there should be more faculty-student get-togethers? How would you go about this and when?

4. Do you feel that the social life at Merrill should reflect the Third World theme? What kinds of activities would you like to see?
A. Theme

1. Has the theme or emphasis at Merrill changed since you've been here? How?

2. Is Merrill a Third World college in your mind? Why or why not? What should be done to make it more "Third World?"

3. Should Merrill's theme be changed? How and into what? Why shouldn't it?

4. Has Merrill lived up to your expectations? How or why not?

B. Academic Program

1. Have you ever taken any Merrill courses? Which ones?

2. In general what do you think of Merrill's course offerings?

3. Should the Merrill seminars (44 and 144) be more closely related to the theme? Why or why not?

4. If you were designing a core course for Merrill what subjects would you offer? Would you delete any that are now offered?

5. Should the core course be required? Why or why not? If so, how many quarters?

6. If you were able to select 3 professors for Merrill what disciplines would they be from?

C. Field Program

1. Have you ever done field work? What kind and where? Why not?

2. Do you feel that the Field Program is closely related to the theme? Why or why not?

3. Should field work be required? Why or why not?

D. Non-Academic Life

1. Did you ever get to know your advisors or other faculty well? If not, would you have liked to? Why didn't you?

2. How would you describe the social life at Merrill? What could be done to make it better? Whose responsibility is this?

3. Should college nights better reflect the theme? Why or why not?

4. If there was one thing you would liked to have seen changed at Merrill, what would it be?
We approached the study of Merrill Government on two fronts. The first being a study of the opinions, actions and awareness of the governmental process of those who have not been involved in the system. Secondly we approached those who have been involved in Merrill Government and observed the system directly. An indepth study of the Administration was carried out. From this we gathered the strengths and weaknesses of what we feel truly exists and have made recommendations.
Power as viewed by the People

"First we must get an operating, effective, responsible governance system which can wisely guide us on our path; one which is generally understood, widely participated and believed in..." Provost Phillip Bell Jan. 6, 1970

In order to assess how well Merrill students understand and believe in the system of governance at their college we have conducted a quiz-questionnaire of Merrill students and faculty.

The questionnaire was placed in every student and faculty mailbox. We received 60 responses from students. Only 1 faculty member replied.

The responses are obviously skewed toward those who know something about how Merrill government operates. It is reasonable to assume that those students and faculty who know absolutely nothing about Merrill governance would not respond at all.

The survey sought to answer the following questions:

1) Are members of Merrill College generally aware of the different parts of the system of governance?

2) Do people understand how important decisions are made?

3) Do people understand the functions of major committees?

4) How do people generally perceive the power relationships within the college?

I Identifying major committees

The Merrill Faculty by-laws empower 5 committees to conduct business on behalf of the college. These committees are:

Fellows Committee  Field Committee
Promotion and Tenure Committee  Graduate Committee
Steering Committee  Library Committee
Academic Standing Committee  

(The questionnaire erred in stating that there were 7 committees).
The number of committees correctly identified by the respondents was very low. One quarter of the respondents could not name even one committee. Only 8% of the respondents could correctly identify all 5 committees. Many people listed committees which operate in Merrill but are not named in the by-laws such as the Residential Council, Finance Committee, Judiciary Committee, College Night Committee or Provost Search Committee.

Obviously, most students do not have a clear or adequate understanding of the decision making bodies which are most basic to governance of Merrill.

II Recognizing how important decisions are made

We also asked the students, "Who decides on the hiring of faculty at Merrill?" We offered multiple choices which were selected as follows:

A. Promotion and Tenure Committee
B. Merrill Faculty Search Committee
C. Steering Committee
D. Provost Bell

Only 25% of the students correctly identified the Steering Committee as the body primarily responsible for making college recommendations on the hiring of new faculty. Even though the Merrill Faculty Search Committee is a fictitious body it was selected by 25% of the respondents.

Clearly, most students at Merrill do not understand how their faculty is hired.

II B A second question aimed at determining how well students understand how important decisions are made:

"Who determines intervisitation policy at Merrill?"

Students responded to the multiple choices offered as
follows:

A. Steering Committee
B. Provost Bell
C. Visitors Committee
D. Residential Council

One third of the respondents correctly identified Mr. Bell as primarily responsible for decisions concerning inter-visitation. The remaining 2/3 of the respondents were not aware of how this decision was made.

III Understanding College Financing

We asked the students how much money they thought comes from four main sources each year. The choices were as follows:

A. State Funds
B. Student Housing Fees
C. Student Registration Fees
D. Gifts and donations

Most students at Merrill have absolutely no idea of how much money come from the four main sources of funds. Most students who answered this question simply guessed at the relative amount of money originating from each source.

III B Merrill College was awarded $650,000 by the Merrill Foundation for capital improvements in the college. In order to determine if students understood how this large sum of money was allocated for the construction of their college we asked, "How much did the Provost's House cost?" Here is how the responses were distributed:

A. Under 50,000
B. 50,000-100,000
C. 100,000-150,000
D. 150,000 and up
Only 16% of the respondents correctly recognized the house to have cost over $100,000. Exactly how much the house cost, even we were not certain. A majority of respondents incorrectly guessed the house to cost less than $100,000.

IV Is the Steering Committee believed in?

The Steering Committee is commonly described as the heart of Merrill College governance. The committee has met weekly for over 2 years. We asked the students if, to their knowledge, the Steering Committee has taken any action which has significantly affected their lives at Merrill. Only 1/3 of the respondents answered yes, and of those who responded affirmatively, the Steering Committee support of co-residential living was the "relevant" decision most commonly pointed to. Other significant Steering Committee actions mentioned by respondents were:

1) co-residential living 8 responses
2) hiring faculty 3 responses
3) Retaining Ruth Needleman
Faculty Student Barbecue
Advising Bell
Pet Policies
Credit for VIA 1 response each

The Steering Committee visibility or credibility in student eyes is very low indeed. Ironically, the decision of importance which students most commonly point to was about an issue brought to the Steering Committee over the objections of the Provost.

V Student perceptions of power relationships

Our last question to the Merrill Community was the most involved. We asked the people to match college functions with
the people or groups that mastermind them. The question was set up in the following manner:

**College People and Groups**

A. Provost Bell  
B. Steering Committee  
C. Isabel Jordan  
D. Promotion and Tenure  
E. Merrill faculty  
F. Merrill students  
G. Stu Schlegel  
H. Anne Reid

**College Functions**

- College financing  
- Regulating student morality  
- Planning college academic program  
- Planning college nights  
- Student discipline  
- Firing faculty  
- Maintaining residential facilities  
- Choosing new Provost

The responses to this question were interesting to evaluate. Provost Bell, the Steering Committee and the Merrill students were by far chosen the most often. All three appeared in the top three choices for five out of the eight functions. They seemed to overwhelm all other choices, perhaps, because they are the most familiar and/or the easiest to use as scapegoat.

However, generally, the matching of groups to functions was correctly assessed. The responses showed that the people see the power held by Provost Bell in the main, the Steering Committee anything that Provost Bell cannot handle or, perhaps, does not want to handle) and, ironically, the Merrill students themselves. They see an elitist population of the school involved in college politics, but see themselves as having nothing to do with it.

Summarily, the questionnaire was helpful in showing the
lack of consciousness in the Merrill Community. Politics, in
general, are considered taken care of by those few people and
groups with power. At the same time complaints are freely
spoken by these same people.

From the majority of the students who filled out this
questionnaire I perceived that the power structure was neither
understood, participated in or believed in. The question
remains, "How can we alleviate this situation?"
In the opinion of the involved.......

During our interviews with people at Merrill College who had been involved or are involved in Merrill government, we could see several common conceptions and a few interesting differences about Merrill government.

The Provost is seen as an inherent part of Merrill government. He was given full rein in the creation and development of Merrill College, with very few restrictions imposed upon him by the Central Administration. He handpicked the first half of the Merrill faculty and had a great influence in the selection of the second half of the faculty, those who would support and continue his system. During the early, formative months at Merrill College the Provost dominated life at Merrill College with few exceptions. His position as the central figure of authority is still very much alive but during the more recent years his control over life here has been lessened. The explanation that we received for the Provost's omnipotence is as follows:

When Merrill first began everyone was a "freshman" except the Provost. No one knew each other, no one knew what was required of them nor what their potentials were. No one except the Provost who had set the system up. Progressively the faculty and students of Merrill College have "learned the ropes". They have learned how to work the system of governance that the Provost set up and the system that exists outside of Merrill (the Central Administration and Academic Senate). Thus, no longer the only manipulator of the system, the Provost's influence has been lessened slightly.

However, the Provost still possesses the greatest policy making power. He sits on all committees, which are advisory to
him and receives much of the communications with the outside (Central Administration) world. Up until now very little policy has been made inside Merrill, policy has been made in the Chancellor's office and in the Council of Provosts meetings.

Merrill College government is a series of Provost advisory committees. Our interviewees perceived the system as functioning smoothly but several very basic problems of propriety were repeatedly mentioned. No one saw the system working as well as Phil Bell who said:

Basically, as I see it all decisions about Merrill College and its future are housed in our central committees -- the Promotion and Tenure Committee on all tenure appointments, promotions, and merit increases; the Judiciary Committee on all student discipline and adjudication of related matters; the Student Finance Committee on all student monies; the Library Committee on library matters; the Field Committee on those matters; and the Steering Committee for all business out of the Provost's Office of a college nature not properly the preserve of one of our other committees.

Most of our interviewees saw our committees handling the concerns that were brought to them efficiently. The problems that they saw in the present system of committees were: 1) with access to information and the caliber of concerns brought to the committee, 2) the resources that they had to function with and 3) with their stature as merely advisory.

At the present time the committees must rely upon the Provost as a source for most of their information and business. The major problem with this has been that many questions have been brought to the committees at the last minute. Thus the committees have too often made hasty and superficial decisions. Many times the wishes of the Provost were accepted with cut debate due to
would like to see the Steering Committee consider itself more with policy and less with administration. The committee is seen to work well because of its small numbers, regular meetings and openness.

The Steering Committee is seen by everyone as representing the community at Merrill. As far as being representative, those involved see the faculty and administration as being such and the student members as not. This, obviously, weakens their effectiveness.

Student government at Merrill has been very sporadic and lacking participation on an acceptable (representative) scale. It changes in form and focus as rapidly as the students who compose it. The task of educating new students in the ways of Merrill government is a weary one, yet ignorance of the citizen is a very big problem. Student participation is stifled in ways similar to other areas of Merrill government e.g. lack of resources, information, influence, rewards and availability; and is stifled further by factors mentioned in other group's papers.

The nullification of the Town Meeting and the instatement of the General Assembly and addition of the Dorm Council in the Spring of 1971 was an attempt to increase the participation and interest of the student body and to facilitate the job of representation for those students on the Steering Committee. This change has failed to attract off-campus students and resident student envolvement is still poor. Students are potentially well represented through the Dorm Council.
Student related problems have rarely been resolved competently. Student Committees have been used at the whims of the students and the Provost. During the first year and part of the second of Merrill's existence, Workshops and Town Meetings were still functioning and many student concerns were handled in Steering Committee. It was never clear to those involved who had or could take authority for student matters. At one point the Steering Committee "decided no controversial community issues should be discussed, not any community decision reached, at any meeting other than the Town Meeting." But the Town Meeting was unwieldy, uneducated, and unproductive. They were meetings of the student community only. Continuity and patience are required for a consensus, neither of which the Town Meeting had.

Part of the purpose of the Town Meeting was to act as a check on the Steering Committee. In reality the two bodies stumbled over each other and problems were never resolved. For the number of issues at Merrill College too much energy was spent. As the Town Meeting faded out, student matters were left to the overburdened (with trivia) Steering Committee. The Dorm Council could if used effectively take over these problems.

Fellows see themselves as having some of the weaknesses of the students. Having a smaller number Fellows work better together when they get together. There is the element of continuity among them which is lacking with the students and they respond with better participation. They have greater access to information; the Provost being one of their numbers and some of the Fellows being on the Academic Senate. They have a Steno Pool
and various other resources and some enumerated power from
the Academic Senate. However their meetings are described as
uninteresting and concerned with trivia. Much of the Fellows
decision making takes place through intra-office communication,
but it takes place.
A study of Merrill College Administration

OVERVIEW

Broadly conceived, the purpose of this study is to help us come to terms with the question of how the processes of bureaucratic administration determine the quality of life of those persons who work and live within the college.

A lot has been written about bureaucracies since Max Weber first successfully defined the essential characteristics, presuppositions, and causes of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy, it has been said, is man's only social invention since the tribe. Bureaucracies are the dominant form of social organization today.

I understand bureaucracy to mean a specific form of social organization. I am not using the term lightly or indiscriminately. Bureaucracy is not simply synonymous with the "Establishment." It means much more. A typical bureaucracy consists of the following elements:

1. a well-defined chain of command; a hierarchical structure
2. secrecy
3. impersonality in human relations
4. a division of labor based on specialization
5. permanence and resistance to innovation

This study will show in what ways the Merrill Administration exhibits the standard bureaucratic features, and how the patterns of interaction among people at Merrill are strongly influenced by these elements.

The recommendations and conclusions of this study will be drawn directly from the experiences and observations of the people that work in the Merrill office.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The organizational structure is primarily determined by three factors.

The first of these factors is Merrill's relationships to the larger
administrative framework of the University of California system. "Santa Cruz being only one small unit in a vast university, the norms of the greater whole were bound to loom large. In short the Santa Cruz College was superimposed on a set of existing administrative patterns, and was serviced heavily from the centre."\(^1\) Although U. C. Santa Cruz is moving toward greater decentralization, Merrill is still linked to the central structure in many important ways. While Central Services has been all too willing to decentralize petty clerical tasks, such as the distribution of study list packets, the processes of policy formation are still strongly centralized.

The Merrill Administration is linked to the central bureaucracy in a formal and informal way. Formally, the Provost is the chief administrative officer of the college and bears primary responsibility for governing the college. The college is linked informally to the wider system insofar as it models the patterns of organization of other units within the system. Like the other colleges, Merrill has Senior Preceptors, a Bursar, and an administrative assistant. Each of these college administrators interact in varying degrees with their counterparts in the other colleges.

The second factor which significantly determined the organizational structure of the Merrill Administration is the simple fact that we know no other way of organizing ourselves other than bureaucratically. The motive factors which influence the way we organize ourselves are so deeply ingrained that the rise of the organizational pyramid and concentration of power at the top goes virtually unnoticed. Robert Townsend, in *Up the Organization*, states "There's nothing fundamentally wrong with our country except that the leaders of all our major organizations are operating on the wrong assumptions. We're in this mess because for the last two hundred years we've been using the
Catholic Church and Caesar's legions as our patterns for creating organizations."

Knowing no better alternative, the Merrill Administration has developed a well-defined hierarchy. The activities of supervising and being supervised consumes a significant portion of everybody's activity in the office. Provost Bell lists his responsibilities simply as "overseeing everything." He specifically oversees the work of Lois Bennett, his secretary; Mary Finnegan, College Assistant; and Isabel Jordan, the Bursar. The Provost also oversees the Senior Preceptors, Anne Reid and Stu Schlegel.

The Senior Preceptors supervise their secretary, Wanda Jett. Isabel supervises her assistant, Gail Caldieri. And Mary supervises Gloria Rodriguez, the college receptionist. Almost everybody supervises the Work/Study students.

The explicitly-defined hierarchical structure of the Merrill Administration can be represented by the following table of organization:
The third factor which determines the organizational structure of the Merrill Administration is the physical environment in general and the physical floor plan of the office in particular.

The health and productivity of any administration can be directly correlated with the physical features of the office facilities.

After years of perceptive and painstaking research, organizational theorists have devised a formula which effectively correlates the healthy productivity (HP factor) of the administration with the physical facilities. The formula is:

\[
HP = \frac{p^2 + \sqrt{W}}{C(D + E) + B}
\]

Where:  
- \( p \) = the number of people working in the office who are in direct visual contact with one or more co-workers for the greater part of the day
- \( W \) = the square footage of exterior windows
- \( C \) = the number of compartmentalized office spaces
- \( D \) = the number of office doors closed for more than half of the day
- \( E \) = the number of private entrances into the complex
- \( B \) = the number of counter barriers or desks-as-counter barriers.

Using this formula an HP factor of one indicates the average healthy productivity of a typical bureaucratic administration. A HP of greater than one indicates that the organization has recognized and overcome one or more constraints on its capacity for healthy and effective productivity. A HP factor of less than one indicates that the organization is in deep trouble.

The HP factor for the Merrill Office may be computed as follows:

\[
HP = \frac{4^2 + \sqrt{12}}{7(4 + 2) + 7} = \frac{27}{49} = .55
\]

The accuracy of this formula is substantiated by the general dissatisfaction voiced by the people who work in the office with the facilities. Many of the people who responded to our questionnaire complained that the office
is too small. Accordingly the college has committed $15,000 in Capital Improvement funds for the expansion and renovation of the office facilities. What is not commonly recognized, however, is that the size of the office is not a significant variable in determining the healthy productivity factor, except in extreme cases where people are so crowded that normal movements of the upper limbs is impaired.

USES OF INFORMATION

The primary function of the Merrill Administration is to regulate and direct the rate and flow of information into and out of the office. In this portion of the study we will examine the dominant features of this information control system.

Generally two types of information is received by the people in the office. First, a lot of information comes from "above," that is, from other parts of the University system which have authority over individuals or facilities within the college. This type of information generally enters the office in a written form such as memos, letters, or minutes of meetings.

The second type of information is that which is received from below, from the individuals within the college who are under the supervision of the administration. This type of information commonly takes the form of verbal communications.

So it is that information enters from above and below. From above it often takes an emperative form, from below it takes an interrogative form. Very little information enters the office horizontally. This is because Merrill is structured as a linear-hierarchy, where all superordinates are connected by neat lines to subordinates. These lines are equivalent to the words "communications with."
Because the Merrill Administration is structured to permit a flow of information along vertical channels only, it is acutely sensitive and vulnerable to information which enters the system horizontally. Horizontal inputs are as disruptive to the flow of vertical information as a drunk driver who might happen to cut directly across six lanes of a busy freeway. This is why students are not allowed to talk with the Provost without first having established contacts with two to seven of the Provost's subordinates. This is what is called going through channels.

Clearly, some channels are more open than others. Some types of information pass through the office faster than other types of information, just as it is easier to drive on some streets than others.

After a recent fire alarm in A dorm late one night, Mr. Bell was able to draft a memo admonishing the unknown culprits and he had that memo distributed to all students by 10:00 am the next morning. Elapsed time 12 hours/2 office hrs.

On the other hand, some forms of information take months or even years to pass through the office system. Examples in the variance in the rate of flow can be illustrated by the following cases:

- Mr. Bell announces his intent to go on leave Spring quarter 1971 two and one-half months after he made the decision, two weeks before he leaves.

- Mr. Bell announces to the Steering Committee that the Gruen Report on housing conditions has been received and that he has drafted a response to the report on behalf of the college, two months after the report was received, one week after he had answered the study on behalf of the college.

- Mr. Bell announces that the bidding specifications for the food contract are under review for revision, two and one-half months after the specifications are received by the college, two weeks before the deadline.
- Student members of the Steering Committee are notified that they must make appointments to the Academic Senate Committee three weeks after notice is received in the College Office, one day after the deadline for response.

The difference in the rate of information flow is also illustrated by the time record of the responses to the questionnaire we submitted to the people who work in the office. We requested written responses to our questions be returned within one week. Only one person responded within the requested deadline. The responses were received in the following order:

Wanda Jett - one day before the deadline  
Phil Bell and Lois Bennett - dated one day after the deadline, received fourteen days after the deadline  
Mary Finnegan - received three days after the deadline  
Stu Schlegel - four days after the deadline  
Isabel Jordan - six days after the deadline  
Anne Reid - 21 days after the deadline  
Gail Caldieri - not yet received 40 days after the deadline  
Gloria Rodriguea - not yet received 40 days after the deadline

Each of these people are positioned strategically along the vital channels of information flow. When asked to define the nature and functions of their job, each person described his role as coping with information in one of several ways. Each person corresponds to and interacts with the information flow just as the diverse traffic-control mechanisms in a large city direct the flow of automobile traffic. Some people in the office act as traffic lights by "sorting and co-ordinating the flow of information." Sometimes they "facilitate" the information (green light), sometimes they slow down and "screen" the information (yellow light), but more often than not, they simply stop and store the information (red light). This is called filing.

Traffic lights are a purely mechanical means of controlling information which are only along the lower levels of the Merrill office, where the flow of information-traffic is relatively constant.
At the higher administrative levels a certain degree of judgment is needed to regulate the flow. The persons who make judgments correspond to traffic control officers (traffic cops). Their job is to sort, interpret, and coordinate traffic-information patterns.

Also encountered in large cities are physical barriers such as one-way streets, road blocks, detours, and traffic lights that just don't work. The Merrill office has many information barriers.

For example, identical forms of information may vary in its rate of flow according to the direction of the flow. The Gruen Report on housing conditions at UCSC is a classic example of the one-way street principle. Many of the points made by the Gruen Report are simply verbatim reports of what students have been saying for years. But what the students had been saying, from below, was never fully recognized or responded to by the Provost. It was only after the same information entered the office from above, (the report was forwarded to the college under a cover letter from the Chancellor) that the important facts of alienation of residential life were listened to and responded to by the Provost.

The point of this discourse and the relevance of our analogy is that the information control system of the Merrill office is must as burdensome and inefficient as the traffic control systems of any major city. In any city it is easier and quicker to walk or ride a bicycle than it is to drive a car. Similarly, in the Merrill office, it is only the little things, the trivia and the miscellany that pass rapidly through the office. If the city bus is full, or if the college information is important or relevant, then a long and costly delay is guaranteed. The law of the urban traveler is that the shortest distance between two points is always under, over, around, but never
through the center of the city. Correspondingly, most Merrill students have learned that it is frustrating and costly to depend on the Merrill office for prompt or accurate information.

THE PSYCHO-SOCIAL DIMENSION

In the preceding sections we have examined the organizational structure of the college administration and the patterns of information flow. We will now turn to the human dimensions.

From the responses submitted by the different people in the office we can make the following observations about the psycho-social environment.

1. Everyone feels busy. The work load varies, but the people in the office rarely have an opportunity for idle reflection. The Merrill office operates naturally in accordance with Parkinson's Law - "Work expands so as to fill the time available for its completion."

2. Over half of the people in the office feel overloaded with trivial details or busy work. Persons who are heavily pressured by the infringement of petty or minor clerical details on their capacity for innovation, reflection or planning respond to the pressure in one of two ways:
   1) They transfer the busy work down the hierarchy (decentralization)
   2) Set up time barriers (office hours) to sort out different phases of the work. Neither technique is particularly successful. In the first case energy is merely shifted from performing the busy work to supervising the performance of the busy work. In the latter case most of the energy that might be saved is directed instead to enforcing the time barriers.

3. Generally people believe things are running smoothly. Mr. Bell's recent letter to Merrill parents expresses this belief as follows:
"It is starting out to be easily our best year so far which should be the case as we gain experience and a little wisdom....With the pangs of birth and the difficulties of crawling, stumbling and then learning how to walk now behind us, and with this hopeful new constructive realism I sense in our faculty and students, it is the right time to get our ideas and program on a really solid footing."

This feeling that things are becoming easier is called "Hubris."

Concerning Hubris, Townsend warns us "In business, as elsewhere, Hubris is the unforgivable sin of acting cocky when things are going well. As the Greeks tiresomely told us, Hubris is followed inexorably and inevitably by Nemesis."

4. The office feels crowded.

5. The people who work in the office feel isolated from each other. Generally, the people who responded expressed satisfaction with the working relationships between the people immediately above and below themselves in the hierarchy, but they lack a feeling of closeness to all the other people in the office. One person expressed her feeling that she found esprit de corps entirely lacking in the Merrill Office." Another person expressed the need for more communication between all of us and the sharing of ideas and complaints."

6. All of the non-academic staff expressed feelings of being isolated from the rest of the college. "I do believe," wrote one person, "that the staff as a whole could be more involved in the college activities and the college community. I think this helps make a job more pleasurable and more meaningful."
Another person commented that there is a need for "More staff involvement in 'student/faculty' activities. Staff need to be actively involved or they feel they are intruding."

One person observed that increased contact between staff and students is necessary because "A somewhat better understanding on the part of faculty and students of basic procedures would be helpful. For example, most faculty members seem to have no knowledge and little acceptance of the way Merrill assigns advisors to students - this in spite of the fact that they supposedly helped formulate the policy. Change of any procedure is fine, but without acceptance of a procedure while it is in force, it is impossible to determine whether or nor the procedure is working."

**RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

Instead of our current process of forcing people to adapt to the needs of the organization, we must find a way to build an organization around the needs of our people.

Developing alternative realities will not be an easy task. Max Weber warned us long ago that "Once it is fully established, bureaucracy is among those social structures which are the hardest to destroy." As Paul Goodman has pointed out "In the nature of the case the very changes that are needed are the ones that administrations must resist, for they curtail administration's reasons for being and jeopardize its security."

A classic example of this fact was the comment of the Merrill secretary who defined her job in response not to the needs of the people around her, but in response to the needs of the institution and to "keeping the bureaucracy running as smoothly as possible."
What I propose is more than simply redrawing the organizational chart, more than simply a change of Provosts, more than flexible office hours. What I propose is that Merrill College make a serious commitment toward evolving adaptive and human patterns of organization and growth.

The key to the transformation of Merrill College is a revitalization of the role of Provost and a redefinition of the nature of leadership within the college.

In a mastery of understatement the Provosts have informed the Chancellor "At present the role of the Provost is not as enjoyable as originally envisioned." They cite: "The distraction of mounting administrative duties due to unresponsive service units and increasingly complex forms and procedures."

Instead of being burdened in administrative detail they rightfully argue that "Provosts should be educational leaders and researchers...They should be able to initiate meaningful reform and innovation themselves and be able to support proposals of others that they deem worthwhile."

What has become increasingly apparent over the past few years is that the idea of Provost as the omnipotent administrator at the top of the organizational pyramid creates unnecessary and unacceptable load for both the Provost and his community. Because Mr. Bell is burdened with the task of "overseeing everything" he has little or no time to innovate anything."
"It is quaint to think," writes Warren Bennis, "that one man no matter how omniscient and omnipotent, can comprehend, to say nothing of control the diversity and complexity of the modern organization. Followers and leaders who think this is possible get entrapped in a false dream, a child's fantasy of absolute power and absolute dependence."

To paraphrase Bennis, the idea of having a finger in every pie or a voice on every committee may well be an occupational disease of "Provosts," but it is fast becoming outmoded.

A team effort is needed at Merrill. A team effort would mean that we forfeit our dependence on structural authority and hierarchical dominance. A team effort would mean that the Provost is relieved of the burden of overseeing everything, that he is relieved of the necessity of "playing the field."

An administrative team at Merrill would trust each individual member of the team to carry his or her assignment free of hierarchical bonds or constant supervision. If people can't be trusted to do their particular job competently then they shouldn't be on the team.

A second distinguishing feature of a team effort at Merrill would be that the Provost would share with the wider college community the opportunity of setting community goals and objectives. The Provost would no longer be alone in the huddle, and we'd all know the game plan.

"In the best organizations," writes Townsend, "people see themselves working in a circle, as if around one table. One of the positions is designated chief executive officer, because somebody has to make all those tactical decisions that enable an organization to keep working. In this circular organization, leadership passes from one to another depending on
the particular task being attacked — without any hangups."

Such a revitalization of the Provost's role would do much to encourage flexibility, unity, and innovation in the office and the college. But we can do more. Consider the following opportunities for innovation.

1. **Involving the office staff in the life of the college.**

   The office staff should be encouraged to participate as much as they would like in the life of the college by taking classes, attending college nights and generally participating in college activities.

2. **Involving students and faculty in the life of the office.**

   Similarly faculty and students should be encouraged to be a more viable (livable) part of the administration. Space in the soon to be expanded office should be made available to faculty and students who are working on college projects. Many of the staff expressed the need and desire to have more responsible student involvement (other than work study students) in college operations and planning.

   The people who now work in the office must make room for others to become involved in a figurative and literal sense. A change of attitude is very important in this regard. It would be best if the office could be seen as an available resource center, designed to assist the people who work and live in the college in fulfilling their needs and functions, instead of a place whose only purpose is to keep the bureaucracy running smoothly.

3. **Improving internal office communications.**

   Merrill should have regular staff meetings at least once a week to share information, problems, interpersonal difficulties and ideas for new direction and growth. The idea of having an administrative team that runs most of its plays without ever meeting in the huddle will prove to be disastrous in the long run.
4. Assigning responsibility clearly.

Job descriptions, as a basis for selection of college personnel, often tend to be a listing of petty responsibilities, rather than a description of a clear and meaningful activity or function. Sometimes tasks are added to the job description just so that it appears that there are enough things to do to fill up a 40 hour work week, and if the enough minor tasks can't be dreamed up to fill out a list, then the same tasks will be described differently.

The functions and activities of the office staff should be fully re-evaluated. First, we should decide what really needs doing, and also what really is not meaningful or important. Areas of general responsibility should be clearly defined and individuals should be assigned to these areas with the understanding that they should shoulder the responsibility as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Flexible office hours should be encouraged. A 40 hour work week should not be rigidly enforced. People should work in response to the work load and not in response to the clock. Flexible office hours, part time employees and a skeleton office staff in the summer would improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the office.

5. A willingness to experiment

This paper should not prescribe specific adjustments in the college operation. To be most effective these adjustments must be made by the people who they will affect. What I hope this paper has accomplished, is that it serves as a source of encouragement for thoughtful innovation and change, which is after all, what Merrill College is supposed to be all about.
Much of the bureaucracy at Merrill is the result of the college's passive intertwining with the bureaucratic organization of the central administration. The college office and many members of college committees perceive the university's forms, methods, and policies as the only existing and "proper" procedures and guidelines for change. This mentality which causes problems, functions, and inquiries to be directed into pre-existing university processing patterns irregardless of their unsuitability, capability, or cost has attained a critical level. If Merrill is to evolve further and satisfy the requirements of its people, which obviously undergo change; if Merrill is to be adaptable, autonomy from the central administration in affairs of strictly college concern is prerequisite. Crucial to the realization of independence in acting on questions uniquely concerns of the college is the progressive development of the office staff and committee members from bureaucrats to individuals with minds unfettered of the central bureaucracy.

Thus, it remains for all individuals, councils, and committees of Merrill to seize the commitment to act independent of the university with regards to intra-collegiate business. Combined with a redistribution and delineation of powers among college decision making bodies and fluid access to information autonomy will offer a fresh surrogate for
Merrill's, presently, undeveloped social consciousness. Apathy, however, will inevitably continue to be the greatest weakness within the college community.
Merrill's present government, i.e. its committees, administrators, and office staff, is structured too poorly if it is to make wise and efficient use of the human resources which compose it. In summary of our findings, 1) the office employees are misused and inefficient mainly because their individual functions are poorly defined, 2) too much time of the senior preceptors and committee members is spent on secretarial work, 3) the provost is involved with too many committees to be an educational leader and innovator of the college as he should be, 4) time required of committee members is compounded by duplicated functions, inadequate staff support, and difficulty in obtaining and dispersing information. Clearly government inter-relations at Merrill require redevelopment, with specific assignment of roles and their associated powers, if faculty, student, and staff time is not to be wasted.

The diagram on the following page is a suggested form for the re-structuring of the college's government organization. With this form the committees will not be advisory to the staff, but rather the staff will provide information for the committees and administrators. Another function the office staff is responsible for is supplying the committees and administrators with adequate secretarial and clerical service.
The steering committee's responsibility is, as suggested by its name, to steer the college; to plan and innovate but not to administer. College policy should be the primary concern of the steering committee. Steering committee is also charged with the delegation of power and realms of function to all bodies branching from it and the creation of new committees and positions. The steering committee must serve as the moderator and forum for discussion between committees with mutual or related concerns.

Merrill should actively pursue the question of how to pay or reward, adequately, persons who contribute large amounts of time to committee and administration functions. Some suggested rewards are reductions in teaching load and (or) honorariaums.
The provost of Merrill College, as an office and as an individual, possesses functions of substantial importance and inherent responsibility to the college community. From the viewpoint of the central administration the provost is a member of the bureaucracy; authorized certain decision and policy formulating power to be used developing all aspects, academic, residential, etc., of the college. Paramount to the central administration of the university is the use of the provost to insure the continuance of Merrill within constraints synthesized by and derived from the values of the university power elite. Diametric to such a role is the college’s perception of the provost’s office. If the provost is to be an acceptable and credible community leader and representative he must perform without the concerns or additude of a bureaucrat employed by a large hierarchical organization. Predominantly the provost should be the educational leader of the college with a genuine conception of Merrill’s evolving identity. Also the provost is recognized by the bureaucratic structure to be the chief administrator of the college and as a result is of great necessity to governance processes due to official university sanction. On the college level the Merrill Provost is charged with the accurate and vehement support of decisions made by Steering Committee, Dorm council, etc., and the facilitation of those requiring action. The provost must not use his office, as perceived
by the central administration, to modify, misrepresent, or refute decisions arrived at by consensus in a delegated college committee. Dissent can rightfully be shown in no other manner than blockage of consensus. The person of the provost thus must reconcile himself to the responsibilities and difficulties of an office with many delegated powers within a larger systems bureaucracy holding the provost’s office amenable for all decisions, actions, and changes at Merrill.
APPENDIX

Procedures and Sources
QUICKIE QUIZ AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Who runs Merrill College? How are important decisions made within the College? How is money spent? How are faculty hired? Who determines college rules? Who runs your life?

The purpose of this quickie-quiz and questionnaire is to stimulate thought on these important questions. Please take three minutes to answer the following questions, and then take a little longer to ponder the questions you can't answer.

PLEASE, PLEASE, RETURN YOUR COMPLETED QUIZ-QUESTIONNAIRES to the container by the mail boxes or to the College office.

CHECK ONE: Faculty Student CHECK ONE:

- Less than 1 year at Merrill
- 1 to 2 years at Merrill
- 2 to 3 years at Merrill
- More than 3 years here

1) THE MERRILL COLLEGE FACULTY BY-LAWS LIST SEVEN STANDING COMMITTEES WHICH CONDUCT IMPORTANT COLLEGE BUSINESS. HOW MANY OF THESE COMMITTEES CAN YOU LIST?

MULTIPLE CHOICE (Circle the appropriate answer)

2) WHO DECIDES ON THE HIRING OF FACULTY AT MERRILL?
   A. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE
   B. MERRILL FACULTY SEARCH COMMITTEE
   C. STEERING COMMITTEE
   D. PROVOST BELL

3) MERRILL COLLEGE OPERATES ON ROUGHLY $700,000 EACH YEAR. PROBABLY MORE. THE MONEY COMES FROM FOUR MAIN SOURCES. WRITE IN THE SPACES BELOW HOW MUCH YOU THINK THE COLLEGE GETS FROM EACH SOURCE.
   A. STATE FUNDS FROM THE GOVERNOR
   B. STUDENT HOUSING FEES
   C. STUDENT REGISTRATION FEES
   D. GIFTS AND DONATIONS

4) OF THE $700,000, HOW MUCH IS MANAGED BY THE COLLEGE FINANCE COMMITTEE?
   A. $15,000.
5) **Who Determines the Intervisitation Policy at Herrill?**

A. **Steering Committee**
B. **Provost Bell**
C. **Visitors Committee**
D. **Residential Council**

6) **How Much Did the Herrill Provost's House Cost?**

A. **Under $50,000.**
B. **$50,000. to $100,000.**
C. **$100,000. to $150,000.**
D. **Over $150,000.**

7) **Has the Steering Committee Ever Made Any Decisions Which Have Significantly Affected Your Life at Herrill? If Yes, What Were Those Decisions?**

8) **Hatching**

Please match the college officials or committees (left column) with the appropriately corresponding college functions (right column) by representing the letters representing persons or groups before all functions with which they are significantly involved. Each function should have one or more letters before it. Some letters may not be used at all.

**Examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College People and Groups</th>
<th>College Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Provost Bell</td>
<td>A. Naming College Dorms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Steering Committee</td>
<td>B. Approval of College Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Isabel Jordan</td>
<td>C. Regulating Student Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Promotion and Tenure Com.</td>
<td>D. Planning College Academic Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Herrill Faculty</td>
<td>E. Student Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Herrill Students</td>
<td>F. Planning College Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Stu Schlegel</td>
<td>G. Firing Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Arne Reid</td>
<td>H. Maintaining Residential Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Choosing New Provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please Return Completed Questionnaires!**
PROCEDURES FOR PART TWO -- How those involved view Merrill Government

To approach the problem, the first order of business was to have an understanding for ourselves about what was going on so we could ask intelligent questions. We did background research in: special collections, the Merrill Steering Committee minutes, the Fellows minutes, the Town Meeting minutes. We attended various meetings. Then we made up the list of questions on the following page. Using this list as a basis for discussion we interviewed a wide sample of those who have been involved in the past and are involved now. We held both individual and group interviews. Then we synthesized the results.

One thing that we noticed was that only a couple of our interviewees could answer with confidence on all areas of Merrill government. The Faculty often did not know what the students were doing, nor the students about the faculty. Only a few interviewees knew about the financing of Merrill College. Being involved people, they have learned how to get things done, often the hard way, but there are no common ways or methods to get things done and our disorganization is perpetuated. And a government that is not understood can not function effectively.
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

General Governance:
Is our governance coming along well?

How effective is it? How much influence does it have on outcome?

What kind of grand scheme do you see the Provost as having for Merrill governance? What kind of scheme do you have?

Is Merrill government tripartate in nature?

What effect does the government have upon students? Faculty? Administrators? The Central Administration?

Provost:

What are the responsibilities of the Provost?

How much and of what nature is his power?

How much delegation of decision making and responsibility takes place?

How does the Provost work with Committees? Faculty? students? other administrators? Is this the ideal situation?

What effect will having a new Provost have upon Merrill college? What kind of role would you like him to play?

Fellows:

What is the relative power of the Fellows?

What is the influence of the Chairman? the Provost?

What is their relationship to the Steering Committee?

What is this we hear about the Faculty Commons?

What do the Fellows do, what are they responsible for?

Committees:

Do the Committees at Merrill function according to their purpose?

What do they handle? How efficient are they?

What is their relative power?

Who carries out the committees decisions?

What is the role of the Provost?
Steering Committee:
What is the power and authority of the Steering Committee?
What are its responsibilities?
Is it representative?
What should it do?

Student Organizations:
How effective are they?
What is their relative power?
What role should they play in Merrill government?
What happened to the Town Meeting and the Workshops?

Administration:
What is their purpose and role?
What is the power and role of the Bursar? the Senior Preceptors?
  What is their authority? How involved are they in policy making?
Do we suffer from a tyranny of the clerks?

Financing:
Who controls the budgeting?
What are the priorities?

Misc:
Who controls the physical facilities?
Who makes the policy of moral issues i.e., pets, co-ed, intervisitation?
  Is this as it should be?

Suggestions:
What are your ideas concerning the direction that Merrill College
  should take?
How could a balanced power structure be set up?
SYNOPSIS

TEN SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING MERRILL COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

1. DECENTRALIZATION. Merrill should become an autonomous administrative unit. Merrill should make every effort to acquire the capacity to make independent policy decisions relevant to the life of the college.

2. Merrill should make every effort to recentralize or dispose of all bureaucrap, all 79 office forms, all petty clerical functions not essential to the operation of the college.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY. Implementation of the above two suggestions will enable Merrill to restructure the administrative functions so that each member of the college staff is able to assume full responsibility and authority for a clearly defined area of college operations.

4. The administrative team members shall be required to work directly with a representative group of students and faculty within the college. The administrative team members shall be responsible for providing their student and faculty co-workers with prompt and accurate information at all times.

5. The committees are not advisory to the staff, but rather the staff members are advisors to the college committees.

6. STEERING COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITY. The purpose of the steering committee should be to steer, to plan and to innovate, and not to administer. Policy and programs should be the primary concern of the Steering Committee, not petty details.

7. INTEGRATION OF MERRILL OFFICE INTO COLLEGE LIFE. The Merrill Office should be a resource center for the college work groups. Program files should be made available to all interested students and faculty. The office staff should make room for students and faculty to share in the administration of the college in both a physical and philosophical sense.

8. Similarly the Merrill staff should be encouraged to join in the life of the college by taking classes, attending college nights, spending time outside of the office.

9. REWARDS. Some faculty are rewarded for their participation in the governance of the college with salary stipends or reduction of teaching loads. Some faculty and students are penalized for their participation in governance. Merrill should actively pursue the question of how to provide adequate rewards for everyone's participation in the burdens of leadership and administration.

10. Redefining the role of PROVOST. All of the above suggestions should help revitalize the role of Provost. The idea of a pie in every finger, a Provost on every committee is impractical and detrimental. We must help to change the role of Provost from that of overseer and administrator, to that of an innovator and leader.
DRAFT

BY-LAWS OF THE FACULTY OF MERRILL COLLEGE

Chapter 1. General

1.1 Functions of the College. Merrill College is an administrative, residential, and academic unit. As an academic unit, the College is responsible for providing its students with faculty advisers, setting and administering College requirements for graduation, providing course offerings where necessary in support of College requirements, overseeing College sponsored field work activity, sponsoring individual interdisciplinary major programs, and administering minimum scholastic requirements.

1.2 Faculty. The Faculty of Merrill College is composed of Senate members holding appointments therein, provided that some part of their salary is paid by the College.

1.3 Fellows.

1.3.1 The Provost, Deputy Provost, The Bursar, all Preceptors, all Faculty and full time teaching staff, and such other University staff as may be selected by the Fellows shall be Fellows of Merrill College. Such selection shall not increase the total number of Fellows above seventy. The Fellows may also select members of the local community as Fellows of the College, their term of fellowship to be five years, renewable by mutual consent.

1.3.2 The Fellows may select persons who do not hold active appointments on the Santa Cruz campus as Honorary Fellows of Merrill College. The number of such Honorary Fellows shall not exceed fifteen and the term of fellowship is five years, renewable by mutual consent.

Chapter 2. Officers

2.1 Provost. The Provost is the chief administrative officer of the College. He usually presides at Fellows Meetings, and may participate in the deliberations of any committee of the College.

2.2 Deputy Provost. The Deputy Provost acts for the Provost in his absence.

2.3 Senior Academic Preceptor. The Senior Academic Preceptor is responsible for assisting the Provost in all matters concerning academic administration and records and for coordinating the work of academic advisers.

2.4 Senior Preceptor for Student Affairs. The Senior Preceptor for Student Affairs is responsible for assisting the Provost in all matters concerning residence halls and other student affairs, and for coordinating the work of the Resident Preceptor.
2.5 Coordinator for Field Work. The Coordinator of Field Work is responsible for day to day administration of the Field Work Program, under the direction and supervision of the Committee of Field Work.

2.6 Chairman of the Faculty. The Chairman of the Faculty is elected biennially by the Fellows from among their tenured members other than Provost. Should the office become vacant before the completion of a term, a special election is held for a Chairman to fill the remainder of the term. The Chairman of the Faculty presides when the Faculty is meeting as a Committee of the Senate, and usually presides at meetings of the Steering Committee.

2.7 Secretary. The Secretary of the Faculty is elected biennially by the Fellows from among the Faculty. Should the office become vacant before completion of a term, the Chairman of the Faculty shall appoint a replacement for the remainder of the term of office. The Secretary prepares the call for Fellows and Faculty Meetings, keeps minutes and circulates them to all persons eligible to attend such meetings, and conducts all elections and all balloting in the College.

2.8 Terms of Office. Election of the Chairman of the Faculty and of the Secretary occurs in the Spring Term. The two-year term of office in each case begins with the Fall Term following election.

2.9 Preceptors. Preceptors are administrative officers of the College having continuing responsibility for advising students, helping to guide and support student activities both educational and recreational, and aiding in the maintenance of safety and good order.

Chapter 3. Elections

3.1 All elections and all balloting in the College are by mail and are conducted by the Secretary of the Faculty. The Secretary appoints two tellers for each election to count the ballots; and he certifies the results to the Chairman of the Faculty.

3.2 Nominations. Each nominating petition must be signed by two qualified voters and must contain certification of acceptance by the nominee or nominees. Each nominating petition may include as many nominees as there are places to be filled. Nominees must be eligible for election.

3.3 The outcome of an election of officers or committee members is determined in accordance with divisional By-Law 11.4.

3.4 Only Fellows may nominate or participate in selection of Fellows or Honorary Fellows. Nominating petitions must be signed by the Provost and seven other Fellows. Such nominations must be communicated with supporting material to the Fellows at least two weeks in advance of the Fellows Meeting at which the nominees are considered.
Chapter 4. Meetings

4.1 Fellows Meetings are open to all Fellows, Honorary Fellows, and all members of the Standing Committee. They shall be held at least once a term at the call of the Provost or of the Steering Committee. The Provost normally presides, or he may call upon the Deputy Provost or Chairman of the Faculty to preside.

4.2 At the written request of any five Fellows, the Secretary shall call a meeting of the Fellows within eight days, and such a meeting shall be presided over by the Chairman of the Faculty, or, in his absence, the Secretary of the Faculty.

4.3 At Fellows' meetings and meetings of Committees appointed by or under the provision of these By-Laws, Fellows and members of Committees who are not members of the Faculty of the College may join with members of the Faculty in proposing actions involving the exercise of powers of the Academic Senate. No such proposed action shall be effective unless a quorum of members of Faculty is present, and unless the proposal is approved by a majority of that quorum. At a Fellows' meeting, one-third of the Fellows in residence constitutes a quorum for non-Senate business: the quorum for approving Senate business shall be one-third of the Fellows of the College in residence. No College Committee to which the power to act in an executive capacity for the Academic Senate is delegated shall include less than four members of the Faculty. Two-thirds of the members of a Committee who are members of the Faculty of the College shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking any executive Senate business delegated to the Committee.

4.4 At any time during a Fellows' Meeting, the Chairman of the Faculty or, in his absence, the Secretary, may rule pro tempore that the motion under consideration involves exercise of powers of the Academic Senate. If, in the course of any Committee meeting, a dispute arises as to whether motions involve exercise of Senate powers, the matters shall be postponed and referred to the Chairman of the Faculty for his decision.

Chapter 5. Committees

5.1 Steering Committee.

5.1.1 The Executive Committee of the Faculty shall be contained within the Steering Committee of the College.

5.1.2 Members of the Steering Committee shall be: the Provost, two Senior Preceptors, the Chairman of the Faculty, the Secretary of the Faculty, two additional Fellows, and five full-time undergraduates of the College, and one affiliated graduate student. The two additional Fellows shall be elected by the Fellows for staggered terms of two years and shall be selected such that Fellows in each of the Three Academic Divisions are members of the Committee.
5.1.2 **Steering Committee (cont.)**

Elections are held in the Spring Quarter and terms of office begin with the Fall Quarter following election. Should an elected member not complete his term, the replacement is selected by the students of the College. Although the Chairman of the Faculty normally presides, he may delegate this responsibility to another Committee member.

5.1.3 **Duties of the Steering Committee.**

A. To advise officers of the College with regard to all aspects of the administration of the College.

B. After due consultation with the Faculty, to make the College's recommendation concerning all new appointments to untenured positions in the College, and to set before the Committee on Promotion and Tenure recommendations concerning new tenured appointments in the College.

C. To make recommendations about College Requirements for the Bachelor's Degree.

D. To review course offerings, and to submit approved course offerings to the Divisional Committee on Undergraduate Courses.

E. To appoint members to the Committee on Field Work and to the Committee on Academic Standing, in accordance with the appropriate sections of these By-Laws.

5.2 **Committee on Field Work.**

5.2.1 Members of the Committee of Field Work shall be: The Provost and the coordinator of the Field Program, ex officio, four Fellows, and four full-time students to be appointed by the Steering Committee. The members are selected annually in the Spring Quarter and serve for one year beginning with the succeeding Fall Quarter. A Faculty Member shall be elected by the Committee to serve as its Chairman. The persons eligible to vote may be broadened or restricted in accordance with Senate By-Law 188.

5.2.2 **Duties of the Committee on Field Work.**

A. To determine and evaluate continuously policy and goals of the Merrill Field Program, to direct the program, and to supervise the Coordinator of Field Work on all matters pertaining thereto.

D. To consider and decide upon all proposals for field work projects in which the students of the College are to be involved.

5.3 **Committee on Academic Standing.**

5.3.1 The members of the Committee on Academic Standing shall be: The Chairman of the Faculty; two other Fellows appointed by the Steering Committee in such a way that each of the three Academic Divisions is represented by at least one Committee member; two members appointed by the Provost from among the Provost, Deputy Provost, and Senior Preceptors; and two full-time students appointed by the Steering Committee.
Committee on Academic Standing (cont.)

5.3.1 A Chairman shall be selected by the members of the Committee from among the non-administrative Fellows. The members are selected annually in the Spring Quarter and serve for one year beginning with the succeeding Fall Quarter. The persons eligible to vote may be broadened or restricted in accordance with Senate By-Law 188.

5.3.2 Duties of the Committee on Academic Standing.

A. To determine which students subject to dismissal on academic grounds are to be dismissed; to suspend dismissal when appropriate and to authorize subsequent return.

B. To administer College requirements for the Bachelor's Degree and such campus-wide requirements as are vested in the College Faculty, and to recommend on behalf of the College candidates who have satisfied the College requirements for the degree.

C. To establish policies with regard to petitions of students pertaining to academic matters in the College, and to recommend to the Divisional Committee on Undergraduate Courses suspension of the regulations, where appropriate in individual cases.

D. To select the students to be awarded General Honors.

E. To select the students to be awarded such other honors and prizes as the College may sponsor.

5.4 Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

5.4.1 The members of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure shall be: The Provost, all tenured Faculty, and two untenured Faculty to be elected by the untenured Fellows for staggered terms of two years. There shall also be two student members formally elected by the Student Body. A Chairman shall be elected by the Committee from among the non-administrative Faculty members. The persons eligible to vote may be broadened or narrowed in accordance with Senate By-Law 188.

5.4.2 Duties of the Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

A. To ensure that proper procedures are carried out in all matters of changes of academic status of academic appointees within the College, including adherence to Academic Senate regulations and considerations of the long-term interests of the College.

B. To advise the Provost and approve recommendations of the College with regard to changes of academic status of academic appointees within the College.

C. To consider the recommendation of the Steering Committee concerning new appointments to the rank of Professor or Associate Professor. To make recommendations on behalf of the College concerning new appointments to the ranks of Professor and Associate Professor.
5.5 **Committee on Graduate Students.**

5.5.1 The members of the Committee on Graduate Students shall be: The Provost, three Fellows, and three graduate students to be appointed by the Steering Committee. The members are selected annually in the Spring Quarter and will serve for one year, beginning with the succeeding Fall Quarter. The members of the Committee shall elect a Chairman from among the Fellows.

5.5.2 **Duties of the Committee on Graduate Students.**
- A. To incorporate graduate students into the College community.
- B. To plan and administer a program of events for graduate students affiliated with the College.
- C. To draw up a budget for the graduate student program in the College.

5.6 **Library Committee.**

5.6.1 The members of the Library Committee shall be: The Provost, four Fellows, and two full-time students to be appointed by the Steering Committee. The members are selected annually in the Spring Quarter and serve for one year beginning with the succeeding Fall Quarter. A Faculty member shall be elected by the Committee to serve as Chairman.

5.6.2 **Duties of the Library Committee.**
- A. To review annually the status of the Library, the statistics on the number of volumes, circulation, expenditures, and to prepare a budget for the following year. It shall have the power to recommend facilities or expenditures for the improvement of the operation of the Library.
- B. To consider and report to the Fellows any matter concerning the Library which should receive their attention.
- C. To receive from the Fellows recommendations or suggestions which may aid in the development, promote more efficient service, or encourage greater use of the Library.
- D. To determine Library policy governing 1) use of library materials by students, faculty, and other users of the library, and 2) the selection, acquisition, cataloging, binding, storing, and safeguarding of all library materials.

**Chapter 6. Amendments**

6.1 These By-Laws may be added to, amended, or repealed by a two-thirds vote of the Faculty, or by a two-thirds vote of members of the Faculty present and voting at two consecutive Fellows' Meeting, provided that written notice of the proposed change was sent to all Faculty members not less than five calendar days previous to a meeting of the Faculty or Fellows.
TO: MERRILL STEERING COMMITTEE

FROM: PHILIP W. BELL

RE: GUIDELINES ON DECISIONS AND AUTHORITY, MERRILL COLLEGE

March 23, 1971

Michael Cowan has suggested that I try to get something down on guidelines as I see them on decision-making and authority in Merrill College.

Basically, as I see it all decisions about Merrill College and its future are housed in our central committees - the Promotion and Tenure Committee on all tenure appointments, promotions, and merit increases; the Judiciary Committee on all student discipline and adjudication of related matters; the Student Finance Committee on all student monies; the Library Committee on library matters; the Field Committee on those matters; and the Steering Committee for all business out of the Provost's Office of a college nature not properly the preserve of one of our other committees. Expediting matters as between Provost and Steering Committee and from Steering Committee to action has not always been as efficient as I would like and will become one of the major functions of a new College Administrative Assistant as I see him or her.

There is only one (that I know of) function that lies still in the Provost's Office and has not been in the realm of Steering Committee decision-making, i.e. selection of Resident Assistants and Resident Preceptors. Some of this work I have delegated to Anne. We have, for example, just gone through the exercise of appointing some 22 RA's for next year using ad hoc interviewing teams of old RA's and RP's and a consensus of that body as a whole. This makes sense to me. With new RP's I plan to work largely with old RP's and some selected RA's - again as a sort of ad hoc committee. Is this reasonable from your standpoint?

A lawyer - and I am not one - should try to get our decision-making procedure on all college questions down in our Bylaws. Perhaps the Steering Committee would consider asking an ad hoc subcommittee to draft some stuff up on this?
SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT MERRILL GOVERNMENT
By Philip W. Bell

I appreciate being asked by the Editor of This Week's Issue to comment about government in Merrill. I have no set, preconceived notion of how we should end up. And it is clearly a complex but important problem for us -- one which I hope that we will have the "staying power" to work our way through to an effective outcome. Let me here just sketch some of my thoughts as I have tried to work them out.

My basic philosophy starts in a negative way -- rejection of what I irreverently call the "Holy Trinity" of College governance: the tripartite distinction of administration, faculty, and students. I think of us as one corporate community joined together by a set of common aims delineated in Catalogue and Handbook (which of course allow for continual revision), the members of the community being equal one with another in principle, or at least not unequal because of status, i.e. some of us may have more wisdom, better judgment, and what have you, but if so this is not because of the status we have but rather because of the kind of experience we have had and the kind of person we are. For many purposes certain of us are charged by campus-wide or university-wide regulations with certain responsibilities; a Provost at Santa Cruz is given enormous power and must assume awesome responsibilities; and Senate regulations make certain requirements on Senate members of a College with respect to the academic affairs of that College. But there is no reason why those of us who are charged with these responsibilities cannot choose to carry them out in accordance with certain procedures.

I say this as a statement of my personal philosophy as I look at Merrill and my responsibilities. It should in no way be interpreted as an admonishment of procedures in other Colleges or within the University as a whole. Indeed what I am urging be tried at Merrill can only be regarded as an experiment -- it may work, or it may not. And even if it works at Merrill it might not work at another College; as with Oxford each College must slowly evolve its own style, its own practices and procedures. Merrill College will grow older and gather its own momentum as a "person" or corporate body. Alumni (Stookey's students in one, two, three, etc. years) will have to be taken into account. The Provostship may well become an elective office and its nature change. We are thinking or should think in terms of a hundred or indeed a thousand years; that is why everything should be kept malleable for some time. Further, while we are working out our experiment we are working within the University of California Santa Cruz campus community -- what we do must ultimately fit in within the best traditions of our University and with the rest of our campus.
Remembering these constraints, then, let us consider the framework I am suggesting we try for working out the College responsibilities, mostly charged to the Provost within the present Santa Cruz campus structure -- a framework which can be diagrammed as follows:

![Diagram of the framework](image)

The Fellows are organized as a separate body primarily because the rules of the Academic Senate charge them with certain responsibilities. If I know the Fellows of Merrill, they will wish to consult widely the whole Merrill Community in performing these functions -- hence the horizontal arrows to Steering Committee and to Town Meeting.

Let us turn to the other side of the diagram, the Town Meeting. The Town Meeting, as I see it, is the end-process by which participatory democracy should be made to work, with full deliberation of issues arising from (a) workshops, (b) workgroups, and (c) individuals, or referred to it from the Steering Committee (see below). I have done my best to describe my hopes (and the hopes of the Fellows) for Workshops in the Handbook. Some are functioning effectively, some, I know are not. The whole concept needs more thought and discussion, and indeed it might be well if This Week's Issue devoted a whole number to the problem. Workgroups, in contrast to workshops (the names are not significant and we undoubtedly could improve on them) as I see it, are study groups built around a single problem or problem area on the part of interested Community members. We have three such groups on the Third World Course, a group on the Field Program, and still others evolving on the Merrill College Library, on judiciary problems and the College, on political issues and the appropriate behavior of the Community as a Community, on food problems, and on community action projects. I feel that we probably should form further workgroups, one definitely on student admissions and the EOP program, still others, for example, on inter-relations among Colleges at Santa Cruz and on the Natural Sciences and the "Merrill Emphasis". It seems to me that these workgroups should evolve as needs develop, should be flexible in membership as the
interests of individual Community members wax and wane, and
should stay in existence so long as need for them is felt.
In other words, they should be flexible instruments of the
Community designed to push forward certain tasks that members
of the Community feel need doing. From time to time they would
report to the Community as a whole, in Town Meeting, to report
progress, elicit opinion, and enlist support.

Much more could be said about the Town Meeting, but I
think that the last two Meetings have shown that we are defi-
nitely making progress. Let us turn to the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee is a critical group for the College,
especially in the transition period as we gain some experience
in working out the difficult concept of participatory democracy
in Town Meeting. But even in the longer run I see both types of
deliberative bodies as having an important role to play in the
affairs of the College -- an important complementary role one
with another. So let me dwell a bit on this Committee. In the
first place, the Steering Committee is not, as I visualize it, a
"Provost's Cabinet" or "National Security Council". It is an
agent of the Provost since it is the Provost who must, by present
campus regulations, assume the responsibility for almost all
College affairs; but it is also an agent of the Community since
the Provost thinks that the Community should have much of this
responsibility as the Community works together; gets to know
itself, its problems, and those of the campus and University;
and fashions a way to work responsibly on these problems. The
Steering Committee is a group of wise men, of Elders in point
of view of experience of the College, including many that must
be in part confidential such as those involving new faculty ap-
pointments, and make recommendations to the Provost, who believes
that many candles shed more light than one. Because the
Town Meeting is so large and discussion somewhat difficult (but
so important for decision-making), the Steering Committee would
always be the repository for some types of decisions. But as the
Town Meeting becomes effective, the Steering Committee might more
and more refer matters to the Town Meeting for general discussion
and elicit Community opinion through the Vehicle of the Meeting.
Gradually the Steering Committee would lean on the consensus of
the Meeting in much decision-making in the same sense that the
Provost leans on the Steering Committee. Surely when 450 people,
are suddenly thrown together in a setting as complex as that of
a small College in the midst of a larger campus which is an
integral part of a vast University system, such as the University
of California, and when all of these people are essentially new
to the system of which they are a part, evolution of a system of
government inevitably will take time, and we must be patient in
working out a framework which will be both fully democratic but
also responsible and effective.
To be really effective, I think that the Steering Committee should be a continuing body of people who learn to know one another and how to work quietly and deliberatively as a group to improve on the decision-making process which would otherwise be the Provost's alone. It will work best, I think, if it remains relatively small and so consensus is fairly easily arrived at, and if discussions can for the most part be confidential where openness and complete candor can prevail. Democracy is assured in two ways: (1) through publication of agenda and minutes to the whole Community; and (2) by the fact that its members know they are acting on behalf of the Community. Circulation of agenda encourages or would encourage interested members of the Community to discuss issues coming up with Steering Committee members so that their views may be represented; in some cases this may suffice, in others members may ask to or be asked to meet with the whole Committee to present their views. And of course as I have already indicated on many issues the Steering Committee may say that wider discussion of certain matters should be undertaken and go to the Town Meeting.

The last problem I want to discuss here is membership on the Committee. I have wrestled with this one but have not come up with any clear and obvious solution. What is clear in my mind is that the Steering Committee should (a) enlist the best of the Community in terms of wisdom and judgment, (b) be representative of the whole strata of Community membership, (c) be somewhat biased in terms of numbers toward faculty because many of the Committee's decisions, such as new appointments to faculty, new courses, etc., have hitherto in higher education been largely or usually solely matters of faculty concern. But composition should clearly not be sacrosanct and should be capable of revision over time.

What I did in initially establishing the Steering Committee is consult widely the then members of the Community (June 1968), make selections on the basis of those decisions, and put them to the Community for approval. I must stress that the appointments were made not on the basis of getting carbon copies of the Provost for that would not have added any new light to our decisions at all, but rather on the basis of garnering a wise group of people representative of all facets of the Community. Its present constitution, then, is the Provost and two Senior Preceptors, three faculty members, one from each division, and two students. It has I think, been a very effective and thoughtful group, and I have followed any consensus it has arrived at. It needs to be supplemented now, I think, by two more students so that the students on the Committee represent not only accumulated wisdom of persons who have been at Santa Cruz for a while but new students as well.
Steering Committee membership is, as I see it, very important to Merrill College and its future. It cannot be left to lot, i.e. chance. Nor should it be limited to volunteers, for the wisest people are often the most humble and least willing to put themselves forward as wise men. In the longer run I would think that we should work out some sort of direct-election system or election of a committee on committees which would fashion the Steering Committee, and probably other Merrill Committees as well -- these issues being different, as I see it then ICB and related matters, for those involve strictly student government in a milieu which is set up differently than what we are trying to fashion at Merrill. For the present I would suggest that we simply add two further members through a wide-consultative process, although if the Town Meeting this Thursday evening urges direct elections, I will be glad to abide by that. There are pro's and con's -- let us discuss that,
PHILIP BELL

From: Robert Greenway

Re: Fellows' Meeting

I have made commitments for Friday afternoon which cannot be broken. I am very sorry not to be able to attend the Fellows' meeting because, as you know, I am eager to participate in Merrill as a legitimate and fully-involved Fellow in every way. As you must know, two days' notice is not enough for many of us with administrative responsibilities, and I grieve over our apparent inability to find a time and means to meet together more regularly, both formally and informally. Surely a community must log time together, and faculty do have special interests that would make valid their separate meeting (perhaps open to the rest of the community) at frequent intervals.

I would like to participate through you in Friday's discussion, about the following topics:

1. A Merrill Government

   I do not believe there is, in fact, equality between students, administrators, and fellows at Merrill, nor can there be. We get paid, they pay; we are permanent, they are transients; we do in fact make decisions (based on irrefutable delegated responsibilities), they in fact only recommend; we at times must uphold scholarship in a way they do not understand, they at times must give priority to their own growth processes in a way that we do not understand, etc. I think we are perpetrating a rather cruel delusion on the students to imply otherwise.

   Secondly, I do not believe that a town-meeting system based on concensus-finding will work in such a large, naive, and diverse group - at least without a tremendous amount of training. On the other hand, I think the workshops could be a base for a truly representative government. But not without training to achieve it, as I attempted to convince you of last June. We are talking about incredibly sophisticated forms of government, yet we are dealing with "natives" in states of early development. We are only cruelly arousing their expectations, and their frustrations. Several members from each workshop could be trained in political organizing, and should be so trained immediately. It would cost very little, a weekend of time, and would save the system.

2. Goals for Merrill

   Now that we are "blooded", I think it is time to explore among ourselves what the aims of Merrill are. We are all fuzzy, and this is translated to the students every day. Do we mean "in" the Third World, or "about" the Third World? Are we willing to accept our own perpetuation of a third world here in California?

cc: Noel King, Stacey Widdicombe
Problems of Government at Merrill

1. I have argued that what I tend to call, somewhat irreverently, the Holy Trinity of Administration, Faculty, and Students at an institution of higher learning is a false trichotomy — that in fact an institution of higher learning should be considered one corporate body of equals, a true community wherein all members have an equal voice in matters of concern to the community. This is an absolutely fundamental hypothesis, which we all must accept as a starter, or we will indeed be "perpetrating a rather cruel delusion on the students" as Bob Greenway suggests in his memo of October 30th. Bob argues that equality does not in fact exist, nor can it because:

a. faculty get paid, students pay;

b. faculty are permanent, students are transients;

c. faculty in fact make decisions (based on irrefutable delegated responsibilities), students can only recommend;

d. faculty must uphold scholarship, whereas students must at times give priority to their own growth processes.

I do not myself see that a) is necessarily fundamental, nor even always true. I look at students and faculty giving of themselves to the continuous learning process; the only important aspect of payment is that we all, as some students recommend, give our $8 per quarter to the Merrill Community Fund. Some students are obviously independently wealthy, more so than some faculty members; some students are quite poor, more so than faculty members. I simply do not see that there is any fundamental distinction here as between one type of person and another that would in any way negate equality. Proposition b) is simply not true — some faculty members are more transient than some students. I would argue only that membership in the Merrill Community be one of two types — resident, and non-resident. Proposition c) is trickier, but also wrong I think. It is related to d) which is also wrong I think. I would argue that there is one and only one issue wherein delegated responsibility might separate faculty and students; viz. the establishment and maintenance of academic standards, and that even here the line is not at all a clear one.
Graduates of Merrill have as much interest in and concern about academic standards as faculty; so, too, potential graduates. Evaluations of courses are made by students as well as faculty, and they must listen to one another. Evaluations of faculty are made by both students and other faculty and they must listen to one another. Evaluations of students are made by other students and faculty through seminar discussions, reading of papers, etc., and they must listen to one another. It is true that as of now faculty must pass on courses and make evaluations of students, but as I have indicated the line is a very thin one, and there is no reason whatsoever why faculty and students should not consider and evaluate course proposals to make to that final deliberating body, the Committee on Courses of the Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate, which is a sound final board of approval, and I have already indicated that in effect students already participate in course evaluations although the final responsibility in this case rests with the faculty member in charge of the course. In summary, I see no reason why we should not be a society of equals, participating equally in the learning process, some of us because of experience or demonstrated judgment (and these may be faculty or students) being perhaps listened to more carefully than others.

2. If my basic hypothesis is granted, then how should we govern ourselves? What I have proposed is that we designate, by one means or another, a body of "Elders" in the form of a "Steering Committee" to guide us in our deliberations. My thought was to build, at least initially, a system of checks and balances into such a body, drawing on our cumulative wisdom and judgment as I saw it. In working with that group so far, I think that its basic structure is a wise one -- a small enough group so that we can learn and know each other yet large enough to represent all interests of the Community. I personally think that what is lacking at the moment is representation of the new members of the Community -- I think that our eight could now readily be stretched to ten, adding two students of the "newer" variety, i.e. who entered the Merrill Community this fall. The composition of the all-important Steering Committee should be, I suggest: the Provost and the Senior Preceptors -- there because, hopefully, of wisdom as well as because they hold essential administrative responsibilities in the Community; three Fellows, one from each Division; and four students. I see no compelling argument for
stipulating the nature of student representation on this committee, although many possibilities might be suggested:

a. class representation (e.g. one person from each class);
b. resident representation (e.g. three on-campus and one off-campus, reflecting existing realities);
c. sex representation (e.g. two male, two female);
d. academic representation (e.g. one from each division, and one 'floater');

and obviously there could be others. I would argue that three people have to be on this committee, and that the other seven should be elected by their peers. Who are their peers? Obviously members of the Merrill Community. One could simply devise an election system so that all would vote. Here, however, I do have a caveat. I believe that Fellows do get to know other Fellows, and that they should select their peers, and so, too, students. I recognize that this involves an inconsistency with what I have argued elsewhere, but "foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds." The Steering Committee should designate, by consensus, its own Convener, Clerk, and Secretary. For administrative reasons I suspect that the Convener should be the Provost, for it will inevitably be he who knows more about agenda items and affairs of the Community, but the all-important Clerk should be someone other than the Provost, chosen for his judgment and wisdom.

3. I would recommend that we move from this group directly to the Community, via Workshops and the Town Meeting. For fear of anarchy, I would recommend that the newly constituted Steering Committee supervise:

a. the reorganization of Workshops, after extensive investigation and consultation, and with the aid of Anne Chrislock;
b. the restructuring of our Town Meeting.

It must be the newly constituted Steering Committee which is the key, critical governing body of our Community -- our governing body of "Elders", I think. It may, in its wisdom, decide to recommend changes in both Workshops and Town Meeting, or it may decide to leave things as they are. If the Elders consult widely, listen, and deliberate, they should be listened to on these matters. We all want to make participatory democracy work; and we can make it work.
4. I suppose that I have to "diagram" our structure as I see it. Given the rather unusual UCSC structure, which lets us face it is unique in American higher education, the Provost speaks for the College. I would see myself speaking for Merrill College or the Merrill Community only after consultation and approval of at least one of our deliberative bodies: (a) the body of Fellows (on new appointments), (b) the Town Meeting; and (c) the Elders or Steering Committee (on all other matters). The Provost would propose matters to each of these three bodies, who in turn might decide to consult with each other; and the Provost would listen to and normally act on matters proposed by each of these three bodies. I look at our organization, then, as follows:

```
UCSC

The Broader Community

Provost

Town Meeting ↔ Steering Committee ↔ Fellows

Workshops
```

Needless to say, any member of the Merrill Community may and should speak freely to the outside community as an individual. But the corporate Merrill Community can speak as a corporate body only through the Provost and then only on the basis of approval from one of its three constituent bodies. This may sound to you paternalistic or autocratic; I can only ask that you know me well enough to know that this is the last thing I want.

5. Given this suggested structure, what sorts of decisions get made by what Merrill governing bodies? Here I think that we still have to play it by ear for a while. But in general I see it as follows.
a. **Faculty appointments** in accordance with UCSC procedure must be recommended by a Provost and relevant Vice-Chancellor; the latter normally does so on the advice of a Board of Studies; the former at Merrill will do so only on the advice of the faculty members of the Steering Committee, who will normally consult other Fellows who have an interest. Students will also be consulted as widely as possible in the process.

b. **Academic program**, including Merrill courses and Field Program in accordance with UCSC procedure must be recommended by a Provost to the Senate Committee on Courses; the Provost would plan to make proposals only on the advice of the full Steering Committee, who may normally make a recommendation to the Town Meeting and possibly the Fellows.

c. Other issues including **community life** and so forth; matters would arise through Workshops and/or the Steering Committee and go to the Town Meeting.
Some Reflections on Merrill College at the Beginning of 1970

I. Introduction

1. I have had many concerns in pondering this piece and sketching notes over Christmas "vacation" and trying to put it down finally on paper the last few days. My primary immediate concern is that we set up properly as an institution to handle urgent concerns lying ahead of us, as we move ahead in our very young life with the innovations we have believed in and dared to try to put into practice - with respect to course program, the field program, and perhaps particularly, or at least so far as the principal point of this paper is concerned, governance.

2. We have no "traditions" really at Merrill - no "honor system", for example, which a number of small colleges in other parts of the country have successfully put into the governance system but which seems to be "foreign" to UCSC students, and even anti-theoretical to some (many?). Yet active student involvement and self-regulation as well as full community participatory democracy are two of the governance innovations we are trying to institute at this College. It is not an easy task.

3. One principal reason for this lies in the outside constraints which rest upon us: a legislature and tax-paying public (many of whom feel very much removed from the present mood of this generation); an unsympathetic governor; Regents; parents; and the necessity and importance of close liaison and cooperation with other groups at UCSC - in Central Services, other Colleges, and Committees and Boards of Studies. To be free agents would certainly be a lot easier (a mastery of understatement!).

4. Further, I have to stress that principally because of these constraints an enormous amount of the responsibility in the end
for what goes on at Merrill College rests with me. I accept this but since my intellectual and emotional commitments lie strongly on the side of true democratic governance, wherein responsibility is normally diffused and spread, I am frankly put under great strain unless we can work out a responsible, tolerant, viable, working framework of governance, which is the subject of Part II of this effort. Even if we are able to do this, the strains do not disappear, but then they are ones I am willing, indeed, at least in a way, anxious to accept. If we are not able to work out and operate such a system, I fear that I have no alternative but to throw in the towel, or act against all my convictions and withdraw to a traditional polarized political framework, give up our experiment, and perhaps try again sometime.

5. Like Voltaire once said, "I am sorry that I do not have sufficient time to be brief in this piece." But I hope - really pray - that all or at the very least the great majority of you - will read at least the essentials of what I am trying to say because I fear that so much hangs on it, to wit Merrill's future. It was once suggested to me that the worst of what was going on up in Merrill College was that it was going to make it extremely difficult to bring it back to the traditional mode of college governance. I really hope that this is right, for I think that we are attempting things that need trying in higher education and are having some basic success. And if I read the views of young people at all correctly - faculty and students - it is what is desired by these groups - more relevance in education and a "piece of the action." But what has been going on at Merrill College is not going to be difficult to change if we fall on our faces and "mess the deal up", so to speak, by being irresponsible, intolerant, and/or pay no attention to the constraints within which we must operate.
II. Governance

1. The faculty proper and faculty presently serving in administrative capacities at Merrill have placed a lot of faith in the maturity and responsibility students can and will show in taking part in all of the important decisions of the College, even in discussion of Merrill College Academic Senate issues the decision on which by overall University of California Senate rules must technically lie within the Senate. I have in a sense gone even further in a way as Provost, not without trepidation as already suggested. In a college or university, as in any organization, there must be some resting place for responsibility; as Harry Truman once said on this issue with reference to the Presidency, "the buck stops here". So far as Merrill College proper is concerned, that place, for the most part, except in Academic Senate matters, lies initially in the Provost's Office, unfortunately for me, - eventually at the door of the Chancellor, President Hitch, and the Regents.

2. In taking these steps about decision-making in the College, both the faculty in its as yet unapproved By-Laws and I have felt that we could learn in the process and so, too could students, that we could work together as a community in a way seldom if ever before tried in College governance, each sector respecting the relative experience, wisdom, and ideas of the other, the parts fusing together through the method of consensus. (See green portion of the Handbook, page 1.)

3. At the heart of the Governing process of Merrill College as presently constituted lies the Steering Committee on the one hand, through which all important College business is channeled and which appoints student and faculty members to the all-important Field Program Committee and student members to the Committee on Academic Standing; and the Town Meeting on the other. The Steering Committee consists of eight faculty members, four ex officio because of administrative roles, four elected by the faculty, and five students elected by the student body. Steering Committee meetings are all open to the Merrill Community (unless infrequently closed because of discussion of what are deemed "delicate" matters (see green portion of the Handbook, page 3)); agenda are posted three to four days in advance of meetings so that members of the community may decide if they wish to attend or may pass along their ideas on various topics to Committee members; and minutes are posted within two to three days after completion of a meeting. It operates by consensus. The Town Meeting, consisting of all members of the Merrill Community is less well defined as to function and procedure, and unquestionably needs more work and thought to become the effective and important forum for discussion and resolution of issues before the Merrill Community that I think it can be. It was fashioned perhaps more as a forum for the input of substantial ideas for Steering Committee resolution once it knew better what the community really wanted through the widespread interchange of
ideas on complex issues; but it was also to be a place for
decision, hopefully by consensus also, of issues which had
substantial impact on all members of the community, such as
the TV cable issue last year when to most people the procedure
worked well, or the Open Campus issue this fall. In a sense
also it might be said that the Town Meeting could act as a
counter to the Steering Committee if the Community as a whole
ever had strong adverse reactions about the latter's actions -
hence the election by the whole community of a panel to run
Town Meeting independent of the Steering Committee to preserve
the interests of the community as a last resort.

4. Two other permanent committees of the Merrill Community should
be mentioned here - very important committees to which students
 elect members - one, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, a
duly constituted Senate Committee which passes on College
recommendations with respect to merit increases and promotions,
and the other the Judiciary Committee, which makes recommenda-
tions to the Provost on all significant matters of student
discipline, (Faculty discipline comes under the Academic Senate
and the Chancellor), recommendations which if reasonable and
responsible the Provost would normally be reluctant not to
accept, although it should be recognized that any Provostial
decision may be appealed and overruled by the Chancellor under
the UCSC Student Manual.

5. I have gone at some length into composition, duties, and functions
of the Merrill governance procedure as it stands at present
largely because there seemed to be a lot of confusion at Town
Meeting on December 10th, and I have had the feeling that new
students in particular have not been fully aware of the import-
ance of what I, at any rate, feel is at stake here.

6. Now I am obviously not about to comment upon any student person-
 alities who may at the present time or possibly in the future
 be running for any office. (Faculty members have all been elect-
ed.) But I cannot help but comment on the procedures or lack of
them appropriate for this exercise, and in many ways this is
the most important feature, or so I feel, of what I have to say.
One way to illustrate my concern is to compare what has been
proposed but not acted upon thus far for elections by students
with the procedures adopted by the faculty, who voluntarily
gave up "authority" and with myself initiated the widespread
potential for student participation in decision-making at Mer-
rill - faculty procedures for elections to the very same commit-
tees now subject to consideration for student elections.

7. Faculty By-Laws specify first of all nominations initiated by
any faculty member, supported by a specified few additional
members, with of course the consent of the nominee. On nomina-
tions for the above groups and in general on the activity of
the governing process at Merrill, it must be kept in mind that
it is not like choosing interest groups for a "happening"
although of course those willing to serve have to be interested
in doing so - interested in the activities of the group for
which they stand as nominees as well as in the institution.
We are a community searching for judgment, wisdom, and represen-
tative tolerance in running an experimental institution of higher
learning; and in fairness in judging fellow students in their
social or anti-social behavior. Our philosophy as suggested in
the Introduction is that students and faculty of different
backgrounds but hopefully with a common bond of interest in their
fellows and in the institution of which they are part can learn
from one another and enjoy working together. Participation is
couraged and with respect to nominations sometimes needs to
be encouraged. I, for one, am not about to step up and say I
am the person with the right balance of wisdom, judgment, and
energy to be Provost of Merrill College; indeed I have stated
on a number of occasions that the community at some point should
elect its own Provost - students, Fellows, and perhaps in some
way alumni all taking part in some manner with carefully worked
out procedures and with the electorate representing a balanced
composition of interests. Hence, I hope very much because of
the above that the Merrill Student Community, like the Fellows,
will consider carefully required adequate advance preparation
for nominations and a formal nominating procedure involving some
members of the Community submitting the names of those they
believe most qualified, or at the very least encouragement of
such persons to allow their names to stand for nomination, as
was the case in our last effort to a limited extent.

8. Second, on elections I strongly believe that everyone should
have the opportunity and indeed be encouraged to vote, as is
the case with the Fellows (where participation was near 100 per
cent.), whether or not he or she happens to have a class or
other important function or duty at the time a meeting is held.
An appropriate procedure again adopted by the Fellows following
Senate rules, is a secret ballot in a small unsigned sealed
envelope enclosed in an outer signed envelope, with a teller
appointed to check off names but maintain the secrecy of the
ballot - paraphernalia which could easily be provided by the
Merrill Office. Second, there is the question of what comprises
election of nominees and possible run-offs. Here I can do no
better than quote Senate By-Law 11.4 on Elections which the
Merrill Fellows decided to adopt for their procedure:

"A voter may cast one and only one vote for each
place to be filled in an election for a given office.
A candidate receiving a majority of his maximum
potential vote is elected, provided that no more
candidates receive such a majority vote than there
are places to be filled. If more candidates receive
a majority vote than there are places to be filled,
those having the highest votes are elected; if there
is a tie vote for the last vote for the last place to
be filled, a plurality of votes in a second election
between those tied will be determining. If those having majority votes in the first election do not equal the places to be filled, the remaining vacancies shall be filled by a plurality vote in a second election in which the ballot lists those who received the next highest vote of those already elected, but limited to twice the number of still vacant positions. A tie shall be broken by lot. The second election, if required, shall be held within five days of the first."

All of this seems very formal. But if the faculty deems it that important, then it seems to me, at any rate, that students in whom such new trust has been placed should hopefully deem it that important also - indeed I am tempted to say can hardly deem it less important.
During Merrill's first year as a college, this journal was edited and distributed regularly by student and faculty members of the college under the title of THIS WEEK'S ISSUE. During Merrill's second year interest dwindled, and members of the college rarely bothered to share their thoughts and feelings with each other, and so the publication came to be known as THIS MONTH'S ISSUE. The title of this publication speaks for itself.

IN THIS ISSUE:
1. A FEW WORDS ON CONSENSUS, THE TOWN MEETING, STUDENT POWER AND DECISION MAKING IN MERRILL...BY Michael Cowan
2. WEDNESDAY NIGHT'S POLITICAL COUP...BY Jim Pitts
3. A FEW MORE WORDS ON KITE FLYING AT MERRILL AND IF INDEED "THERE IS NO USE IN TRYING"(dyland)...BY Gregg Wheatland
4. AND A WORD FROM THE PROVOST.........BY Philip Bell

During the Spring Quarter the Steering Committee will be sponsoring a series of discussions on the college and its future.
The first open discussion will take place on Wednesday, April 14 in the Merrill Dining Hall beginning at 7:30pm. All students and faculty are encouraged to attend.

"If I am not for myself, Who will be for me?

Being for myself alone, What am I?

If not now, When?"

College meeting - Wednesday, Apr. 14
7:20 pm
Merrill Dining Hall
A FEW WORDS ON CONSENSUS, THE TOWN MEETING, STUDENT POWER, AND DECISION-MAKING IN MERRILL

by Michael Cowan

The Merrill College Working Handbook for 1970-71 argues that "two key words or concepts have played a key role in our evolution to date, namely 'community' and 'consensus.'" Ideally, the use of a consensus method of arriving at decisions will both produce wiser decisions and contribute to a feeling of community.

For better or worse, however, there have been immense practical difficulties in attempting to incorporate consensus method in all aspects of Merrill decision-making. In fact, the method has often lent itself to misuse to irresponsible vetoes, to overly hasty attempts to wrench decisions out of discord, and certainly to misunderstandings and even disillusionment.

For one thing, consensus depends much more on a prior feeling of community than a feeling of community depends on consensus. As the handbook notes, the consensus method "demands participation, work, listening, understanding, humility, practice;" it "works best when members of a group are bound together by friendship, affection, and sympathetic understanding." To which I should add that it works quite badly when even a few of these ingredients are absent. And these ingredients cannot be created by the consensus method itself, although the method may well reinforce these ingredients if they are already present. Instead of bemoaning the decline of "town-meeting consensus" at Merrill, therefore, we should spend considerably more mental effort searching for ways in which these pre-consensus ingredients (humility, openness, willingness to share, mutual trust, etc.) can be "created" within Merrill.

For another thing, the consensus method has worked reasonably well only within one aspect of Merrill life, namely within the College's various small committees. The reasons that consensus can work in small groups while failing in large town meetings are fairly obvious; small committees, meeting frequently over a period of time and "specializing" in the discussion of a limited range of issues, have a reasonable chance to create a climate in which individual members come to know each other fairly well, gain practice in arriving at mutually agreeable decisions (practice being crucial to consensus and begin to develop a sense of shared concerns and, hopefully, mutual respect. The Field Committee, for example, has worked well in this regard; so has the Judiciary Committee and the Promotion and Tenure Committee; so, for the most part, has even the Steering Committee.

But unless most members of Merrill College are given a systematic and continuing opportunity to practice consensus method in small groups in Merrill, it is futile to expect them to be able to
exercise the method wisely or responsibly in the large, infrequent, and oratorical meetings of the town meeting.

In addition to the issue of consensus, there are two other major difficulties with regard to the Town Meeting. One is the issue of the Town Meeting's authority. Just what kinds of decisions should it have the power to make? What should its area of authority be vis-à-vis other agencies in the College such as the Steering Committee, the Fellows' Meetings, and the Provost? Closely related is the issue of the Town Meeting's constituency. Just who has the Town Meeting represented in the past? Who ideally should the Town Meeting represent?

Although the Town Meeting may initially have been intended to represent "all members" of the Merrill Community (and the Handbook still affirms this notion), the Meeting by the start of Merrill's second year of existence seems to have become primarily a body for the discussion of student-oriented affairs and attended almost exclusively by students, resident preceptors, and the Merrill administration. The reasons that most Merrill faculty did not attend these meetings are probably many, but two reasons are primary. First, the faculty saw that the issues generally debated at these meetings were primarily student-oriented—the allocation of student funds, the selection of student members to committees, etc.—and therefore felt it pointless and even improper to waste evening hours away from home in order to intrude into areas of decision-making properly in the hands of the students themselves. Second, the faculty already had a platform for issues of concern to them, namely the Fellows' Meetings.

I personally believe that the Merrill student body should take a hint from the faculty example. It should give up the notion of a "town meeting" and create instead some sort of "student caucus" that would be responsible for student-oriented matters in the college, including the allocation of student funds, selection of student members to college and campus-wide committees, etc. Furthermore, in order that the decisions of the student caucus should have the strongest possible impact on the deliberations of the Steering Committee, the "convening committee" of the student caucus should co of the five elected student members of the Steering Committee. After all, the Merrill student body has elected these five members in order to represent student interest. The running of student elections and the appointing of student members to committees (subject to the approval of the student caucus) would be in the hands of these five students. And these students, of course, could be held responsible for their performance to the student body that elected them, and could be recalled if their performance was not seen as satisfactory.

Any student in the college, of course (as well as any teacher or administrator) could still bring any issue he wished to before the Steering Committee, which remains the central decision-making body in the college and the major appeals body in the college. In this
connotation, although the Steering Committee's meetings are now open, it should take a much more aggressive role in gathering opinion relevant to decisions it must make. At least twice a quarter, it should hold open hearings in the evening (or at some time convenient to most members of the college) to gather such opinions. And, of course, it should do more to encourage members of the college to attend its regular weekly meetings and participate in the discussion.

To my mind, three elements should be essential to Merrill's decision making process: information, individual expression, and "initiative and recall." (1) Information. Each individual in Merrill, whether student, administrator, or faculty, should be informed, as a matter of course, of all forthcoming decisions and issues that bear directly or in major ways in his life. To achieve this, all issues requiring decision must be publicized widely by those bodies responsible for making the ultimate decisions, and must be publicized well before a decision is to be reached. Furthermore, decisions by Merrill bodies should ideally be reached in advance of the required deadline for these decisions, and these decisions publicized widely within the College, so that those with objections to the decision will have an opportunity to protest and gain a reversal of the decision before it goes into effect. (2) Individual expression. All individuals in Merrill must have the power to appear before the relevant decision-making bodies to express their opinions on matters of concern to them. This power must be not only passively accepted by the decision-making bodies but actively fostered. These bodies should hold more aggressively "open meetings" and "public hearings" and should seek out those who may have important interests in the issue at hand. (3) Initiative and recall. Every individual at Merrill should be aware that he has the power to require the appropriate decision-making body in Merrill to give serious consideration to any issue he believes important, and the power to require it to review any decision it has previously made. Furthermore, Merrill should institute a "recall" process whereby a constituent group could initiate recall proceedings against an elected or appointed representative of that constituency if in their opinion he was not exercising responsibly his delegated powers.

I am tempted to add "consensus" as a fourth essential element; but, frankly, I think too much has been said about consensus at Merrill and not enough about these other elements. As I've said before, consensus is not just a process or method but a product of other processes. Let's go to work to strengthen those other processes before we lose too much sleep over consensus. Consensus has taken care of itself quite nicely in Merrill's small decision-making body and undoubtedly will continue to do so. Let's give it more practice on this intimate level; let's find more intimate ways to disseminate information in the college and to encourage participation in the college before we tackle the bugaboo of college-wide consensus.
TO: ALL MEMBERS OF THE MERRILL COMMUNITY

RE: A POLITICAL COUP - also - AN UP COMING CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

A political coup is being planned for Wednesday night, April 14, in the Merrill Dining Commons when the Steering Committee holds its 7:30 meeting. The all-inclusive questions of who ultimately runs Merrill College (and to that extent, who runs you) will be discussed with a distinctly revolutionary flair. All the schemers, big and little, are preparing for the excitement. Men of principle and men of little principle—they will all be there, and there is bound to be room for you. Even Provost Bell currently in semi-retirement in Bonny Doon, will be there.

On the agenda there are several plots:

---The Steering Committee is going to consider announcing itself as ultimate governing and decision making agency.

---The Provost will try to explain that he is, after all, the well and spring from which all glory and power flow, and thereby he is supreme.

---Faculty will try to explain that, even if they rarely exercise it, ultimate power is theirs via the Fellows' Meeting.

---Antiquarians will remind us that the Town Meeting is still not legally dead, and someone has promised to brighten the Easter season with a resurrection.

---Revolutionary romantics are going to cite chapter and verse to show how Philip Bell has abdicated and should therefore vacate the throne. Using the Town Meeting, they will try to fire P.W.B. as Provost (keeping him on as Prof. of Econ.), dissolve the Steering Committee and declare "Merrill College" dead, setting up a new "College IV" in its place. (Believe it or not, this may be theoretically possible.)

A Constitutional Convention may be held, too. Many are speaking of the need for strong student voices. So all those who are anxious to get an ASB—or to be the first ASB President—should be sure to come.

The stakes are quite high. Spirits may be high, too. And voices of experience, sense, and trust will be needed if we are to avoid a more scramble for power.

Jim Pitts 4/12/71
"He not busy being born is busy dying." Dylan

Merrill College is busy dying. Most of the students and many of the fellows have ceased to know or care about the vital functions and interactions of our college. We are alienated from the college, alienated from each other, in a very real and critical sense. As Fromm would put it, the individual Merrill student "does not experience himself as the active agent in his grasp of the world." The various functions of the college remain alien to the student. "They stand above him and against him as objects, even though they may be objects of his own creation. Alienation is essentially experiencing the world and one's self passively, receptively, as the subject separated from the object."

During the past year at Merrill only a handful of students have become actively involved in making the decisions which profoundly effect all of our lives within the college and the University. Already this year the college curriculum was reviewed and revised, faculty were hired and fired, the great bulk of student funds have been allocated and expended, the rates for room and board next year have been determined. In several of these decisions one or two or as many as five students were included or consulted. In other decisions there was no student input at all. Out of a total student body of 600 students or more, less than a total of 15 students were meaningfully included in the decision making processes. Only 76 students voted in the last college election.

Many of us become indignant, bitter or hostile when a favorite professor is fired, when room and board rates or other fees continue to rise, when the college fails to respond adequately to the needs of minority students, or for that matter any of the students.

What most of us refuse to recognize, however, is that the responsibility for these failures rests primarily with ourselves. Our indifference, apathy and lack of awareness contribute directly to the dis-integration of the college and the recurring disruptions of our lives.

The difficulties I have encountered in encouraging my brothers and sisters to become involved and to work to make a relatively pliable college structure more responsive to our needs and values, have been much like the difficulties encountered in flying a kite. Ideal kite weather is a bright and sunny day when a strong but steady wind is prevailing. Unfortunately the conditions more commonly encountered are quite adverse. Either the air is at a dead calm, where there is no breeze at all and no hope of getting anything off the ground, or the wind has assumed gale proportions,
and the blustery gusts of hot air threaten to tear the kite to shreds.

If I were forced to choose between a gale or a calm at Merrill, I would readily prefer to chance the hazards of the gale and the periodically recurring crises, when at least some people are active and aware, than continue to be oppressed by the stagnating silence of apathy and indifference which generally prevails within this college. But better yet, better than either of these types of conditions, would be a social-political climate in which the winds of students' concern, commitment and enlightened self-interest flowed freely, strongly and consistently through the college.

To be sure, there are a number of flaws in the decision making process which need to be remedied. Serious improvements need to be made in the Town Meeting system (that is, if we intend to retain it). Some people have argued that the Merrill dream of 'one corporate community' as epitomized in the now defunct Town Meeting, is a deception which facilitates the manipulation of honest student opinion. Serious improvements need to be made in the information sharing processes of the Steering Committee. We must make a serious attempt to define and circumscribe the powers and responsibilities of the college administrative officers. Long ago Mr. Bell suggested that the position of Provost might be an elected position. I believe that this is an excellent idea, that is, if more than 76 students would vote.

I do not believe that any of these faults, in themselves, have prevented students from becoming actively involved in their own lives within the college. It is rather precisely because of our apathy and neglect that the processes have been allowed to deteriorate.

Let us fantasize for a moment that the 600 students of this college, might under certain conditions be willing, even anxious, to become involved in the decision making processes which relate directly to their own lives. How then do we proceed? How do we begin to create these ideal conditions?

FIRST WE NEED A DIALOGUE. We need to begin talking to each other about things that really matter. We need forums, media, and the openness to talk to each other informally (informally) as well. If anyone wishes to share their thoughts in writing I encourage you to write and edit "Next year's issue," at anytime you want during this quarter. I hope people will come to the college meetings. Come to the Steering Committee and present your problems. Talk to your roommate.
SECOND WE NEED INFORMATION. The most serious problem with Merrill in general and the Steering Committee in particular, other than student non-involvement, is the inability or unwillingness of the college administration to share relevant information concerning vital decisions until the last minute, or even an hour past the last minute.

But this is a two way street as well. Students have a responsibility to clearly define and express their needs, to ask for information which is not immediately forthcoming, and to share our side of the issues with others.

THIRD WE NEED ACTION. A good example of the needed action was when the Steering Committee ceased mouthing platitudes about minority, chicano hiring of faculty, and stated explicitly "The next faculty member we will hire will be a Chicano" and then acted on the commitment.

Another promising hope of action was when residents of A dorm, 5th floor, worked actively with the Steering committee to allow co-residential living on two residential sections.

I strongly favor the idea of student task groups, groups of active and committed students that would work closely with student members of the Steering Committee on specific issues, to gather information, establish student positions, and to ensure that these positions and programs are implemented.

But its all right ma, we are only dying.
A word from the Provost
ON GOVERNANCE AT MERRILL

Philip W. Bell

I hope that there will be widespread discussion and deliberation on issues of governance as Merrill moves ahead as a community. In the beginnings of the institution it was our hope that the Holy Trinity of administration, faculty, students traditional in most academic institutions would be broken down so that decisions would be made by all segments of the community acting together as a body in the decision-making process. It seems to me that in our Steering Committee, in our Promotion and Tenure Committee, in our Academic Standing Committee, in our Field Committee, in our Judicial Committee, and elsewhere, we have largely brought this about: seven, eight, thirteen people, students and faculty, some with administrative titles, sit as a body and work out their differences with all members taking an active part in the decisions arrived at through consensus. Proposals come to these committees and through extensive discussion are altered in a way that makes them better proposals when they are adopted than when initially proposed. Of course we are in constant need of improvement, but my experience with all these committees tells me that we are surely on the right track. We are certainly unique at Santa Cruz and very unusual in the academic community at large in involving all segments of the community in all important decisions of the community, including faculty hiring and promotion.

Because members of these committees are democratically elected (and we have a judiciary committee to resolve any differences over elections) we have a true democratic representative government. What we have not been able to effect as yet, if indeed this is what we want, is true participatory government, where all members of the community will have a say directly in decisions where they are personally affected. A number of issues it seems to me -- for example, those related to academic and overall program, those related to budgets for expenditure of student and other monies, those related to development of college facilities like the library and the new Crown-Merrill student activities building -- deserve the widest possible discussion and participation on the part of all members of the community. Some of this can be done I suppose by polls as we have tried to do in the past, or informal opinion samples from resident living groups and others, but there is a great deal to be said to each of us listening to the other's opinions directly and adjusting our own individual thinking accordingly. We can learn a lot from one another, and doing so might hopefully help us to keep together as a community.

No one else has resolved the problem of participatory democracy so it is not surprising that we have not been able to pull it off. The main problems it seems to me, are twofold: too little self-discipline is exercised, and too little structure has been built into the system, at Merrill and elsewhere. The situation devolves into anarchy. Consensus, which works so well in our committees, is very difficult to effect in large gatherings. I, for one, am such a believer in discussion and evolution of consensus, rather than the quick and easy voting procedure which often tends to split a community, that I would like to see us try to find modifications of a participatory method which would work in large gatherings. We need some means whereby we would not get hung up on amendments to proposals, and amendments to amendments, with untimely calls for the question, which so rigidify and confuse honest and open discussion, yet means which would provide us structure for orderly deliberation and the evolution of ideas. A shaking of heads, vertically or sideways, as new ideas are expressed should do, but periodic samplings of viewpoints by a show of hands might help, for example.
Of course many feel that people simply do not wish to be bothered with working at decision-making, that it is much simpler to elect someone else to do the job. But something important is clearly missing when we limit ourselves in this way. Many who were here our first year and who were frustrated to be sure by our efforts to develop participatory democracy feel, nevertheless, that Merrill now lacks a sense of community such as we did to some extent develop when we all met together periodically to work out our problems. Two evenings a quarter is not much to spend listening to and getting to know the views of others outside of our immediate living environment. I for one would like very much to try again to evolve something which all members of the community can participate in directly, be a part of, have a stake in. But it is up to the community to decide what it wants. We should try to think out what we want, keep what is working well as I think all our committees are, and develop further what will make us a more effective institution.

April 11, 1971
ANOTHER YEAR'S ISSUE

Volume 3, Number 2 April 16, 1971 Edited by both of us

SOUNDING MERRILL'S DEATH KNELL: After reading The Last Issue, edited by Greg Wheatland, I decided to add my own comments on the failure which calls itself Merrill College. Since I was a charter student of Merrill in 1969, I have been a witness to its demise over the past three years, and would like to share my thoughts.

I think the primary reason for Merrill's death (i.e. the almost total apathy and lack of student participation in college activities) has been that we as students of Merrill College have always lived more with the myth of change than with the reality of change. This has been exemplified by the college administration and carried out through the course of events. No really substantive change has occurred at Merrill in three years, except the annual mass exodus from our beloved dormitories. I shall explain what I feel to be the reasons for Merrill's death litany.

Most of the confrontations at Merrill have been concerned with living arrangements and personal behavior. During Winter Quarter of 1969, the intervisitation issue came to the fore. Dramatic stories of couples watching TV after midnight in the dorms and subsequently being suspended were told and retold, and accomplished their design of terrorizing the masses. Merrill had a crisis meeting at which the students told the Proost how they wished to be treated in their bedrooms. The Administration just could not accept this, and threatened more severe action. A large proportion of students continued living the way they had been living, and, fed up with all the bullshit, moved off-campus last fall.

This incident illustrates the way in which the Administration has always responded to student problems. There was the occasion of the Proost's now-famous behind-the-scenes "drug and sex" letter to parents last winter which was later exposed in the Merrill Issue. The letter urged parents to assume responsibility for the way their Merrill offspring behaved. Students were told to act like adults, while still being treated like children.

There are other cases in point. One occurred last quarter when some students in A-dom tried to effect change which really meant something within the context of their lives. They attempted to organize a co-ed living arrangement between the people of two living units. The Merrill Administration had a fit. The students were told to return to their respective rooms because they had avoided the "channels." And although they then proceeded to go through the channels, they have not yet been permitted to carry out their plans, in spite of parental approval. The issue is now being debated as a "possibility" for next year's residents.
The dorms are impossible; the people are isolated now. The inhabitants of the dorms are predominately freshman and sophomores with a sprinkling of RA juniors and seniors. Many or most will escape to the flatlands this fall. I can sympathize with the people unable to find housing because of students living together. However, there is no reason why students should put up with intolerable living conditions any more than people with other occupations.

So it is not extremely difficult to understand why students cannot enthusiastically continue to attend meaningless meetings and listen to meaningless platitudes. No matter what you do, it'll all be the same next year. Where can we go from here? It's really hard to say, since liberating forms of change are always too offensive, or too far out. It seems you either have to love it or leave it. The idea of a free university at Merrill was a good one - perhaps we can revive it. The "channels" don't work. Simply smashing it without a collective vision won't work. Many of us have quite honestly given up. Perhaps future students of this College will be able to look back upon Merrill's death in 1971 as the constructive step toward triggering renewed fervor and maybe even some good old Merrill fanaticism.

It's all over now, baby blue.

...Jeff Snyder

********************

Merrill, paradise prison of blue and ice,
your gentle walls of words
deny that we belong to each other,
that we belong to the earth,
separate us from
each other (all we are really trying to find here, anyway)
without the words we would be there

I cannot justify my life to you
I cannot define my ecstasies,
I am not yours.

when I can print out my life to you
I will have lost.
I am not going to lose.
I will walk into your walls.
i will not see them.
I will walk into them until they move.
They will move.

we are beyond academia
beyond translation
beyond any words.

They will move.

...Roz Spafford

prose note to a certain now bittersweet optimism here.
I wrote this fall 1969..., and they have not moved.
September 16, 1970

As in any "democratic" system of governance, Merrill College's policy-making apparatus must be both efficient and powerful, while being responsive to the community it serves—the students, faculty, and staff. The concern here is for the students' interest and our voice in College policy.

Even in an atmosphere where "community" is not just a catch phrase (Philip Bell, 1970-71 Handbook) there is a collective student interest. The creation of a real community is in the student interest: a community that respects both academic and social freedom and a community where collective and individual desires can merge. In the selection of faculty, we—as students—have an interest in good teachers. In the planning of new buildings, we—as students—have an interest in a warm, comfortable, and useful environment. In the expenditure of College funds, we—as students—have an interest in how our money is spent. And in the setting of general College policies, we—as students—have an interest in our own lives and how they are affected by the College.

Experience indicates that students' interests—and oftentimes those of the faculty—are by-passed, evaded, or ignored by the administrations use of our bureaucratic system of governance. That system—supported by students—with its divisiveness and lack of coordination has invited the College administration—Provost Bell—to assume the role of management, rather than one of executing the will of the people. The delay, or even total lack of information dissemination, the "sudden" deadlines for decisions, and the outright manipulation of the system has virtually reduced "student influence" into student's suggestions. The administration's role must be re-established as administering the policies laid down by all the people, rather than one of managing the College environment.

We—as students—must organize what power we do have and coordinate our efforts toward the creation of a community that truely is a "united corporate body."

Power to the people!

Lee Rafalow
I think it appropriate that I begin by explaining why I took this course.

When I came to Merrill, I was not impressed by Merrill's "Academic Mission". I was, however, interested in the community concept. As a member of Merrill, I felt I had an active, participatory role in attaining "community".

It became apparent that the concept of community held by many students, including myself, and that held by the Provost differed, and that the Provost's conception invariably prevailed when decisions were made. I felt dissatisfied and frustrated, feelings I expressed in my final paper for Merrill Core course, Winter 1969.

The following Spring, I was a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Housing. At the first meeting the Provost laid out the housing issues we were to decide. When asked if the committee was to have a role in deciding if "C" and "D" dorms were to be co-ed, the Provost stated "No" emphatically, and told us we were to restrict our efforts to those issues he had outlined.

It was also decided at this first meeting that those present were to become the voting members of the committee, and that others, although welcome to attend, were not to cast votes. It subsequently developed that a proposal to allot rooms for the next year by lottery amongst all continuing students was supported by a majority of members in preference to the Provostial Plan of room allotment by class ranking. At the next meeting a small number of new-comers attended. They voted. The vote went for the Provost's proposal.

Following these episodes, I decided not to participate in Bell's "community". However, the Provost's "Dope and Sex" letter of April 20,
1970 lead me to public act. Terry Trayes, John Rick, and I duplicated
the letter and made it available to the student body. We included a
one page editorial which concluded: "Our personal feeling is that Bell
is not answerable to this community... Too often Bell has acted
according to his own wishes over those of his "Merrill Community" for
us to conclude otherwise."

The following year I lived off campus. I did not concern myself
with Merrill again until this quarter.

On my return to school this quarter, I heard that Bell was resigning
as provost. When I saw the course description for 144 AM I thought that
Bell's dominion was over. I still felt a commitment to making Merrill
work as a community; I thought 144 AM would be a platform from which
Bell's Merrill could be decried, and a new beginning made.

So I took the class.

But I was in error. The others did not want to make anew, but
to patch, repair. And I realized, too, that I had been gone from
Merrill a long time; that my conceptions of the way-things-were were
outdated.

I began my research, knowing that Merrill had changed, but in
ways I did not understand. As the quarter wore on, limitations in my
approach and the course became apparent. In my own work, I realized
that the effects of physical facilities upon social life are hard to
distinguish. I found English to be incapable of rendering what I wished
to express. I wondered how much stock I should take in my interviewee's
contradictory answers. And I discovered my own residence experiences
have colored my analyses of dorm-life far more than I felt possible,
even though I had resolved to be on my guard against that bias.
And then there were the class meetings. In class, I saw people carried away by their enthusiasm. I saw people fail to recognize the implications of their thinking. I saw people with narrow vision.

At times I felt elated—I was doing something that mattered that would change Merrill. At times I was depressed—my efforts would have little effect. Now that it is over, I feel I have not done as well I might, for my work neither conveys all I know, or adheres to objectivity, or carries weight with those who have their own visions of Merrill.

In retrospect, I doubt we have accomplished very much. The "objective" work we did was a scratching of the surface. I feel very strongly that the deeper issues were left untouched.

Perhaps I should explain. What do I mean by a deeper issue? I believe Merrill’s Academic Mission to be a "deeper issue". It was said, "I wish I had never heard those three words." (The Third World). Yet, we did not discuss what should replace them.

How can we make intelligent recommendations, when the deeper issues are neither articulated, discussed, or agreed upon? Because we have failed to decide these deeper issues, our recommendations are trivial.

I do not mean to say our work should be ignored. Compared to previous attempts to understand and change Merrill, I imagine our work to be more profound than most. And from this view our work is good, positive. But I do mean to say we have not shown our recommendations to be a means of realizing an ideal of Merrill all have agreed upon.

It is quite possible, then, that our recommendations are contradictory. It is certainly possible our recommendations can be disputed.
Both of these are sufficient reasons for a future Provost, study-group, or governance body to ignore our work.

And if our work be ignored, we will have spent much time in fruitless research, time that could have been better spent discussing our own visions of Merrill-Grandeur.

[Signature]
Course Evaluation
Merrill Self Study

Self study provided the needed opportunity to take an in depth look at several major areas of concern in the college. I feel the discussion that occurred in the class, if taken advantage of, could prove highly beneficial to the Merrill community in the future. Professors Cowan and Schlegel were an invaluable resource for the class and also provided an essential viewpoint to discussion.
This course was a very real learning experience for me. The skills that I learned, mainly in regards to researching and writing will stay with me much longer than of the more traditional courses that I have taken. We had a lot of work to do and each class member assumed their responsibilities and carried out their tasks. Everyone participating was very concerned with the results of the class and this made for a very productive class. The attitude was more one of "providing a service for Merrill College" than the more common goal of seeking personal knowledge which gave the class a feeling of togetherness and cooperativeness to the class. Our discussions were very good and I only wish that we had had more of them. We did not have enough time to do any free association/suggestion and random discussion which I feel after each of our presentations could have been very fruitful and not the usual bull shit.

The class helped me a lot in my extracurricular work, and will help make concrete changes in Merrill College I hope.

Professors Conan and Schegal were great. They both had a great deal of background in most of the areas of conversation. They skillfully lead the discussion at weak points but otherwise behaved on a level equal to the other participants in the class. Their contribution was extensive and invaluable. They had the experience of working with surveys, studies of the sort and the Merrill system, which we used and were greatful for. Their participation added "refinement" to the conversation and with only one exception did they ever monopolize the discussion. They were enthusiastic and eager recipients of new information and ideas. The class was the best I have ever taken.

Thank you!

Happy Holidays!
PART I: LIFE IN THE DORMS

Opening Statement

In discussing Merrill dorm life, two seemingly insolvable problems loom, inability to clearly distinguish the effects of physical facilities upon social life, and the inadequacy of a written report to convey the experience of dorm life it seeks to describe. Granting these problems their due, I see no neat way of presenting this discussion. Accordingly, my linear and abstract discussion cannot be considered realistic. Neither can it be considered non-arbitrary. So please read advisedly.

Preamble

For most incoming students, university life represents a significant break from their previous way of life. The first important task each student faces is building a new social self about his new role within the University. In the absence of the old life's frame of reference, many incoming students find university life disorienting. This problem is often complicated by the student's ignorance of his student role and/or his lack of identification with his role and/or his inability to make contacts with others and/or feelings of inadequacy inspired by UCSC's PR image.

Because most incoming students reside in the dorms their first year, the problems of developing a new self are on campus problems. That one needs to play his new role all his waking hours on campus makes the development of a new self most crucial.

Life in A & B Dorms

As continuing students see C and D dorms as more desireable, rooms in C and D dorms are first to be chosen in the annual room-assignment lotteries. It turns out that the unreserved rooms, the rooms granted to in-coming students, are largely in A and B dorms. As a result, the typical dorm unit in A and B dorms has few continuing students, and is dominated numerically by freshman.
Social Life in A & B Dorm Units

The A and B dorm unit has a lounge, a common bathroom, and a hall, upon which all rooms open. The maximum occupancy is fourteen. Most units that have not been altered in some way (kitchen) presently house twelve or thirteen students. For several reasons, this unit becomes the first arena for the incoming student to attempt establishing his new social identity. Primary among these are: 1) location of the only place to which he can reasonably lay claim of ownership, his room; 2) contact with others in unit is hard to avoid, especially in the hall and bathroom; 3) the desirability of getting along passably well with those sharing his living space, especially roommate; 4) fact that as unit is his place of residence, he spends most of his time there; 5) the number of people to be dealt with is of manageable size.

A process of exploratory groping begins where unit-mates "smell out" the strangers with whom they've begun to live. Friendships usually develop as the process proceeds. A social structure develops amongst the members of the unit. The process continues, until it reaches an equilibrium where everyone has sized the others up. In some units, the process does not go very far, and the unit remains a bunch of strangers casually ignoring one another. But on many units this process continues and produces a number of close friendships. And in some units, the process continues much further. In these units a considerable number of the unit-mates become mutual friends. A striking aspect of these units is that a sense of group identity appears. This feeling is greater than mere friendship for it is a sense of belonging to something greater than oneself; a something to which the members feel allegiance. I call these groups tribes.

From personal experience and conversations with others who have been or are members of tribes, I have noticed common several factors to be necessary for their evolution: 1) those involved must be of similar socio-economic background; 2) those involved must be in a similar identity-crisis situation; 3) there must be enough people within the tribe to form a socially self-sufficient group (by this I mean that the group is large enough that a member doesn't feel he needs to establish a social identity outside the unit; 4) the members must be sufficiently extroverted to make the acquaintance of the other people
in the unit.

If these conditions obtain, the individuals involved come to see themselves as members of a group. This perception is attained through the recollection of co-operative activities; that is, the group of friends develops a history as a group. Some examples of co-operative activities which have jelled a unit into a "tribe" are: helping a unit-member who was having personal problems, hatred of the R.A., and co-operation in pulling pranks. The sense of unity may be felt so strongly that the "tribe" will coin a name for itself, "Fifth Column", "Fifth Floor Freaks", "Bay Street 7".

Because the tribes are socially self-sufficient, they are very durable. The friends formed within the tribe become the nucleus of the members peer-group. Older students who were tribe-members still count these friends as their closest. Those living off with others were all living with members of their tribe. These reported that they had few or no close friends outside of their dorm unit their 1st year.

But membership within a "tribe" does have limitations. Because one has established his social identity within his unit, he has no social identity outside it. Because one's claim to membership in the tribe depends upon his participation in its activities, the formation of friendships outside of the tribe threatens one's status as a member. Because the "tribe" relies mostly upon unit-members for its membership, failure to participate in activities undermines it as a socially self-sufficient group. Thus, a member's friendships outside the "tribe" (unless, of course, these new friends can be drawn into the "tribe") is not a matter of indifference to the other members of the tribe. For example, one girl stated she was unsatisfied with her contacts with boys, then added she felt she would have jeopardized her position in her tribe if she had spent time with boys.

The people banding together in "tribes" are invariably freshman. Continuing students, having established a peer group, do not find the social rewards of the tribe fulfilling. Thus, they rarely take central roles in the tribe, but rather are hunger-ones or peripheral members. The "tribe" consciously views those that do not participate with toleration, but there is a definite sense of one's status as "in", "out", or "hanger-on". Unconsciously, the "tribe" views those who do not participate with distaste or condescension. The source of this tension is
that it is not a matter of indifference to the "tribe" that unit-members ignore it.

The people banding together in "tribes" are almost always white. Blacks and Chicanos, with a few exceptions, come from greatly differing economic and social backgrounds. Confronted with a strange white world, they seek others of their own race. Peer groups are nearly always formed within the bounds of their own ethnic background. Blacks and Chicanos are quick to leave the dorms. An important reason is that it is not possible to establish a Chicano or Black existence within a unit dominated by whites.

The inter-campus transfer usually knows people at UCSC. As he already has a peer group, he finds no particular appeal in the "tribe." The junior transfer, too, finds little appeal in the "tribe." While the junior transfer may resemble the Freshmen in that he does not have a social identity at UCSC, he differs in that he has attended an institution of higher learning. Thus, he may have experienced and overcome some aspects of social isolation, e.g. he has had a job or gone to school away from home, and/or he has established a new peer group at the other school.

While this understanding of why the junior transfer remains aloof from the freshmen's socialization is not lucid, that this aloofness exists is undisputable. Because of the lack of other older students on campus, many junior transfers feel isolated. The feelings of inferiority inculcated directly by the University's PR image and indirectly through counselors at the junior college and high school level, may estrange the junior transfer from his fellow students, because he feels he cannot compete intellectually in any discussion.

This estrangement and feeling of inferiority is heightened by the difference of atmosphere between a junior college, were the method of teaching relies on rote memory, and the University, where emphasis is placed on expositive writing and critical thought.

In addition to the above "types" of students, there are a numerically significant group of students whose striking characteristic is that they do not have any apparent social life. While terming these students' schizoid as a group may be a misuse of that term, from personal experience I would characterize those I knew as schizoid personalities. The two individuals I knew would go to great lengths
to avoid contact with other members of the unit.

From interviews with Bonnie Ring and students, I have the impression that a disproportionately large number of those utilizing the counseling service are "schizoid" individuals. (The other type of student who utilizes the counseling service disproportionately is the junior transfer student.)

A characterization of the social interaction within the unit is now possible. The more loquacious freshmen, if of similar background and goal orientation, band together. Continuing students, who already have a circle of friends, remain aloof from those they don't know, but remain intimate with their old friends. (This came out very strongly in our survey.) Junior transfers feel very alone, and live on the periphery of other people's social lives. Minorities go outside the unit for friends of their own race. They find on campus life expensive and alien.

The unit, then, has as its most obvious social structure, a group of freshmen who are quite close. If numerically large, this group may be a "tribe". Hanging-on about this group are those students within the unit that have empathy with the freshmen--sophomores that never got to know others their first year, who can now handle the socializing process--junior transfers, who need friends, but find it hard to make older acquaintances. Outside of this, one finds the continuing, minority, and transfer students who have a coterie of friends outside the unit. And outside of these, the individuals who do not interact at all.

In some units, the residents are remarkably successful in getting to know one another. In others, cohesiveness never develops. It is much harder to determine why a unit fails to get together, than why it did. Interviewees usually explained that they failed to interact with members of their unit because they had personal problems or that they had friends outside the unit.

There is a significant relationship between how well unit mates get along and how unit facilities, such as the lounge, are used. In units where a large number of residents are on close terms, the lounge is used frequently as a place for socializing. Interviewees who lived in close units state that they went to the lounge whenever they felt lonely or bored. In units where those on friendly terms were in a
minority, socializing tended to occur within private rooms. The lounge, when used, was used as a place to study or read.

In units where there is very little or no interaction or cohesive-ness, the common areas are infrequently used. Little or no interaction occur within rooms. Lounges are often littered or cluttered with unwanted furniture.

Cohesive floors use the lounge rather than rooms as the place to socialize because 1) the group of friends, being a majority, can "lay claim" to the lounge, 2) private rooms are too cluttered with furnishings to accommodate more than a few people and 3) the lounge, especially if the lounge was located so that other unit mates had to pass through it, reinforced group solidarity. (The other members of the unit, in having to pass through the lounge, would be aware of the groups activities, thus affording them an opportunity to become involved. Even mere knowledge that some activity was taking place may be sufficient to establish or reinforce one socially as a member of the group.) Interestingly, those people who claimed the lounges were sterile, cold, and interrupted by passersbys, were people who felt estranged from the members of their unit; while people who were on friendly terms with most of the people of their unit used the lounge frequently, and view it positively. People on cohesive floors leave their doors open as an invitation to social interaction. (An open-door is a typical "sign" that the residents desire contact with others.) People in units where the freshmen group was a minority generally keep their doors closed unless they are members of the group, who would often keep their doors open, people in units where there was no cohesiveness kept their doors shut.

The bathroom was not mentioned by my interviewees. From personal experience I can state that the bathroom plays an important social role. Largely because people, with some exceptions, view using the unit's bulk facility at the risk of confronting their unit mates more convenient than trekking to a more isolated facility. Since nearly everyone in any unit will use that unit's bathroom confrontation is inevitable. Confrontations in the bathroom are among the few that do not require a great risking of self to accomplish; one has an undeniably valid reason for his presence in the head, in the process of getting to know ones unit mates.

My freshman year, as we got to know one another, the bathroom
became a way of meeting the people on the periphery of our "tribe."
Because one was most likely to meet someone else within the head about
bedtime, the bathroom frequently was the site of pre-bedtime reminiscences
of recent events or commentary on one's plans for the morrow. Occasion-
ally the discussion would move into the lounge, but because most
participants were committed to retiring, they remained, standing about
the sinks, toothbrushes in hand. Once such a discussion got going, it
frequently was joined by new-comers similarly preparing for bed.

There were two individuals in the unit who were "schizoid personas-
lities." They did not use the unit's facilities while others were up
and about. My second year, most of the people were continuing students.
We had our circles of friends, established. The bathrooms social role
was much diminished--we didn't have that much in common to talk about.

Hallways, too, provide a means of meeting ones fellow students
without risking one's self. Because one is usually on the way to one's
room or going out, opportunities for conversation are more restricted
than in the head, but these confrontations allow the unit mates to
observe one another's physical appearance whereby they can mutually
recognize one another as unit mates at subsequent confrontations.

The merits and weaknesses of the A and B dorm unit is hard to
evaluate because student response to the unit is closely linked to his
relationship with his unit mates. Those students who had a very hard
time socially were the ones who complained most about the coldness of
the lounge, sterility of the rooms, the noise, and shared bathroom
facilities. Significantly, Bonnie Ring, whose clientele is drawn
largely from those students who do feel very isolated and alienated,
has similarly concluded that grumbling about facilities was a means
of absolving oneself of solving his problems.

Lie in C & D Dorms

Most residents of C and D dorms are continuing students who selected
their room in the annual room-assignment lottery the previous spring.
The others are junior transfers and freshmen.

Because most C and D residents are continuing students, they have
already established a peer group. As a result, there is less need to
fraternize as the establishment of new relationships is not necessary
became a way of meeting the people on the periphery of our "tribe." Because one was most likely to meet someone else within the head about bedtime, the bathroom frequently was the site of pre-bedtime reminiscences of recent events or commentary on one's plans for the morrow. Occasionally the discussion would move into the lounge, but because most participants were committed to retiring, they remained, standing about the sinks, toothbrushes in hand. Once such a discussion got going, it frequently was joined by new-comers similarly preparing for bed.

There were two individuals in the unit who were "schizoid personalities." They did not use the unit's facilities while others were up and about. My second year, most of the people were continuing students. We had our circles of friends, established. The bathrooms social role was much diminished—we didn't have that much in common to talk about.

Hallways, too, provide a means of meeting ones fellow students without risking one's self. Because one is usually on the way to one's room or going out, opportunities for conversation are more restricted than in the head, but these confrontations allow the unit mates to observe one another's physical appearance wherein they can mutually recognize one another as unit mates at subsequent confrontations.

The merits and weaknesses of the A and B dorm unit is hard to evaluate because student response to the unit is closely linked to his relationship with his unit mates. Those students who had a very hard time socially were the ones who complained most about the coldness of the lounge, sterility of the rooms, the noise, and shared bathroom facilities. Significantly, Bonnie Ring, whose clientele is drawn largely from those students who do feel very isolated and alienated, has similarly concluded that grumbling about facilities was a means of absolving oneself of solving his problems.

Lie in C & D Dorms

Most residents of C and D dorms are continuing students who selected their room in the annual room-assignment lottery the previous spring. The others are junior transfers and freshmen.

Because most C and D residents are continuing students, they have already established a peer group. As a result, there is less need to fraternize as the establishment of new relationships is not necessary
to one's social well being. Consequently, the lounge-kitchens do not see as much use, even though they serve significantly larger numbers of people.

Freshmen feel more isolated, as they have much less contact with their peer group.

There is a significant difference in atmosphere between C (women) and D (men) dorms. C dorm is cold. There is seldom any activity in the lounge, and the residents do not seem very friendly, particularly to one another. D dorm, on the other hand, is friendly. The reasons for this difference are not clear. That the "C" dorm lounge serves as a throughway for residents of "D" does hamper its use by "C's" residents. A more telling reason was provided by Bonnie Ring, who stated that women tended to base their self-valuation on their relationships with men rather than women.

My personal impression of "C" and "D" dorms is that they are somewhat more esthetic, but that the people are not very interested in one another. From my contact with C and D residents I get the feeling that they are more conservative than their off-campus peers. Because on campus life is not very appealing to the majority of continuing Merril students, I wonder if C and D residents aren't insecure in the sense that they embrace, rather than fight, their dependence on the university for their lifestyle. To my knowledge, no work has been done to determine that such differences exist.

Student Attitudes with Respect to His Room

The student's conception of his living space is important in understanding certain social phenomena, notably activism in attempts to change that living space, and in effecting interaction between the resident student and guests.

Students with the exception of freshmen generally view their furnished rooms as sterile, stark, and impersonal. Almost all students attempt some modification of their room. These modifications range from changing the rooms appearance through painting, posters, and other decorations to physical modifications of the room through removing undesired furnishings, acquiring different types of furnishings (notably low japanese style tables from the lounges, and overstuff...
chairs and couches from used furniture stores), and construction of room dividers or other partitions, usually to separate sleeping and working areas.

In cohesive units, modification of the common facilities may be made. Usually some type of decoration is attempted, notably painting the walls of the lounge and hallway.

Students, especially those living off, when asked how they would change dorms, frequently stated that they wanted the dorms more "homey".

That students think that their dorm accommodations should be homey should be underscored. The dorm room is the only place within the University that the student can claim as his own. It has been noted that the incoming freshman finds the university life disorienting. One of the greatest distinctions between home life and university life is that the new student has nothing he can call his own, not even his social being. The room, then, is very important to the student because it is both a retreat where he can escape from the university world and a place that he can shape, within limits, to his own specifications. In the sense that the dorm room fulfills the role of inner sanctum and is one's residence it is home.

And many students stand by their right to have their home as they wish. All types of regulations which state how the room and its furnishings shall be maintained and utilized are ignored. Intrusions by workmen or other university functionaries, even over quarter breaks, are viewed distrustfully by students.

Students who have lived on, but who now live off, express reluctance to enter the dorms unless they have some accepted explanation, such as visiting a friend, because they feel they are intruding where they do not belong. This feeling is quite strong, and is exemplified in such requests as Merrill should have a place made for off-campus students, e.g., telephone.

This willingness to maintain the independence and integrity of one's decisions vis à vis his living quarters also extends to life styles. In developing a new life at the university, students are concerned with consistency and philosophical tenets. Many students hold views of life that are in contradiction with those held by the society as a whole. Unfortunately, the university requires adherence
to many of these conventional tenets as is witnessed by regulations regarding intervisitation, drugs, co-habitation, etc.

Since the regulations are rarely enforced, most students do as they think best. However, most students base their way of life upon some understanding of consistency. The hypocrisy of unenforced rules is distasteful. But more significantly, the university, or at least Merrill College under Provost Bell, has enforced rules concerning co-residence (both sexes in residence in same unit) and co-habitation (both sexes living in same room).

This conflict between administration and students over how students self-determination of life style has been an important motivation in student activism. For a start of this conflict.

Merrill's Physical Facilities

This discussion of Merrill's physical facilities will consider how existing facilities are actually used. From the point of view of this discussion, facilities that aren't used aren't there, because they do not influence anyone, and facilities that are used are not to be understood by what they are supposed to be, but by what they are used for. For example, the Merrill Classroom building is not a classroom building, but a building that, in addition to being a classroom building, serves as a place for students to study in quiet and peace at night, a place for student organizations to have their offices, a place for faculty to keep their books and office hours and bodies, a place where the steno pool resides.

As this discussion is primarily concerned with Merrill Residential life, it shall begin by delineating which facilities at Merrill serve important social functions of that life.

The dining commons. People on the meal plan have their choice of dining halls. In practice, most students eat at the dining hall of their college because it is more convenient. A great many students are on the meal plan, and the dining commons affords them the opportunity to meet one another. (In practice this function is greatly reduced as students tend to eat with their friends, with the result that new relationships do not develop.) The dining commons also is a meeting place for the classes organizations, and occasionally is place where musicians practice.
The small brick-courtyard immediately outside of the dining commons serves as a place for quiet conversations. During meals, especially lunch all year, and dinner in spring, many students take their meals in the open. Because students must pass through this courtyard on their way to and fro the dining common and Crown College, it is seldom completely empty of people. Off campus students take advantage of the crossroads to meet friends they seldom see.

The Baobob lounge, too, draws meal-takers who do not want to take their meals within the dining commons cafeteria atmosphere. The Baobob furniture is alien in appearance, though, and a wood partition screens the sunken fireplace from the rest of the room. Beyond meal times and occasional off-campus student marking time between classes, the Baobob room is infrequently used informally. Perceived by many students, formally, however, a great number of committee meetings are held there. That the lounge is often locked about 5 p.m. further reinforces its image as a meeting room, by preventing informal use from taking place.

The lawns between the classroom building, the brick courtyard, the Gatehouse and the central quad redwoods are used by many people as a place to eat, as a place to spend time between classes, and as a place to meet people, especially as they come up the path from the Gatehouse.

Nearby, within the redwoods, there are two picnic tables. While the tables are used occasionally by people eating lunch, they are more often used as places to read and write out-of-doors that are somewhat secluded from the passerby's on the adjoining paths.

The Gatehouse is a focal point of Merrill Social Life. All students, on or off, come to the Gatehouse to receive mail and to pick up hand-outs, e.g. current issues of campus newspapers. Bulletin boards are present, but do not attract much attention, particularly as they have been appropriated by the administration and are actually locked. Because the gatehouse does draw all Merrill students to one spot, it is a fertile place for interaction.

The Merrill College is described in great depth by the Governance research committee.

Across from the Dining Commons are two small buildings, the area lounges. These buildings house a television lounge, a snack bar, and a ping pong room. These buildings constitute Merrill's central core, and house what little well defined social activity as occurs on
campus after the off-campus people leave. The snack bar almost always has someone within it (and serves as an informal gathering place and as a chess and card room. An adjoining room is frequently used by people as a study room. The ping-pong room is used by an avid bunch of pong players, many of whom know each other as such-and-such caliber of pong player. The television lounge is used by those that still find the offerings of the tube of value. Surprising gatherings may develop about particularly interesting offerings, such as Governor Reagan's "Camelot speech" of May 1970 and sports events (Super Bowl games). During the day the lounges are used by off-campus students looking for places to study between classes.

The Merrill library is the only building that is widely acclaimed by Merrill students. It is the only building to be acclaimed by off-campus students. During the day it is used by off-campus students. In the evenings it is utilized by on-campus students who want to get away from their units for study, reading, or reflection.

We asked our interviewees several questions relating to physical facilities. We were especially interested in any comments students had about the facilities they wanted to have that weren't presently available.

These questions failed to reveal anything we didn't know. The impression I received was that students do not think in terms of the facilities influence on social interaction or in changing the facilities. The responses confirmed the Gruen reports findings, namely that students, particularly those living off, felt that dorm living lacked a home atmosphere. Most suggestions for improvements sought to establish this home-atmosphere: refrigerators in the lounges, more kitchens, make some of the floors into apartments housing several students each.

That students seek to change dorms to resemble homes points to the gulf between the students home and university life. If the living accommodations were of a familiar nature, the contrast between the two life styles would be reduced in total effect.

Several students expressly pointed out that they had no place to entertain guest within the dorms outside of their rooms—and who wishes to entertain in his bedroom.

Several students also commented that they preferred the enclosed quad type of dormitory arrangement found at Cowell. Merrill does have
a quad enclosed by the buildings of the college. Merrill students see this space as filled. From the dorms, this impression is readily obtained. The dense stands of second growth redwoods, the most, and the area lounges do seem to fill the space.

Three off-campus students commented that they felt Merrill needed more facilities for off-campus students. The new Merrill library partially satisfies this need.

Beyond this there were no suggestions. Several thoughts have occurred to us.

There are a number of problem points of the present physical plant which we feel should be dealt with.

1) The center dorm unit of each floor of A dorm and C dorm handle a great deal of through traffic. While this traffic forces encounters between the residents and the traffic, the reaction is pronouncedly negative. People living in these units feel a loss of privacy. Because the people coming through are doing so with some objective in mind, they usually do not interact with the residents. The lounges of these units are not used, because activities in the lounge are constantly being interrupted by strangers who do not belong there.

2) The central core of the Merrill campus, which is an enclosed quad, is not perceived as open. While an effort is being made to make some of the facilities therein, namely the area lounges, a gathering place, students perceive it as filled. The core area tends to be used by off-campus students who gather in the area to meet their off-campus friends rather than by residents, who return to the sanctity of their dorm units. Because of the large numbers of trees and the buildings within the quad area, it is difficult to see from one side of the quad that activity is occurring on the other. Thus, it may occur that less activity is perceived as taking place in the quad than actually does occur.

3) Students, in walking from place to place, notably from the dorms and dining commons to the Gatehouse, walk in straight lines. The result is that a number of unnecessary paths have appeared in the lawn and amongst the redwoods. One of our research team says that the trees cannot take the trampling on their roots, and may eventually die.

4) Students do not have any place but their bedrooms to entertain their guests.

5) Some rooms are unappealing, e.g. rooms on first floor A and B dorms facing the retaining wall.

* interaction occurs if the participants have met elsewhere beforehand.
Several Merrill facilities are not currently being used:

1) Crown-Merrill Recreation Room. This empty building is carpeted has a fireplace, and a kitchen. Intended as a recreational facility, it contains no recreation equipment. To further discourage use, it is kept locked, as we found out the day we sought to use it as a meeting place for our research group. At present, it is seldom used.

2) Merrill-Faculty Lounge: Originally intended as a lounge for faculty, this structure is now used as a place for committee meetings. It is seldom used by students.

3) The Baobob Lounge: Merrill's Fireside Lounge. In distinction to other colleges, whose fireside lounges are popular places, the Baobob lounge is rarely used by students. Accept as an alternative eating place to the dining hall. The separation of the fire pit by an open screen (effective against socialization, but not against noise) from the rest of the room, the furniture, and its use as a committee meeting room make it unattractive as an informal gathering place.
RESIDENT ASSISTANTS AND RESIDENT PRECEPTORS

Sources for this part of the report are: 10, 11, 12, and 15. The random interview of students contained the following questions concerning RAs and Preceptors:

1. Has your RA/Preceptor been important in your, and your unit's activities?
2. How do you view your relationship with your RA? Preceptor?
3. What, if any, changes would you make in the RA and Preceptor program?

The responses to the questions about the Preceptor were pretty unanimous; the Preceptor does not have much to do with the floor's activities or with the individual student's life. When asked question 2. above, typical responses were, "None." "I haven't had any need to see my Preceptor." "No relationship," "Not much," etc. It came out that the Preceptor is rarely seen on the floor, has little or no influence, and serves no purpose in the unit's life.

The answer with respect to the RA varied considerably more. Some RAs had actually been important in some degree to the interviewees, but when further questioned about statistics, it turned out that this usually was in the capacity of "a member of the floor" rather than his or her official capacity as RA. Most students felt that the RA was primarily important during the beginning of the year, with less, little, or no importance later in the year. Freshman commented that when they first arrived, the RA was helpful in telling them certain administrative facts and procedures. The cases in which the interviewee responded most favorably to his RA
were those in which the RA was characterized as "just another member of the floor".

As mentioned under source 10., the RAs were also interviewed. When asked their primary reason for wanting to be an RA, they usually responded with some answer relating to working with people and another answer about the benefits to themselves. The most common types of answers were: convenience to the RA himself (43%), money (43%), getting involved and meeting people (86%), specifically mentioning helping new students (29%), and do not know (29%). The responses ranged from accounts of extensive hopes and plans to, "It was either that (being an RA) or live at home."

As to what they did as RA, they usually answered that they unlocked doors (master key), handled administrative details, and organizing things. It might be mentioned that on some floors where the RA said that he organized things, students who lived on his floor who were also interviewed said that he did nothing. Most RAs mentioned some administrative duty such as hanging notices, handing out keys, giving out the master, locking doors, etc. as their first answer. Most RAs felt (naturally) that the role of RA should be essentially what they were doing, or at ended a comment on being an initiator of activities. All RAs felt that they earned the $300/annum that they had their housing bill reduced by as compensation for their work.

The procedure of selecting RAs and Preceptors was investigated and considered by our team. RAs are theoretically selected by the following procedure: Those who wish to be an RA submit applications. Present RAs and Preceptors are asked to make recommendations of
people that they thought would be good, and these people are then asked to submit an application if they so desire. Next, Preceptors, old RAs, and administrators conduct interviews of candidates and rate them. The old RAs and Preceptors meet and discuss all candidates and the interview results. The list of new RAs is composed, with a list of alternates to be used in case of openings developing over the summer.

In actuality, the procedure for last year was slightly different. In discussing the meeting after the interviews with four people who were present at the meeting, we received a similar report from each. Their conclusions were that the interview results were completely neglected and the meeting was one big gossip session. Things were related about candidates that the relator did not know to be true, but had heard somewhere. At least one candidate went from the strong candidates list to the alternate list in this meeting. One of us was a candidate the year under consideration and had recounted to himself the things said about him. The items mentioned fell into one of the following categories: that which was true, but that the person stating the fact did not know personally to be true, but had relied on hearsay to relate; partial truths; outright lies; and guilt by association. Many openings occurred over the summer, and several of those of the alternate list were asked to become RAs. It is not known what procedure was used to select which of those from the alternate list were picked, but since this was done over the summer, it is unlikely that there was much student input. In addition, old RAs were asked to name additional people during the summer who they thought qualified, and
these people were contacted, some of them becoming RAs. It is known that in at least one case, additional people were asked to be RAs, when a member of the alternate list (of the same sex) was not asked. It should be mentioned in passing that though we did not investigate this area, the amount of input by students into Preceptor selection was not known by any of us.

The comments of the RAs on Bonnie Ring's course for RAs were quite similar. All of those who took it felt that it was a positive thing, because they had a chance to meet the other RAs. Few commented on the counseling emphasis or if they did, indicated little or no use thereof. None of the students interviewed indicated that they had used their RA as an academic or personal counselor. All of the RAs indicated that the course content was either not nearly so important as the factor of meeting the other RAs or stated that the course content was irrelevant.

In regards to counseling, we asked a question about who a person would talk to about a personal problem, and the results overwhelmingly indicated that people would generally go to friends for this. Once again, the RA or Preceptor was never mentioned.

In regards to financing the RA and Preceptor program, we mention the following: (Source 6.) Merrill is allotted $7,164 per year for RAs, with which it can hire any number of RAs, their salary naturally varying inversely to their number. This money is not actually paid as a salary, but is used to reduce the RAs housing bill. The Preceptors receive no salary per se, but have free rent, and can eat at Saga free. Allowing the Preceptors to eat free is part of Saga's contract. One pair of Preceptors
of Preceptors turned their eating privilege back to the college in the form of meal tickets. This pair when asked about it felt that Saga had not supplied a fair number of tickets in relation to the actual cost of not feeding them.
RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION.

We have listed many recommendations below. Following each recommendation is a discussion containing facts and reasoning connected with the recommendation. Some of our recommendations we feel very confident in making, others are still matters for debate, even among ourselves. Those with which we feel confident are stated in detail, those still to be discussed merely have a topic heading after the number and discussion of alternative views is found in the discussion section following it.

1. Central Core Area: (See accompanying diagram)
   A. Removal of part of the railing between the quad and the area lounges and the installation of stairs between the two areas.
   B. Paths constructed where dirt paths presently exist, (see diagram).
   C. Expansion of the snack bar facility by moving it into the adjacent lounge and removing part of the wall, placing all the food preparation and serving facilities in this room. Greatly expanding the diversity of the snack bar and increasing its hours.
   D. Large improvements in the decor of the snack bar, making an intimate, comfortable atmosphere. Round tables and comfortable chairs. A good carpet is a must, (the Bursar indicated that a price of $6/sq. yd. would be a reasonable expectation). Drapes are also a must. The fixtures for
drapes are already present, so the only expenditure would be for the drapes per se. Keep the thermostat at a reasonable level. Expansion of the snack bar into the adjacent lounge, removing part of the wall. Construction of a door and stairs leading down to the opposite side of the building (see diagram).

E. Inclusion of the mailboxes in the Core Area, in the building indicated, expanded if necessary.

1. Discussion.

A. As we have pointed out, students do not feel that they have any open space. Part of this is that they are unconsciously affected by the railing and slope between the quad and the area lounges. This would help to integrate the two areas.

B. The plants are suffering along these areas as they are inevitably used anyway. Establishing a paved path and borders for the planted areas will stop this, as well as provide a feeling of easy travel and open area.

C. The snack bar received a very positive report from our interviewees, but most felt a strong need for improvements as mentioned, especially greater food variety, better decor, and the removal of the serving bar from the immediate eating area. We did notice that the snack bar generally had someone in it. This will provide a place for people to meet informally at Merrill, as no place exists otherwise, and the need for such was definitely felt. Under such circumstances as going to get a donut or (free)
cup of coffee, the student will feel comfortable in the situation; it will involve a feeling of "belonging" there, rather than one of looking for social contacts. It is hoped that this would be the type of atmosphere in which informal groups gatherings would take place, one would meet friends, play chess or cards, etc. Hopefully, members of Merrill who play musical instruments would feel free to play in an informal situation. Expanding into the Latin American lounge will allow part of the facility to be cut off from view of the rest of the eating area, while still being an integral part of it. The door is to encourage people to come in from that direction. Its placement and the placement of furniture in the eating area will be such to prevent this being used as a thoroughfare. The present lighting is not bad, it should be low level. We received several complaints that the room was too cold. We went down to investigate the heating facilities and they turned out to be quite adequate. The cause of the coolness was that the thermostat was kept at 60°.

E. The mailboxes are an important socializing point. By including them here, we will draw additional people to the area. The side door indicated is so that the traffic will not be too heavy through the snack bar area. The television room seems to attract a small group nightly, and this is a good location for it.

This recommendation should be implemented by giving it to
Note: Present situation is in black.
Recommendations are in red.
the Core Area Committee that is studying the problem, for their considera-
tion.

2. The Baobab Room should be turned into a ping pong, pool, and fireside room. The partition between the fireplace and the rest of the room should be removed. A pool table should be added. The extra furniture should be removed to the Crown-Merrill Building and the Charles E. Merrill Room, etc.

2. Discussion:
Pong enjoys quite a popularity at Merrill, some people mentioned meeting others through it. The location of the Baobab room would be good.

3. The Merrill Room should be used as the meeting room of Merrill.

3. Discussion: People who are going to a meeting are not as influenced by its location being out of the main traffic patterns as areas of socializing are, consequently the out-of-the-way location of this building is alright.

4. Merrill must make every effort to achieve autonomy, especially financial.

4. Discussion: Merrill is presently tied into the nine campuses with respect to her debt on the dorms. We do not actually pay for the loan on the dorms, rather we are assigned our share of the debts on all dorms and dining facilities of the nine campuses. This figure has averaged about $148,000/annum. Next year, the Bursar informed us, Santz Cruz will become responsible for its own debts by itself. Merrill should make an effort at this time to obtain financial independence for itself as a college. We could then use any means that the college felt it wanted to pay the debts on our dorms, etc. The annual revenue from room and board has been approximately $350,000. Saga is paid in the neighborhood of $3200/week this year. The actual cost of construction of the Merrill dorms was A&BE, $2,675,631; C&G, $440,900; for a total of $3,116,531. (these last figures are from source 15, all others are from source 6)

5. Saga - for short term improvements, we would like to defer to the recommendations of the Dorm Council.

5. Discussion: These things should be left to the residents. The dorm council seems like the proper body to consider this and they are doing so.

6. Saga - ultimately a dining service as an integral part of room and board should be phased out. An inexpensive, restaurant type of provision should be available.
7. Merrill should invite more speakers and performers and provide movies at cost. Information should be made available about movies being shown in classes that would have general interest.

7. Discussion: cf. comments on Merrill social life. This recommendation should be addressed to the Merrill activities committee.

8. The RA job should be abolished. Inserted in its place should be the following: A returning student, in exchange for the guarantee of a single room (he would pay the full amount) would volunteer to serve as an information source. He would give out the keys initially, etc. He would serve as a source of information of administrative details for the incoming students. It would be clear that he had no authority and that his job would terminate after one month. After this time, the unit would then decide how they would handle such things as posting notices, locking doors, etc. The $7,164 could be used for more beneficial things among which would be the assignment of an activities fund to each dorm unit. This fund would not be large and remaining money at the end of the year would revert to the general fund.

8. Discussion: The Ra situation is covered elsewhere in this report. Giving the units a little money and responsibility for planning their own administration will tend to get the members together as they will have to discuss these things.

9. Abolish the role of Preceptor. The apartments should be rented out to married couples at a rate comparable with similar facilities in town. This would be open to faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates on a first-come-first-served basis.

9. Discussion: The need is felt for more apartment like housing on campus. We definitely did not want to open these up to all undergraduates as they would be so much better (if priced as indicated) than what else was available in the dorms that a great deal of quibbling for this preferred place would occur. The revenue could be used for the many improvements needed in the Merrill life. Many obvious advantages to this plan exist. If faculty do want to live on-campus they would be there as fellow residents. This would probably promote better interaction than if they are in some official position. The Merrill community would benefit from the immediate presence of married undergraduates. In the interim before more kitchens are built, the Preceptor apartments can be used as kitchens.
They are not adequate for kitchens on a permanent basis. This recommendation and the immediately preceding one must be addressed to the new Provost directly, as well as being considered by the Dorm Council and the Senior Preceptor for Student Affairs.

10. The Red Cross should be approached to offer first aide courses on campus.

10. The Merrill community should be better able to take care of itself.

11. Co-residential living should be made generally available to all who want it, including freshman.

11. Many students mentioned the difficulty of meeting members of the opposite sex, and this tends to alleviate the matter. Freshman in particular are subject to this problem and they are presently the ones denied co-residential living. The denial is based on an edict from the Chancellor which was given during the fight to achieve co-residential living last year. The original co-residential floor included a majority of freshman, and this was allowed because they were an "experiment," to be analyzed later and a report given to the Chancellor. The experiment turned out well. The dorm council should handle this matter.

12. Small, low table such as are presently found in some lounges should be more generally available for those students wanting them in their rooms.

12. These are particularly nice. Making them available would get rid of the problem that students appropriate them for their rooms anyway.

13. A mechanism for holding a bar of soap should be installed in the showers.

13. The amount of profanity in the bathrooms would be drastically reduced by this, as the soap is always falling off of the little shelf.

14. Construction of more kitchens, eventually one per floor.

14. Discussion: Little can be said that has not already been said in great detail. Merrill needs more kitchens. The double room type, i.e. those which require the use of two double rooms to construct, are preferred. This is probably the single strongest request of the Merrill dorm residents.

15. The Charles E. Merrill Room should be considered the committee meeting place of Merrill rather than the Baobab Room.

15. Discussion: cf. discussions above.
16. The dorm council should be given office space such as that off of the Merrill room or room 212. A mimeograph machine should be available.

17. A phone should be installed in the central core area so that off-campus students may use it, perhaps near the mailboxes.

18. More single rooms are needed.

18. Discussion: If Merrill had financial autonomy and could develop revenues from the areas discussed above, it could probably make more single-doubles at a reasonable rate. A room-only single-double presently goes for about $120/month, hardly comparable to off-campus quarters.

Discussion: One of us has discussed the tribe situation in detail. Another of us has discussed the lonely people who are outside of this realm. The tribe has been a very positive thing for those involved in them. We do not feel that anything should be done that would jeopardize the establishment of them. On the other hand, we have mentioned the difficulty of meeting people and the problem of getting to know those outside of one’s own unit. It is a moot point whether removing certain physical barriers between units will actually be detrimental to the formation of tribes. This is for Merrill College to further think about. Suggestions 19. and 20. will aide in encouraging relationships between adjacent units.

19. Kitchens should be built in a checkerboard fashion, to be used by the entire floor.

19. Discussion: This will facilitate people on the same floor getting to know each other since they will be preparing food in the same kitchen.

20. Lounges could be placed in a checkerboard fashion also alternating with the kitchens. These would be enlargements of the present lounges. These would be accomplished by walling off the present lounge and removing the wall between it and the adjacent room.

20. Discussion: Many people felt that the lounges were inadequate. Those units which were particularly "together" used their lounges while those that did not get "together" did not. It is questionable whether a nicer, larger lounge would actually do anything. It is also debated whether such a lounge will help people from adjacent units getting to know each other, or if each will feel a lack of ownership in the lounge and have it end up unused.
As already mentioned, the open lounge is a positive factor in strengthening the tribal situation. We were unable to resolve this problem. The Merrill community should think about these matters. Hopefully our analysis will be helpful in putting things in perspective so that a choice can be made. We should mention that the lounges which suffer the most are that of the center units in A dorm, as they have large amounts of cross traffic, especially on the fourth and fifth floors. Perhaps one lounge enlargement should be attempted here, and that way its results could be better analyzed. We should also mention that it has come to our attention that the college has already realized the need for checkerboarding the kitchens and has used that policy in placing their second kitchen.

21. Trees

21. Discussion: The trees in the center of campus (the area bordered by the gathouse, class room building, area lounges, and paths) are suffering from the trampling on the roots. Students do not perceive of this as open space, yet they walk through it. Either the area should be enclosed, the students should stop worrying about the lack of open space in this area or, the following should be done. The undergrowth and smaller trees should be removed, leaving only the major stands, which should have some small barrier around them. This would be a rather controversial plan. Merrill should openly discuss what it is they want to do, the alternative seems to be either trees or open space.

21. All studies, research papers etc. that can be should have a copy filed in a file and indexed in some place readily available to students.

21. The activities committee might address themselves to this.

22. It should be made easy to change one's roommate and this should be well known.

22. Since the college throws two people that do not know each other together, it should make it easy for these people to change if they want. By making this a readily acceptable procedure, there would not be any much trauma connected with it.

23. 15-30 days notice should be all that is required to get out of one's contract.

23. Discussion: Though this makes it more difficult to plan finances, as a matter of philosophy and a matter of competition with off-campus situations, this should be done.
Social Life of Merrill College Residential Students

A very large number of students living on campus at Merrill will express the opinion when asked, that there is very little if any social life at Merrill. They generally find the existing situation inadequate in fulfilling their needs. Many students feel isolated and lonely much of the time. When asked if their present living situation provided sufficient contact and acquaintance with other students, most residents initially responded affirmatively, but on reflection said that they find making new contacts extremely difficult. The opinion was expressed that although there is a great deal of homogeneity among the students, there exists at the same time no broad base of common interest and no way of finding others of common interest. Merrill students are generally dissatisfied with the quality of their social life at Merrill.

Almost all residents find their social life centered around their own floor unit. First year residents responded that most of their close friends live in their floor unit. There are three types of social organization in specific units. Two of these, the unit with a dominant tribal group and the unit with no social cohesion to speak of, are dealt with in some detail elsewhere in this report. The third type of organizational structure in specific units is in the center of these two extremes. These are units in which the residents get along in relative congeniality but in which no one is extremely close to more than one or two others in the unit. It is primarily in these units that one finds
more middle and upperclassmen and thus students who have close friendships with people outside of their unit as well as within the unit. Again it should be pointed out that there is not a great deal of inter-unit activity, that people do not readily meet and form friendships with others outside of their particular unit. How the specific organizational structures found on specific units relates to social life in general is dealt with in some detail below.

The predominant social activity of residential students is the small informal group gathering centered in unit lounges or in someone's bedroom. In these group gatherings the primary activity is "shooting the bull" with a smattering of gossip and occasionally a discussion of some current event. Other forms of entertainment include going to on-campus movies, walking in the forest, listening to music, and informal spontaneous parties. Many of these are passive forms of entertainment and social activity. Many students find that these eventually become rather empty and boring.

The major physical areas around which most socializing takes place, beside the unit lounges previously mentioned are; the dining commons (primarily for students using the food service), the mail box area, the grass around the gatehouse and the classroom building, the quad in front of the dining commons, and Area Lounge complex. Most of the space available for socializing is out of doors and can only be utilized in fair weather. The dining commons is used primarily for meals with occasional use as a meeting hall for classes and organizations and as a movie
house. Most students recognize the potential of the Area Lounges and use them to a certain degree, but generally feel that the existing facilities are physically unattractive and do not use them to the fullest of their potential. The Crown-Merrill recreation building is not used at this time. For at least the first half of the Fall Quarter 1971, this facility was kept locked with a key available only at the college office. Most students abandoned the idea of the Crown-Merrill recreation building as a center for student activities because of its being locked and because of its out of the way location. (For a more detailed analysis of the physical facilities for student social interaction see pg. )

When asked what they felt was lacking from the social life found at Merrill, most resident students responded that there are not enough planned events, lectures from outside speakers, cultural events, and inexpensive films of all types. There was also the opinion expressed that the Area Lounge complex and the "Coffee Shop" left a lot to be desired in the way of attractiveness and activities to be found there.

There are several mediating factors which tend to get people from differing units together on a social basis. Sex is an important mediating factor, especially for people in sexually segregated units. It is necessary for students to cross unit boundaries to make heterosexual contacts. Drugs provide another mediating factor of some importance. The supplier is sometimes on another unit and it becomes necessary for the drug user in searching out the supplier to become acquainted with students of other units. Drug users sometimes get together with other drug users in different units.
house. Most students recognize the potential of the Area Lounges and use them to a certain degree, but generally feel that the existing facilities are physically unattractive and do not use them to the fullest of their potential. The Crown-Merrill recreation building is not used at this time. For at least the first half of the Fall Quarter 1971, this facility was kept locked with a key available only at the college office. Most students abandoned the idea of the Crown-Merrill recreation building as a center for student activities because of its being locked and because of its out of the way location. (For a more detailed analysis of the physical facilities for student social interaction see pg. )

When asked what they felt was lacking from the social life found at Merrill, most resident students responded that there are not enough planned events, lectures from outside speakers, cultural events, and inexpensive films of all types. There was also the opinion expressed that the Area Lounge complex and the "Coffee Shop" left a lot to be desired in the way of attractiveness and activities to be found there.

There are several mediating factors which tend to get people from differing units together on a social basis. Sex is an important mediating factor, especially for people in sexually segregated units. It is necessary for students to cross unit boundaries to make heterosexual contacts. Drugs provide another mediating factor of some importance. The supplier is sometimes on another unit and it becomes necessary for the drug user in searching out the supplier to become acquainted with students of other units. Drug users sometimes get together with other drug users in different units.
Sports provide an opportunity for meeting other students living in differing units. The ping-pong table is invariably constant use when there are balls available and it provides a good opportunity for meeting new people. The Field House is an extremely popular center for students to meet others. Classes are another mediating factor in making new social contacts, although many respondents replied when asked that they did not meet others in classes and that those that they did meet did not become lasting friends. Church and religious group functions play a role in facilitating new acquaintances. Student government brings people of differing units together. These last two mediating factors are factors for only a small percentage of the students. It can readily be seen that all these mediating factors bring people together around common interests, but that these are subject to chance. No one can be fairly sure that participation in some of these will lead to friendships, excepting of course the factor of sex. In fact, many of these mediating factors can prove to be rather impersonal and participation in them by some will cease.

To summarize social life at Merrill; it is apparent that Merrill is socially dull and uninteresting, with some few exceptions. Weekends are spent by many students in their rooms wondering where all the other students are. Loneliness and isolation are dominant feelings of many students. The casual "bull sessions" that make up much of the social activity at Merrill are for many inadequate and unsatisfying. A major complaint of many students is that they experience a real lack in that sense of community
so important to human beings and that they are without any deep and intimate relationships in a sea of people. It appears most plainly that there are many students who are extremely dissatisfied with the present situation.

The manner in which the existing situation got to be the way it is is at once simple and complex. The major complaints of the students at Merrill are indicative of all the problems of our modern American culture. It is after all from mainstream American culture that most Merrill students come. To deal effectively with some of the problems of social life at Merrill would require a major restructuring of many of our social and interpersonal relationships, a restructuring that Merrill College as it exist now in both theory and practice will not attempt. There are some factors of the existing situation though, that do stem directly from the way in which Merrill is set up.

That students feel isolated from other students, especially those of other units, can be seen partially as a result of the physical layout of the dorms. Each unit, which houses fourteen students in full occupancy, is indeed a separate unit. There are two doors, doors which are sometimes locked, between each unit. With these barriers there is the added factor that there is no need for students to enter another unit for any reason other than the occasional friendship that already exists between people of different units and the traffic through the center section of A-dorm.

The dining hall is the only place where large numbers of
students from different units can get together with any regularity. This is of course for the express purpose of eating and whatever social activity that does take place here is usually between friends eating together. Dining commons social activity is of the same type as is found in the dorm lounges. Small numbers of students from different units do get together in the open kitchens, but this is also primarily for the purpose of preparing and eating a meal. There are no large areas in which many students from different units can meet at a single time for social purposes. The Area Lounges are much too small to accommodate large numbers of students. The Area Lounges themselves are separated from each other, a further factor leading to the sense of isolation. Both the Baobab Lounge and the Crown-Merrill recreation building are not used to the fullest of their potential. The Crown-Merrill building is in a very poor location and students have been discouraged from utilizing this facility by its locked door. The Baobab Lounge has had an ambiguous history of uses. It has been used as a meeting room, classroom, lounge, and has also been kept locked at times. The overwhelming conclusion here is that students are almost forced into staying in their own units for social purposes through a lack of adequate facilities.

An analysis of the present social life at Merrill would not be complete without an attempt to describe the differences between social life as entertainment and activities and social life as a feeling of community solidarity. In the existing situation there is little of either, excepting that of the "tribe" described in great detail previously in this report. The "tribe" that develops
around the necessities of the new living experience of some of
the members of a floor unit is both a positive and a negative
thing. It satisfies the needs of most of its members, allows for
the formation of meaningful and lasting relationships, is a
positive growth experience for its members to a certain extent,
and it is sometimes a strong factor in the development of the
college. (It is generally the "tribe" that has the necessary or-
ganization for pushing through needed reforms, e.g., the housing
lottery and co-residential dorm units.) There are many definite
weaknesses in the "tribal" arrangement as it presently exist,
though. The "tribe" forms as a response to the newness of the
living situation and to the isolation of dorm units from the rest
of the college. As they exist now, it is as if they are forced
to develop within a particular unit, with some of the students
in those units excluded from them. "Tribes", not needing any out-
side social contact, tend to withdraw from the general social
life of the college. Those students living in units with "tribal"
domination of common facilities not in the "tribes" themselves
must somehow muddle through on the fringes of the unit's social
activities. All this tends to perpetuate the isolation of students
who are not members of specific "tribes". (In this sense "tribes"
can be seen as being a form of clique.) The end result is the
fragmentation of the general community and a perceived lack of
community solidarity.

As the present situation stands, members of floor units
through lack of adequate facilities outside, are forced to remain
within their own units for most of their social activities. Added to this the lack of specific events, those students not in "tribe" groups spend a great deal of their time either lonely or bored.

As stated above, there exists now no readily available means for students outside of "tribal" groups to find other students with common interests with the expressed intent of meeting socially with these people. As it exists now, all of the factors leading to students meeting others of common interest outside of their own unit are left to chance, within a facility that tends to fragment and isolate people to begin with. The result of all this is to leave people without a sense of belonging to a real community other than those who are fortunate enough to get together in the small communities of the "tribes". The lack of specific social and entertainment type events, and the lack of a nice place in which to center activities only aggravates the problem.

To describe what the situation should be at Merrill involves making the decision as to what sort of arrangement would be best for all students. The ideal of course is to retain the best factors of the "tribe" (for all their weaknesses they are a positive experience for members), at the same time facilitating for those students who find themselves excluded from specific "tribes" the means and opportunity to meet other exclusions with whom they can form meaningful and lasting friendships. The ideal condition includes the sense of community solidarity of the "tribe", but in an expanded form to include as many students as possible. This ideal cannot be engineered by the college, but some of the blocks
to its realization may possibly be removed by the college in specific areas. Our recommendations for facilitating the improvement of the quality of social life at Merrill are addressed to these specific areas of concern.
MERRILL AND THE LAW

Several questions were asked in the interviews about Merrill and the law. When asked how they felt about dorm rules most students either expressed ignorance of any or had no interest in them as they were never enforced. Students simply do not obey the rules. Some interviewees indicated that they did obey the rules, but later questions indicated that they smoked dope or violated intervisitation, etc. Some students felt that it was necessary to have the rules to keep the public or parents happy, and so felt that it was alright to have rules as long as they were not enforced. Most students realized that the rules on drugs were simply a matter of state law about which little could be done. They felt that intervisitation rules were "stupid" and obviously not followed. Almost all students felt that the rules should be determined by the residents of the dorms.

Contrary to the Provost's expressed feeling in his letter to the parents of 20 April, 1970, marijuana and drugs were indicated to be (by all those able to comment thereon or willing to do so) as prevalent on campus as off (a few), or more prevalent on-campus (most respondents indicated this to be the case).

We asked our interviewees to estimate the number of people who used marijuana in their unit, (this would refer to all users, both frequent and occasional. Off-campus respondents were asked to recall their on-campus experience.) The average estimate was 72%. If one weighs the results so that users are given twice the weight of non-users, on the assumption that they would have better knowledge, we obtain 65.6%. These results seem quite in contrast...
to the percentage quoted by the Provost in his previously cited letter to the parents, in which he cites 15% as the figure of occasional users and 7% as the figure of frequent users.

Our personal observations and experiences indicate that co-habitation is a rather common phenomenon at Merrill. The Provost has indicated that he is aware of the amount, but does not do anything unless a particular case is brought to his attention.
SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED IN THIS REPORT

1. Interview with Bonnie Ring, Merrill College Counselor
   Interview of 10/14/71 to discuss which problems occur most, common complaints, and generally ascertain with respect to the problems brought to her about residential life.

2. Bonnie Ring's annual report
   Obtained copy of Bonnie's annual report of 1970-71 form Anne Reid; this contains the statistics of Bonnie's counseling activities.

3. Interview with Katia Panas, EOP counselor
   Interview to ascertain what are the special problems of minority students in dorm living situations.

4. Gruhn Report
   We obtained a copy of the report of Gruhn, Gruhn, & Associates on housing at UCSC.

5. Drop-out study
   We obtained a copy of the Merrill College drop-out study from Lois Bennet. This is a summary of a questionnaire sent to students leaving Merrill.

6. Financial figures from the Bursar
   We asked Iz for certain financial figures concerning the dorms.

7. Saga - Gregg Wheatland's "What Does It Really Cost to Eat at Saga?"
   Report presented to Merrill Steering Committee about costs of eating at Saga.
8. Saga - Dorm Council discussions about the contract.
    Attendance at these meetings.

9. Interview with Chief of Campus Police
    Interview with Chief McIntyre re Proctor.

10. Interviews of Resident Assistants
    Interview with 7 RAs (out of 22) about what they did as RA
    and how they viewed their job. The nature of the selection
    process to determine which RAs were asked was simply one of
    who we happened to be able to locate the day that we did the
    survey.

11. Interviews
    Interviews with 45 randomly selected Merrill students. This
    was done by applying a random number table to the Merrill Stu-
    dent Directory. This interview also involved a general rap
    session on Merrill. Off-campus students were asked to recall
    the situation when they lived on-campus, as well as discuss
    their present situation.

12. Dorm Council
    One of the members of our team was a member of the Dorm Coun-
    cil.

12. Direct observation
    We spent time in specific areas of Merrill to see how they
    are actually used, especially the Area Lounges and Merrill
    library.

13. Personal experience
    The three members of this team are all fourth year students
    at Merrill, there since its beginning. Our involvements with
Merrill life have been multi-faceted. Two of us have lived on-campus the entire time, and the other moved off after two years.

14. Archives of the Fifth Column

Archives of one of Merrill's oldest tribes.

15. Office of Physical Planning and Construction