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Abstract The University of Massachusetts is one of sixty Land Grant institutions founded by the Morrill Act of 1862. The reality of fine arts in the University is firmly rooted in the Land Grant mission of integrating theoretical knowledge with the practical applications of that knowledge, providing access to this education for all who could benefit from it, and informing a broad and changing public. Within this framework the Fine Arts Center provides cultural and educational programs in the performing and visual arts for the campus community and the surrounding region.

Fine Arts Center programs are integrated with students' professional education in the arts, and complementary to their academic work in every other discipline. The arts constitute an important element in the University's outreach programs to encourage lifelong general education. In addition to the Concert Hall, theaters, and University Gallery, the Center houses the Art, Theater, and Music and Dance departments in which seven hundred fifty undergraduate students enrolled in 1996-97.

In the general education curriculum Arts and Literature are complementary disciplines which consider the production, performance, function and aesthetic evaluation of the arts - verbal, visual, and aural - in relation to one another and to the societies that produce them. Each of the 17,400 undergraduate students in the University must complete at least two Arts and Literature courses.

The Fine Arts Center stands in the heart of campus, along side the University Library. Its centrality embodies the ideal of interweaving the arts with every other aspect of the University. The Center provides a setting for deepening appreciation of artistic tradition from every continent. Chancellor David K. Scott has stated that "the Fine Arts Center makes a bold statement about how the campus views creative endeavor."

Integration among arts, humanities and sciences and removal of barriers between liberal and professional learning have been central to the University since it opened in 1867. According to Chancellor Scott, "the Land Grant model called for new approaches to the curriculum and to the applications of scholarship to societal issues. Such integration was considered crucial at the time when society was changing from an agrarian to an industrial base. Never was the need for an integrative approach greater than now."

This year Chancellor Scott initiated a multiple-year redesign of the University's General Education Curriculum to include greater emphasis upon issues of diversity and internationalism, and to prepare students for leadership in the 21st Century. I am pleased and honored to have been asked to direct this design of a new model for the campus and to chair the Task Force on General Education.

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

In our universities and colleges today we seek a revolution. Small improvements in the General Education curriculum for our students are not enough for the twenty-first century. No longer can we afford to educate students with knowledge alone; they must have vision. No longer can we educate our students to live and work only in their own country; they must understand and appreciate all people. In each of our nations—on every continent—our students will live global lives. Let each of us acknowledge: the arts will be full partners in this new education.

In her commencement address last May at Harvard University, United States Secretary of State Madeleine Albright issued a challenge for the future:
Those of you who have graduated today will live global lives. You will compete in a world marketplace; travel further and more often than any previous generation; share ideas, tastes and experience with counterparts from every culture, and recognize that to have a full and rewarding future, you will have to look outward (Albright 1997).

General Education for the twenty-first century must prepare our students to live global lives. The arts and humanities will provide practical and essential preparation for a global life. The arts and humanities are central because they teach students new ways to understand, new ways to communicate, across every boundary of time, distance and culture. Study of the arts and humanities is essential—practical preparation for excellence and for achievement in every field of human endeavor.

What practical purpose can the arts serve in today’s technological world? The arts provide instant communication across the usual boundaries that separate you from me, that separate us from all others. The arts nurture harmony, peace and understanding. The arts complement verbal language. The arts are unique; they offer opportunities to communicate with our past, with our present, with our future, and with our fellow human beings.

What can you do with a liberal arts education? A modern research university offers a distinctive answer to guide our students: learn to be excellent in a major field of study or profession. Learn to be excellent in your study of the arts and humanities. Learn to integrate your professional knowledge with the wisdom you gain from arts and literature. Learn to inquire; to seek new knowledge and visionary solutions. The arts and humanities provide the most practical education for a life of visionary leadership.

A decade ago, General Motors Corporation Chairman Roger Smith discussed “Business and the Liberal Arts” with the volunteer leadership of The Campaign for The University of Michigan:

Management itself is an art. The art of management begins with vision because, whether you are carving a statue or reorganizing a corporation, you have to have an idea of what you want to create. A company’s competitiveness and survival depend on managers with vision.

These mental processes can be acquired in study of liberal arts. You learn to see relations between things that seem utterly different, to combine familiar elements into new forms. You learn to connect the seemingly unconnected. In other words, you learn the kind of creativity that leads to visionary solutions to business problems (Smith 1985).

Likewise the best teacher, the best doctor, the best par-

ent, the most effective political leader is the one who has acquired the special creativity that produces visionary solutions. This special creativity, this vision--this spirit of inquiry, discovery, and integration--is a primary goal of the General Education of undergraduate students in a research university.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Four faculty members and four wooden buildings awaited the first entering class of 56 students when Massachusetts Agricultural College opened its doors in 1867; the first graduate degrees were authorized in 1892. “Mass Aggie” became Massachusetts State College in 1931, and the University of Massachusetts in 1947. The University is governed by a Board of Trustees, which shares responsibility for academic program review and approval with the statewide Board of Higher Education. Board policy is administered by the system-wide president and the chancellors on each of five campuses. As the University’s “Flagship Campus,” Amherst draws students from the nation and the world; this campus provides a broad undergraduate curriculum with nearly 100 majors, and graduate programs leading to doctoral degrees in most fields of study.

Legislation voted by the Faculty Senate states that “the arts do more than imitate life; they interpret and explain it” (Office of the Provost 1995). According to the Board of Trustees, the University of Massachusetts Amherst is responsible for “developing the human and cultural quality of life for the region through a comprehensive arts program, and promoting the multicultural awareness and tolerance of diversity essential to a pluralistic, transnational society” (Office of the Chancellor 1996). Chancellor David K. Scott recently wrote that General Education should “develop students’ aesthetic sensibilities . . . in such areas as art, music, and literature” (Scott 1996).

The University’s mandate is clear: the arts are central to the education of students at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Within this framework the University of Massachusetts Fine Arts Center provides cultural and educational programs in the performing and visual arts for the campus community and surrounding region. Fine Arts Center programs are integrated with students’ professional education in the arts, and complement their academic work in all other disciplines. The arts also are an important part of the University’s outreach programs to encourage lifelong general education. In addition to the Concert Hall, theaters, and the University Gallery, the Center houses Art, Theater, and Music and Dance departments in which 750 undergraduate students enrolled for professional education in academic year 1996-1997.

THE UNIVERSITY FINE ARTS CENTER
During the University’s expansion in the 1960s the Trustees established a full complement of undergraduate and graduate professional degree programs in Music and Dance, Art and Theater; hired the architectural firm of Roche & Dinkeloo to design a Fine Arts Center, and designated the University of Massachusetts Amherst as its location. Selection of a building site for the Center was controversial on campus. At issue was which new building should stand in the most prominent location, close to the center of campus. Today the Fine Arts Center shares with the University Library the distinction of standing in the very center of campus, and thereby “expresses the ideal of interweaving the arts within every other aspect of the life of the University and the larger community” (Stiffler 1995). Last year, Chancellor David Scott reaffirmed the importance of arts at the University:

As we celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the Fine Arts Center, we also express the campus commitment to the arts in all their manifestations . . . The Fine Arts Center makes a bold statement about how the campus views creative endeavor (Scott 1995).

The Fine Arts Center is not only the vast building itself, but in a more comprehensive sense it also is the countless interconnected visual and performing arts events, artists and audiences, concert halls and galleries; and professional arts departments that collectively serve every one of the University’s undergraduates, a large share of its graduate students, and thousands of citizens from surrounding communities.

To much of the University and the community the centerpiece of Fine Arts Center activities is the Center Series, a diverse collection of performance events that take place each year in the Fine Arts Center Concert Hall and Bowker Auditorium. Over the years, audiences have filled these halls to hear artists such as Sarah Vaughan, Yehudi Menuhin, Julian Bream, Bobby McFerrin, Dizzy Gillespie, Dave Brubeck, George Shearing, Ray Charles; the Kronos, Juilliard, Cleveland, Tokyo and Guarnieri String Quartets; the Drummers and Dancers of Kodo; the Royal Winnipeg Ballet, Ballet Folklorico de Mexico, Ballet Theatre de Bordeaux, Dance Theater of Harlem; Broadway musical shows; and many of the world’s great symphony orchestras, including those of Chicago, Leningrad, San Francisco, St. Louis, Vienna and Czechoslovakia. Recently, the Fine Arts Center presented concerts by the Estonian Philharmonic Chamber Choir and Tallinn Chamber Orchestra, Maria Benitez Teatro Flamenco, and Garth Fagan Dance Company.

The visual arts counterpart to the Center Series is the University Gallery. The Gallery is distinguished for its collection of public site sculptures and American artists’ works on paper, including photographs by Ansel Adams and sculptural installations by Daniel Buren, Richard Fleischner, Jackie Ferrara, Jenny Holzner, Shirazeh Houshiary, Jin Soo Kim, Martin Puryear, Allan Wexler, George Trakas, Robert Murray and Stephen Antonakos.

The William Smith Clark Memorial outdoor sculpture garden of cut black steel, granite and bronze marks the home of the first president of Massachusetts Agricultural College and commemorates his contributions to agricultural studies in the United States and Japan and his assistance with the founding of Sapporo Agricultural College, which later became the University of Hokkaido, sister school to the University of Massachusetts. University student Todd Richardson created this public art site in 1991 in consultation with Barrie B. Greenbie, Soichiro Asakawa and Fumiaki Takano.

Given the level of student and faculty activism on campus in 1975, it was not entirely surprising that when the Fine Arts Center officially opened with concerts by the Boston Symphony Orchestra one night and the Boston Pops the next, the events prompted a student protest. Backstage, conductors Seiji Ozawa and Arthur Fiedler proclaimed the excellence of the Concert Hall while, outside the building, student protesters proclaimed this music “elitist, Eurocentric and symbolic of cultural and racial oppression.” It was fortuitous that the University Fine Arts Center thus grew to early fruition during a time when students and faculty had begun to insist upon greater relevance and increased awareness of cultural diversity in the curriculum. As the decade waned, University faculty and administrators grew more aware of their responsibilities to encompass the cultural riches of the entire world. Within the Center, newly developed Special Programs in the Arts increased the diversity of arts on campus.

The most conspicuous of these is New WORLD Theater, created in 1979 to commission and present dramatic works by and about members of every racial and ethnic minority group represented in America. During its first 15 years, New WORLD Theater presented some 200 original theater pieces on subjects including African American and Asian American urban identity, the history of immigration, the abolitionist movement, and working class life in countries as far apart as South Africa, Japan and Mexico.

The first decade of the Fine Arts Center also saw foundation of Augusta Savage Gallery, devoted to paintings, drawings and sculpture by artists of color. This gallery, which occupies part of the University’s New Africa House student residence hall, serves as a performance space for musicians, poets, storytellers and dancers such as Moroccan oud artist Tarik Benbrahim, Puerto Rican poet Jack Agueros, and Abenaki Indian and Quebecois poet Cheryl Savageau. The Center’s newest addition is the Asian Dance and Music Program. Events sponsored by this program during academic year 1997-1998 include the Indonesian Arts...
Project with Ingurah Supartha; In-Young Sohn Korean Dance; and Trio Kokoo, with Akikazu, Shakuhachi Master.

A dominant theme in the Fine Arts Center is life-long education. During academic year 1996-1997, the Center sponsored 56 visual arts exhibitions in five galleries; 172 concerts in four concert halls; and a diverse assortment of artist residencies, master classes and workshops. As an expression if its public service mission as a land-grant University, the University of Massachusetts invites the public to attend all of these events.

The Fine Arts Center’s Performing Arts Division provides classes, private lessons and performing opportunities in music, dance and theater for community residents of all ages, from pre-school children to seniors. Outstanding undergraduate and graduate music, dance and theater students teach in the Division under faculty supervision. The Residential Arts Program organizes experimental and multicultural theater, dance and music programs and performance art in Hampden Theater and adjoining Hampden Gallery. This program is located in a high density student residential area that serves 5,000 undergraduate students. Summer at the Center brings students from around the world to study with jazz artists Sheila Jordan, Max Roach, Yusef Lateef and members of the Billy Taylor Trio in the Jazz in July Workshops in Improvisation. During the school year, public school children and their teachers travel in caravans of school busses to the Fine Arts Center to attend Concerts for Young People. Other thousands of children participate in the University’s ARTSTART Partnership with the Public Schools of Springfield, a nearby urban center. This pioneering program shares Fine Arts Center artists with economically deprived children from the inner city and helps the arts become part of their everyday lives.

THE LAND-GRA N特 MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY

The American movement for land-grant colleges followed closely the publication by Charles Darwin of The Origin of Species, and the increased emphasis upon the role of science that followed. The traditional liberal arts college in America, modeled as it was upon European traditions, had been criticized early in the nineteenth century by Thomas Jefferson, who proposed to found a state university in Virginia, completely public in financial support and capable of teaching advanced studies in botany, chemistry, zoology, anatomy and agriculture (Jefferson 1800). In 1850, President Francis Wayland of Brown University asserted that we had in this country "one hundred and twenty colleges, forty-two theological seminaries, and forty-seven law schools, and we have not a single institution designed to furnish the agriculturist, the manufacturer, the mechanic, or the merchant with the education that will prepare him for the profession to which his life is to be devoted" (Wayland 1850).

The Morrill Act of 1862 set aside Federal land revenues for support of state colleges—some of the best of which eventually were to become the nation’s premier land-grant universities—"where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies . . . to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts.” Because of the growing importance of agriculture and business to the national economy and, not unobserved by political leaders, the increasing political activism of farmers and manufacturing workers, Congress passed the Morrill Act, and President Abraham Lincoln signed it (Brubacher 1968).

Two decades later, Senator Preston M. Sutton of Marshalltown, Iowa reaffirmed the case for a balanced curriculum "so as to provide a general and liberal course of study in which agriculture and the mechanics’ art shall have a leading place,” so that pupils would “be taught agriculture, together with such other studies as will give them a liberal as well as a practical education” (Sutton 1884). In a real sense, the University of Massachusetts espouses such a curriculum today—one that combines a “practical education” in each student’s selected major and a “liberal” education as defined by the General Education Curriculum required of all undergraduate students. At issue is a reexamination and redefinition of the goals and content of a General Education Curriculum to prepare students for a lifetime of learning in the twenty-first century.

THE GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM FOR EVERY UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT

The present General Education Requirements for University of Massachusetts Amherst undergraduate students were approved by the Faculty Senate for implementation in September, 1986. In the enabling legislation, the Faculty stated that “every reasonably well-educated person must have some appreciation of literature and the arts—fields of activity that explore, interpret, and evaluate the life of the imagination” (Office of the Provost 1995). Among the guidelines adopted for the new program were the following:

General Education should enable students to learn how natural scientists, social scientists, humanists and performing artists think about their disciplines and how they view their work in relation to both history and contemporary society. This means that writing and problem solving are the norm rather than the exception and will be reflected in the evaluation and examination procedures.

The General Education curriculum has four principal divisions: the Social World, the Biological and Physical
World, Basic Math Skills and Analytic Reasoning, and Writing. These divisions reflect categories of knowledge rather than departmental boundaries. There are three curriculum areas within the Social World: Arts and Literature, Historical Studies, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. Students must take six courses in these curriculum areas, distributed as follows: two courses in the Arts and Literature, at least one of which must be in Literature; one course in Historical Studies; two courses in the Social and Behavioral Sciences; and one additional course which can be from any of the Social World curriculum areas. All students must take two courses that carry a Diversity designation; one or both may also carry a Social World or Interdisciplinary designation, or they may carry only the Diversity designation.

The Arts and Literature.
The arts do more than imitate life; they interpret and explain it. The Arts and Literature area of General Education is made up of courses that consider the production, performance, function, and aesthetic evaluation of the arts—verbal, visual, aural and plastic—in relation to one another and to the societies that have and will produce them. Courses in the Arts and Literature area of the General Education curriculum should be designed to provoke comparison and critical acuity, and should encourage verbal expression through writing exercises. They may provide participatory experiences such as projects, performances, and attendance at plays, concerts, galleries, etc., although courses aimed primarily at performance or the learning of a skill do not qualify.

Social and Cultural Diversity.
Students must take two courses devoted to the study of diversity in human cultures and societies. It is important that General Education address the complex ways in which societies and cultures differ from one another because educated individuals should be guided by attitudes that value cultural differences. Courses satisfying this requirement shall reach beyond the perspectives of North American culture and the Western tradition. They may focus on the peoples of Africa, Asia, Latin America, or the Middle East; the descendants of those peoples living in North America; other minorities in Western industrial societies; and Native Americans. Since sensitivity to social and cultural diversity is advanced by an understanding of the dynamics of power in modern societies, courses that focus on the differential life experiences of women, minorities and the poor also come within the scope of this requirement.

Writing.
The purpose of the writing requirement is to help students acquire the skills they will need to cope with the writing tasks they will perform in their academic work, in their lives and in their careers. The Writing Program requires (1) a writing assessment test, (2) completion of a freshman writing course and (3) completion of a junior year writing requirement within the student’s major department. In addition to the required courses described above, writing should be incorporated into other parts of the undergraduate curriculum. In addition, departments are encouraged to offer fourth year elective courses that include advanced writing in their disciplines.

Interdisciplinary Courses.
The General Education curriculum is organized within the existing disciplinary structure of the University. Some faculty, however, have interests in offering experimental, multi-disciplinary and issue-focused courses, and some students are interested in taking them. Students may satisfy up to three of their General Education requirements (except College Writing, Basic Math Skills, or Analytic Reasoning) by taking interdisciplinary courses.

THE ARTS IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION OF EVERY STUDENT

More than a decade ago, the University of Massachusetts Amherst established a bold new General Education curriculum. In response the Fine Arts Center developed the University’s first interdisciplinary General Education arts course, The Lively Arts. In this course, more than twelve percent of the University’s 17,000 undergraduate students attend lectures and small group discussions by experts in each discipline, and experience live performances and contemporary exhibitions. The course is writing-intensive, and offers a class for University Honors students. Citizens outside the University are welcome to enroll. Our goals in planning and teaching The Lively Arts are to help students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Music</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Theater</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Visual Arts</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lively Arts</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Jazz</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance to Modern Art History</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient to Medieval Art History</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
gain an international view of the arts; to teach students to better appreciate the social and cultural differences of others; and to prepare every student for a lifetime of understanding and enjoyment of concerts and exhibitions, anywhere in the world.

In the University’s undergraduate General Education curriculum, Arts and Literature are complementary disciplines; every undergraduate student must complete at least two such courses. Of 1,235 instructional faculty on campus, 313—the largest number of any school or college—teach in the Faculty of Humanities and Fine Arts. The number of general education arts classes, taught for undergraduate students who are not majoring in the arts, underscores the centrality of arts in their education. In academic year 1995-1996, professors taught 248 classes in Arts and Literature, of which 79 (32%) were in arts disciplines. Enrollment data show that 5,111 students completed at least one General Education arts course. These enrollment figures exclude specialized courses for students majoring in music, dance, theater or visual arts. The following General Education arts courses had the highest student enrollments (Office of Academic Planning and Assessment 1997):

The following data (Table 2) show the number of classes offered and their enrollment for each “Area of Knowledge” in the General Education Curriculum (Office of Academic Planning and Assessment 1997):

The Professional Education of Students Majoring in the Arts
The Departments of Art, Music and Dance, and Theater are administrative components of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts. These arts departments offer the following degree programs (Office of Institutional Research 1996):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Area of Knowledge</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13,003</td>
<td>Arts and Literature</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,247</td>
<td>Historical Studies</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,150</td>
<td>Social and Behavioral Studies</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,712</td>
<td>Biological and Physical Sciences</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,413</td>
<td>Analytic Reasoning</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,804</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree or Program</th>
<th>Degrees Offered</th>
<th>Degrees Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Design</td>
<td>Bachelor of Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Music and Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor of Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following data show student enrollment in arts department majors during spring semester, 1997 (Office of Institutional Research (1997)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and Dance</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>213</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>754</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE ON CAMPUS

The Arts, 1975-1997

By 1975 essential groundwork for the arts on campus already had progressed for more than a century. The Commonwealth established a Fine Arts Center on the University’s Amherst campus in 1975 for both educational and public service purposes. In reality the Center initially focused upon presentation of public concerts and exhibitions. Student attendance was modest; by 1979 students constituted only 20.4 percent of the audience. Student members on the University Advisory Board complained that in only four years student ticket prices had doubled. Decisions that followed established a new direction for the Fine Arts Center and laid groundwork for a change in the prevailing culture of the campus regarding the arts.

The Fine Arts Center proposed to the Undergraduate Student Senate Rents and Fees Committee a mandatory Performing Arts Fee of six dollars per year, “for the purposes of subsidizing ticket prices for students and subsidizing the cost of technical services to student sponsors of programs in the Concert Hall and Bowker Auditorium.” The Center promised to offer half-price tickets to University students tickets for all Fine Arts Center concerts. The fee was approved, and yielded the sum of $26,000 to support the arts on campus.

The positive change in students’ perceived “ownership” of the arts on campus became as important as the funds provided. During the first year, student attendance at Fine Arts Center concerts nearly doubled, from 22 percent of the audience in 1979-80 to 42 percent in 1980-81, and an increasing number of students began to participate in the Center’s classes, workshops, residencies and internships. Over the years students have voted to approve each fee increase requested. At present every undergraduate and graduate student pays $77 per year. Total support in 1997 was $1,560,000, nearly 50 percent of the Fine Arts Center’s annual $3,279,344 budget.

The established pattern of shared governance among faculty, students and administration has facilitated the development of the arts on campus. Students participate in all levels of University decision-making, including the Board of Trustees. Massachusetts Senator Stan Rosenberg, while he was a University undergraduate student, observed that a university arts council “shares responsibility, as part of an educational institution, to contribute to students’ development of skills for future citizen involvement in the arts” (Rosenberg and Lynch 1979). At present, the University Arts Council is comprised of equal numbers of faculty, students and staff. A University Advisory Board of students, faculty and administrators advises the Fine Arts Center, as does a Friends Board of Directors drawn from the business, academic and political leadership of surrounding communities.

DESIGNING A NEW CAMPUS MODEL FOR GENERAL EDUCATION.

The University of Massachusetts has embarked upon an intense period of organizational change. During 1997, Chancellor David K. Scott initiated a multiple-year redesign of the University’s General Education to better prepare students for leadership in the twenty-first century. I am pleased and honored to have been asked to direct this design of a new model for our University and to chair the University Task Force on General Education.

Integration among arts, humanities and sciences and removal of barriers between liberal and professional learning have been central to the University since it opened in 1867.
The University of Massachusetts is one of 60 land-grant institutions founded by the Morrill Act of 1862. The reality of fine arts in the University is firmly rooted within the land-grant mission of integrating theoretical knowledge with practical applications of that knowledge, providing access to this education for all who would benefit from it, and informing a broad and changing public.

In May, 1996 the Office of the Chancellor published Strategic Action at the University of Massachusetts Amherst FY 1997-2001: Towards a Commonwealth of Learning, designed to provide a philosophical and fiscal framework for the implementation of strategic planning that has taken place during the past three years. In Strategic Action, Chancellor Scott proposed major financial investment in “Teaching, Learning and Curricular Reform.” We appointed the University Task Force on General Education to study the issues involved, formulate a plan of action, test and evaluate proposed initiatives, and assist in developing a new University model.

The Task Force met for the first time in December, 1996. Chancellor David Scott challenged faculty, students and administrators to consider several principles to guide their deliberations (Scott 1997). General Education should:

- Provide students with a sense of the inter-relatedness of knowledge, especially the melding of liberal learning with the professional, technical, and specialized knowledge of the major.
- Encourage the development of the skills of critical analysis and the use of such multiple modes of inquiry as scientific, artistic, literary, and information technologies.
- Develop students’ aesthetic sensitivities in such areas as art, music and literature.
- Graduate students whose years at the University have provided them with the knowledge, skills, and perspectives that permit the pursuit of multiple careers over the course of a lifetime.
- Graduate individuals with knowledge, skills, and habits of mind that will enable them to contribute effectively and ethically in an increasingly interdependent world and with the imagination, motivation, feeling, and spirit necessary for a life of learning beyond the formal classroom.

The first task in developing a new model for General Education was to define an organizational model for effecting change. Techniques for implementing change in a complex organization are well documented (Demski 1993). Likewise, the organizational literature addresses ways in which the “culture” of an organization affects the success of change strategies (Lorsch 1986). Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn have identified sources of resistance to change that are applicable to the university setting (Katz and Kahn 1978).

Sources of resistance in the academy are legion. Many are deeply rooted in the reward structure, while others are associated with the conflict between individual faculty creativity (research and publication) and organizational product (education and societal service). As Demski points out, “The informal organization exerts a strong influence on members; groups are particularly effective at policing deviance.” Both the problem and the promise of monumental organizational change lie in an effective combination of leadership and culture change among the complex structure of activities, goals and people—faculty, as principal determiners of curricula; students, whose education is the principal organizational product; and administrators, legally designated to implement the Commonwealth’s prescribed goals for the University.

The University’s comprehensive review and development of a new model for General Education will be collaborative throughout. In order to underscore the centrality of faculty in this curricular matter, the Chair of the Task Force on General Education requested and received unanimous endorsement of proposed procedures and task force membership selection strategies from the Faculty Senate Rules Committee. Task Force membership includes the President of the undergraduate Student Government Association and the Executive Officer of the Graduate Student Senate, both of whom helped select student members. The Council of Academic Deans and the Advisors’ Council have provided advice and made suggestions. The campus newspapers, The Daily Collegian and The Campus Chronicle, have helped task force members inform the academic community.

Zelda Gamson and colleagues recently published findings from a study of colleges and universities undergoing organizational change in general education—providing what Gamson described as “a few warnings and many suggestions to help you navigate the waters” (Gamson 1997). Regarding the differing degrees of success achieved by these colleges and universities, the authors found that “colleges that were successful in reforming their general education programs . . . expected conflict and were willing to compromise, encouraged an open design process, prepared for implementation and for program evaluation” (Kanter 1997). The authors emphasized the importance of careful planning:

The very process of designing, approving, and implementing general education programs—carrying as it does so much symbolic, organizational, and personal meaning—invariably engages most academic divisions and departments. So central is general education to a campus’s identity that an institution’s approach to changing it tells much about its past, present, and immediate future as well as its weaknesses and strengths. In the end the process of reforming general education in a period of scarcity and uncertainty reveals a campus’s capacity to act as a responsible community,
to make necessary educational change even as it tends to the needs of its members.

REPORT FROM THE TASK FORCE ON GENERAL EDUCATION

Statement of Goals, Outcomes and Principles, the task force voted those changes to its report at the meeting on November 6, 1997

The main goal of General Education is attaining the foundations for lifelong learning. What further outcomes does this goal imply? What characterizes people who could be said to have learned how to learn?

They have sufficient breadth of knowledge to engage in more directed study in any number of fields.

They are good as a wide variety of modes of learning:

- Reading, writing, listening, speaking or discussing
- Learning independently alone
- Learning cooperatively with others
- Learning by acquiring and understanding existing knowledge
- Learning by working out ideas of their own
- Learning by self-reflection and by examining their own thinking and learning processes
- Learning by entering into the points of view of other people and other cultures
- Learning by engaging in action in the world; community service work
- Learning by exploring relationships between disciplines and modes of learning

These abilities alone are not sufficient; the decision to use them is ultimately up to the individual. Nevertheless, the wisdom and desire to use these abilities for lifelong learning characterize the ideal University of Massachusetts graduate.

When it opened its doors to students in 1867, the main purpose of Massachusetts Agricultural College was to train farmers but also to educate citizens—human beings able to appreciate the complex knowledge of the day; leaders who could not only make a living, but also participate actively in the whole fabric of society. The curriculum included three hours of daily labor in the fields, and classes in the humanities and social sciences.

As we plan for the twenty-first century, the faculty continues to believe that general education and practical training are not at odds, but actually complement each other. While society needs people who can perform specific tasks well, it especially needs people with the intellectual agility that allows them to learn to do many things well. The most productive and satisfied people in the workplace, and in life beyond the workplace, are those who are able to absorb new ideas, feel generously, and express their opinions with passion, precision and civility. General education, accordingly, should foster understanding in many disciplines; it should include study of people unlike ourselves; and it should lead to fluency in the arts of communication.

Besides its practical implications, general education is essential as a way of encouraging human beings to develop a lifelong love of learning. Over the years, students have expressed their need to try out unusual ideas and to search for a coherent philosophy of life. The General Education program is designed to encourage this search for wisdom.

CONCLUSION

The reality of the arts at the University of Massachusetts Amherst is that they are part of the academic life of most students. The arts are full partners in the general education of undergraduate students for their global lives in the twenty-first century. The arts also are vital components in the University’s role as cultural center for citizens.

In July 1997, I had the great pleasure of meeting Norihito Tambo, President of Hokkaido University, during his visit to the University of Massachusetts. In his address to Chancellor Scott and members of the University Task Force on General Education, President Tambo stated:

The next theme of General Education will be symbiosis between nature and human nature. Education for a global environmental age must be interdisciplinary, and must start from the general studies that are General Education. After one hundred years of departmentalization in higher education, we are not merely seeking improvement—we are seeking a revolution!

At the University of Massachusetts Amherst we eagerly join this revolution.

We all have been impressed by President Tambo’s educational vision, and especially his sponsorship of the outstanding International Workshop on Higher Education organized by the Research Division for Higher Education, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Hokkaido University. We commend the Chairman, Professor Kazuhiro Abe, for having organized a conference that was stimulating in content, graciously chaired by Professor Abe, and perfectly organized in every aspect. We thank the members of the Organizing Committee and Advisory Committee, and the wonderful group of students who assisted throughout the conference and added so much enjoyment to our participation.
I am grateful to the many citizens of the beautiful city of Sapporo who shared their kind attention and stimulating questions during the Saturday session, “University as the Culture Center for Citizens.” It also was my great pleasure to discuss the reality of fine arts in the major research universities of Japan and the United States in partnership with my distinguished colleague in the arts, Yasuo Harada, President, Hiroshima University.

Thank you for offering all of us the opportunity to participate in this International Workshop. At your sister institution, the University of Massachusetts Amherst, we look forward to further adventures with our colleagues at Hokkaido University.
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