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Miriam Ritvo
Appointed Dean of Students

Mrs. Miriam Meyers Ritvo—behavioral scientist, author, educator—to assist in Lesley's new Dean of Students. A graduate of Smith College and Boston University School of Communications, Mrs. Ritvo has taken Advanced Graduate Studies in Social Science, and Adult Education Administration and Supervision at Boston University.

In her capacity as behavioral scientist, author, or "Mikki" has acted as consultant to numerous colleges, universities, medical schools, and public school systems. She has helped these institutions to become "self-renewing" with the assistance of behavioral science concepts, so that their services can ultimately be improved.

Mrs. Ritvo's belief in the importance of elementary education is one of her reasons for joining the administration.

A New Publication

Lesley Current is a new publication and a new concept for Lesley College. Its purpose—in the simplest terms—is to communicate with all those concerned with the College.

Lesley is a small school—approximately 700 students, 60 faculty members, 3500 alumnae. But as small as it is, Lesley has the same communication problems as a large university. Significant diversity exists within our community; there are marked differences in age, position, interests and outlook among our members. Many of them—some 5000 parents and alumnae—are seldom on the campus. Yet all of these people have an interest in Lesley and a need to understand its problems and accomplishments.

In the past Lesley has tried to fill this need by producing separate publications for the faculty and staff, the alumnae and the parents. These "regular" publications were supplemented by occasional memos and newsletters to these groups and others.

That system is no longer adequate for our communication needs. The pace of college life has quickened; the concerns have multiplied; the issues have increased substantially the College's limited finances and personnel. This publication—Lesley Current—will replace the Alumni Review, the Parents Newsletter and the Community Newsletter. Hopefully, it will do more than replace them.

Lesley Current also will be distributed to students, not as a replacement for the Lantern, but simply to provide a source of information and an exchange of feeling and opinion.

The answer we feel is to publish one publication for all our members. This publication—Lesley Current—will be published at least six times during the year. Each issue will include both news
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Lesley's New Campus—Not Either/or Situation

Q. The controversy over the contract clauses and other new campus issues has left many people with the impression that Lesley College is divided into two groups—one of which is concerned primarily with social justice and views Lesley's progress in terms of its contributions to that justice, and another which sees Lesley's progress in a more traditional way, i.e. new buildings, modern facilities, etc. How do you view this, Dr. Orton? What are Lesley's priorities?

A. I don't see the College as being divided into two camps. There are, I suppose, some people who could be placed in one or the other of the two groups you describe, but I think that most of the people associated with Lesley feel strongly that we should be able to progress in both ways. Contributing to the improvement of society does not rule out the construction of better College facilities, or vice versa. In fact, the two goals can and should be supportive of one another. Lesley is committed to both; we plan to build a new campus, which is essential to Lesley's future, and at the same time we intend to do everything in our power to insure that there is equal employment opportunity on the construction site.

Q. What assurance do we have that there will be equitable employment of minority groups?

A. The Trustees have adopted a strong affirmative action program, whose purpose is to increase substantially the employment of minority group members in the construction and building trades. Full compliance with this program will be achieved by the contractor either through the employment of at least 20% minority workers or, if he cannot attain this percentage, through compliance with each contract provision which encourages employment of minority group members. The contract also outlines penalties to be invoked against contractors in the event of their non-compliance, and provides for a Compliance Officer to oversee and enforce the affirmative action program. The Trustees also have approved the establishment of a Compliance Committee composed of students, faculty, administrators and Trustees to work with and through the Compliance Officer.

Q. How can we be sure that this affirmative action program will work?

A. To the best of my knowledge, Lesley's affirmative action clauses are the strongest ever included in a college or university contract. That fact does not guarantee 100% success, but it does seem to offer the best chance for a viable program. Since this is a new and therefore untested approach, we can't expect it to proceed automatically without any difficulties. But if we have the desire and persistence to work through any problems which may arise, then our program provides an excellent framework for success. In my opinion the Committee on Employment of Minority Workers and the Trustees have produced a set of clauses in which we can all take pride.

Q. In Lesley planning to do business only with contractors who adhere to these affirmative action programs?

Continued p. 2

Council on Student Life Begins Work

Twelve members of the Lesley community have been appointed to the newly-formed Council on Student Life. Purpose of the Council is to formulate policy regarding dormitory and social regulations and, upon the Trustees' acceptance of that policy, to serve in each residence hall with the establishment of an individual set of regulations.

The first members to the Council are: Anita Maek '72, Maxine Lazovich '72, Joanne Woller '72, Magee Brous '72, Ellen Rosenberger '73 (all undergraduate students); Wendy Hyatt (graduate student and residence director); Lucy Ullman (faculty); Martha Ackerson (administration); Elia Sommavilla (Trustee); Miriam Ritvo (Dean of Students); Genevieve Wilson (Director of Residence); and Don Orton (President).

Establishment of a Council on Student Life was recommended at last spring's All-College Meetings and approved by the Board of Trustees in May.
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Lesley's New Campus: Dr. Orton discusses Lesley's priorities

Negotiations underway

Eliot Snider comments on the affirmative action program

"The Black Perspective" (by Lydia Tait)

Do we need a new campus? Eight people comment

Phase I—what and when (by Jim Slattery)

Also:

A new dean is appointed

Council on Student Life set up

New publication
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Q. Why is Lesley in danger of losing its accreditation?
A. The national accreditation council, which will re-evaluate Lesley in 1974, cannot ignore the inadequacies of our present campus. When this committee was here in 1964, it was very critical of our library and certain other facilities. In fact, the library’s limitations were one of the primary reasons the Graduate School received only provisional accreditation at that time. At our next evaluation we want the committee to be especially concerned about our library, science, fine arts education and physical facilities.

Q. What are the consequences of losing national accreditation?
A. It is difficult to make a complete or exact prediction. The loss of accreditation would be a handicap to those students wishing to go to graduate school or to be certified to teach in states other than Massachusetts. It would make us ineligible for many federal grants, such as the $7.5 million grant for the building program. And it would be a tremendous disadvantage in recruiting good students and faculty.

Q. You seem to feel that without new facilities Lesley will have difficulty recruiting students even if we are accredited.
A. Yes, the appearance of Lesley’s campus is already causing some prospective students to have second thoughts about attending Lesley. Most of our present buildings leaves much to be desired. I think this problem will become more serious in the future if we don’t have new facilities.

Q. But aren’t good programs and faculty more important than physical facilities?
A. A college’s programs and administration are certainly assets. But it is fallacious to think that these things are unrelated to the institutions’ physical environment. Certain fundamental provisions are needed for effective learning and a reasonably comfortable living. With every passing year, Lesley’s physical environment becomes less supportive of its philosophy and programs.

Q. Some people seem to think that the money raised for the new campus should be used for improving the curriculum and for faculty salaries.
A. There is a basic misunderstanding here. Lesley is not building a new campus at the expense of its present operation. Lesley is always improving its programs and strengthening its faculty—these are continuing efforts. In addition to tuition, money contributed to the Annual Giving Program is used for the construction of new facilities. Our fundraising campaign and cannot be used for any purpose except the construction of new facilities. Our annual gift and loan programs, which provide the major portion of our construction budget, are also restricted to building.

Q. How do alumnae, parents and corporators feel about the new campus?
A. I think that these groups, as well as most students, faculty and administrators, eagerly wish construction to begin. Building a new campus is a tremendous undertaking for a small, unendowed college. We have spent years in the planning stages to insure the development of a new campus which would enhance Lesley’s educational philosophy and still be financially realistic. Many members of our governing boards, alumnae and parents have generated much enthusiasm and have contributed generously. Now that the momentum has been built up, people are naturally looking forward to concrete results. At this point the new campus is essential to our morale as well as to our academic standing.

A New Publication...  
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and feature articles and will focus on an important—and usually controversial—topic. Our first issue concentrates on the new campus. Comments on the format, style and content of Lesley Current are welcome. Editorial policies regarding the submission of letters to the editor and other material for publication are outlined elsewhere on page 2.

Coming Up

Alumnae Board Oct. 6 Meeting
Father-Daughter Oct. 17-18 Weekend
Notice to Alumnae Please continue to send in class notes. Although a definite schedule of class notes will be included in Lesley Current.
Historically, trade unions have had specific policies which excluded the membership and hiring of black and other minority workers in the construction trades. Contractors in adhering to these policies have protected unions and exploited minority hands. Minority firms have suffered severely from unfulfilled basic human needs and the frustration of ambitions that are concomitant with such economic conditions.

This was the background that inspired the black students and black faculty to initiate demands for a baseline of 20% in all job categories in the employment of minority workers in the building of the new campus at Lesley College. It was felt that 20% was a fair baseline because of the minority group population of the Boston-Cambridge area. It was also felt that in the Lesley College climate of fostering principles of human relations, acts of social justice should be unmistakably clear and that everything in the power of the College would be done to achieve them.

A Minority Employment Committee was formed composed of trustees, administrators, faculty members and students.

Other faculty members and students as well as those in the community from the Cambridge area. It was felt that the problems were many and complex.

The Committee set to work, and finally, out of much learning and turmoil, came a series of clauses known as the Boston Plan (May 15, 1970) which incorporated the combined thinking of all the constituencies - the trustees, the administrators, the faculty, and the students. It was ready to be presented to the Board of Trustees as a total negotiating document.

There was dismay and shock on discovering on July 7, 1970 that the draft of May 15, 1970 had been reviewed by some black faculty or students present at any of the meetings. The attitude of the Board of Trustees at a subsequent meeting (July 16, 1970) was one of inflexibility on the major areas of difference. The clauses agreed upon were minimal in content relative to the critical issues. Students were totally devoted to the cause of any involvement. The Minority Employment Committee was dismissed. These were considered as definite steps backward.

At this point, there was consensus among the black students, black faculty and interested students who have worked diligently with the Minority Employment Committee.

1. It is necessary to form a Compliance Committee composed of trustees, administrators, faculty members and students.
2. Students have a proper voice in choosing a Lesley College Compliance Officer and in spelling out his function.
3. The incorporation of remedies for noncompliance as specified in the May 15, 1970 draft of affirmative action.
4. Deletion of the Boston Plan from the affirmative action program as it is not only untried but has an inadequate baseline for minority employment.

Because of the above areas of difference, there is disagreement with President Orton that Lesley College has a meaningful affirmative action program. Also the communities which have given their assistance and experience are convinced that Lesley College has a meaningful affirmative action plan. Therefore, it is felt that these areas of difference must now be negotiated with President Orton and resolved before the Lesley College proceeds with the building of its much-needed campus.

Not enough attention has been given to the problem which the College and the contractor may encounter jointly once construction begins. Efforts to resolve such problems must include finding sufficient numbers of minority workers and encouraging them to apply at the Lesley site, securing training for those who are interested but untrained, and facilitating entry into minority groups.

Financing of the new campus "will not only be a certainty in the last few years. The cost of Phase I was estimated to be about $50,000,000 in May 1965. Phase II was estimated to be about $30,000,000 in May 1970. Now it is estimated to be $50 million (approximately $4 million for construction and $1 million for architectural, legal and other costs). Lesley is training to raise the needed funds. Since we must assume that Lesley will pay a certain premium for the affirmative action program, there certainly will be no surplus of money."

Areas of disagreement with black students and faculty presently present there are differences regarding the penalties for non-compliance and the inclusion of the Boston Plan. The members of the Committee on the Employment of Minority Workers would like to see the contract include harsher remedies such as a $500-a-day penalty for any nonminority contractor or sub-contractor. But sub-contractors in the smaller trades of those whose total share of the work amount to only $20,000 or $30,000 would not bid if the $500-a-day penalty would be included. A $500-a-day penalty would also increase tremendously the bids which would result from each contractor or sub-contractor and would assume the worst and add a premium of $500 a day for as long as he would be on the job. Members of the Committee also question the inclusion of the Boston Plan. This plan was added to our own because it provides for training, which Lesley could not do by itself, and because it represents a community-wide effort to bring more minority groups workers into the construction trades. The Boston Plan may prove to be very effective in the near future. If so, it would be foolish for Lesley not to be a part of it.

"The selection and authori ty of the Compliance Officer and the Compliance Committee are two other areas where differences of opinion seem to exist. The Trustees feel that the College must make the final decision in hiring the Compliance Officer as the College is ultimately responsible for his actions on the entire building program. They would like the Compliance Committee to be representative of all segments of the Lesley community. On both matters the Trustees are seeking the recommendations and assistance of students, faculty and administrators."
Does Lesley Need a New Campus?

Fine years ago, no one questioned the need for a new campus at Lesley College. Nearly all of the buildings were old, originally constructed as family residences, not as classrooms, dormitories or offices. They were impractical, costly to maintain, perhaps even hazardous. Facilities for music, drama and art were inadequate; science laboratories were non-existent.

That was fine years ago. The buildings haven’t changed. They’ve just a little older, still impractical, still inadequate. But in recent months some members of our community have been asking “Do we really need a new campus? And at what cost—to our limited finances, to our moral priorities, to our immediate comfort?”

To farbom this complex question we asked 12 Lesley people (students, faculty, administrators and alumnae) for their thoughts on this central issue of need. Eight people replied, their comments are on these pages.

"without new buildings... I believe Lesley will go out of business in five to ten years"

—Jim Slattery, Coordinator of Campus Planning and Assistant Professor of Social Science

Yes, yes and yes, not merely for the sake of three organically related reasons: first for survival, second for living up to our present potential, third for future growth.

Survival: Many of Lesley’s present buildings are in an advanced state of decay; they must be replaced. The library is too small, there is not enough research space and what there is lacks comfort and quiet. Space for books and other materials has been completely used up, and a library which does not grow dies. We have no science laboratories, our gymnasium is a joke. There is no place for dramatic presentations, no fully equipped large hall for lectures and speakers. The cafeteria is inadequate.

It is true that Lesley has been criticized in the past by accreditation agencies for poor facilities. The loss of accreditation is, of course, a serious threat, but I am talking about survival: without new buildings and the private gifts which those buildings will attract, I believe Lesley will go out of business within five to ten years.

Present potential: Lesley is a small college, but our facilities prevent us from taking full advantage of that fact. Our student to faculty ratio is now about 18 to 1, and all of our facilities are cramped. If we were to reduce all classes to 18 or 20 students, we would not have sufficient classrooms to accommodate the schedule. A small school should also be able to make use of small classes as a major means of learning. What seminars we now must take place in regular classrooms. Surely learning can take place in almost any setting, but if small classes and seminars are a good idea, why not house them in facilities which support and encourage learning. The human mind puts up enough defenses against learning as it is; we have no need of physical barriers.

Our small size also should enable us to see and meet, sit and talk with each other often and with our degree of closeness but our present campus provides few places to do this, and the aesthetic quality of those places does not bear mention. At present, you may talk with your elbows in sticky, spilled coffee in the cafeteria, or crouch on the hard amphitheater steps (during about three months of the school year), or lounge in White Hall (no eating please). Spaces for reasonable comfort—everyday living are not luxuries, they are a subtle but genuine part of the paraphernalia of learning.

Future growth: Lesley’s new campus is an experiment on a grand scale. The planning was supported as an experiment by Educational Facilities Laboratories, a subsidiary of the Ford Foundation. The design has excited interest across the country; the new campus is an important step toward the laboratory of learning that we talk about and laugh about. I think we laugh not because the idea is silly, but because we know we are still so far from its realization.

The new campus is meant to provide the setting for a unique college, Lesley College. The results of the experiment will not be evident in the buildings themselves, and the buildings alone won’t make Lesley grow more powerful, more sensitive. The buildings will only help the people do these things, but, we all know, people often need help.

Jim Slattery, Coordinator of Campus Planning and Assistant Professor of Social Science

"we have reached our peak of interest, enthusiasm and giving"

—Martha Ackerson, Director of Admissions

YES and NOW! Continuing growth reemphasizes the need for additional space and facilities—office, classrooms, dorms. Practically dictates realizing the new campus as quickly as possible. The longer we delay, the more expensive the venture becomes because construction costs spiral daily.

From another point of view, after eight years of working toward this goal we have reached our peak of interest, enthusiasm and giving.

When our next reaccreditation occurs, our failure to have facilities equal to our needs could affect our standing.

Also, psychologically speaking the addition of anything "new" will spark a renewal of commitment, pleasure in doing, and will make its own small contribution to the motivation of students, faculty and staff.

On the issue of minority employment, I feel that the goal of 20% employment reflects our desire to create fair employment opportunities. This is a very real issue in which I have deep concern but no bright ideas. I feel constriction by the realities of monies and contractual situations.

Lorraine Shapiro ’42, President of the Alumnae Association

As President of the Alumnae Association, I am very concerned about the future of the College and especially about the quality of its graduates. That quality can best be insured by the continuing improvement of educational programs and by the construction of facilities which can contribute to those programs.

Plans for a new campus have aroused enthusiasm among alumnae, but there will be considerably more interest when broken. I am sure that a mixture of pride and curiosity about the new campus will bring forth long-lost alumnae who will take a great deal of interest in Lesley.

The proposed campus offers advantages which will improve Lesley on all levels. The academic stature of the school will be increased; more people will be attracted to the College; and new teaching experiments will be encouraged.

For years now, we’ve been discussing the new campus and many of the alumnae are discouraged by the continuing controversy. Some of them feel that the project will never get off the ground because of financial reasons or the controversy over the minority workers question.

I think that most of the alumnae support the cause of the minority workers, but feel that the students are sending their energy toward the wrong people. They need to pressure

"the library... is never quiet and it is practically impossible to study there"

—Gail Battista

There is no doubt that Lesley’s classroom and dormitory facilities need much improvement. Their appearance really bothers me and many other students. Lesley is an expensive school. It costs as much as Simmons, Tufts and other better equipped schools.

Out of necessity, we need dorms with such basic things as light bulbs, not to mention better furnishings to improve the all around grubby appearance.

Gail Battista ’72

The library is absolutely terrible the way it is now. I’m not talking about its facilities so much as its location and construction. It is never quiet, and it is impossible to talk on the phone there. There is much of the time. Being directly over the gym, almost on top of the amphitheater, next to the main lobby of the classroom buildings are the main reasons for the noise in the library. But even without those things, the library’s construction is a waste of its purpose, for any whispering distracts everyone.

Lesley also needs a large meeting room. We have been using White Hall lounge for this purpose, and even the cafeteria, but these are not good places for guest speakers or meetings. The meetings are very inconvenient for the students living upstairs, but these are not good places for guest speakers or meetings. The meetings are very inconvenient for the students living upstairs, while the stray traffic going in and out is distracting to those at the gathering.

Lesley also needs a large meeting room. We have been using White Hall lounge for this purpose, and even the cafeteria, but these are not good places for guest speakers or meetings. The meetings are very inconvenient for the students living upstairs, while the stray traffic going in and out is distracting to those at the gathering.

Leslie Galle ’71

The answer depends upon how you feel as an individual and where your priorities lie. Personally, I do not care whether a new campus is ever built at Lesley College. I do not have any deep feeling about Lesley, and therefore, I do not care whether they build or not. I guess you might say I lack school spirit.

In terms of priorities, I think that Lesley should place adequate faculty at the top of their list. I feel that Lesley is in dire need of good, competent professors. To me, this is the real need here at Lesley, not a new campus. Possibly if the college could afford better salaries, they could and would attract competent people, who would enrich life at Lesley. Presently, our facilities, with a few exceptions, are so stagnated that a really new idea wouldn’t be recognized if it came up and introduced itself. Many claim to be liberal because of their exposure to "sensitiveness," but I firmly be
Opinions Vary — Most Say Yes

the unions, who actually hold the power in this area, rather than the contractors or the College.

Norman Dee, Instructor in Education

It is a time-honored tradition in New England to "use it up," "wear it out," and "make it do." Lesley College has made every effort to do just that. The time has come, however, to consider the influencing factors of "environment" above the limits of our cultural "heredity." Our students are preparing for a profession which demands quality preparation—a combination of experiences and knowledge which conditions teachers to search out new ways, evaluate alternatives, and move back the most distant parameters. This type of preparation requires facilities equal to the task. Our campus must reflect this commitment. Unless it does, we shall be shortchanging the students who invest in it and in the long run threatening the existence of the College.

If we are sincere in the aim of making Lesley a "laboratory for learning," we must see that even the building of this concept—both physical and academic—requires living with it and through it with an awareness of the dignity of all individuals concerned. This in itself is an essential ingredient in growing up and outward at a time when growth is both painful and exhilarating. It is the belief that the Lesley community has the strength within it to face the entire reality of the situation.

The example it offers—both as an approach to education and as architectural solution to a campus in an urban location—deserves to be actualized. Functionally, it is just beautiful. We shall be deprecating if we do not bow low through our very unusual opportunity to transform an existing and innovative idea into reality.

Paul L. Miller, Assistant Professor of Social Science

Does Lesley need a new campus? Yes, but the costs may be too high.

Our present library and laboratory facilities are not adequate to insure accreditation in the future. Many of our doubles, office and classroom buildings are old, costly to maintain, and architecturally irritating. Certainly a reasonably large lecture hall, a well-equipped gymnasium, and theatre facilities are all of which we now live without—would enhance campus life. Nevertheless, a clear mandate to build a new campus does not exist. The reason is that the costs of the endeavor have not been fully appraised.

I am not referring to the financial costs, immense as they are for any institution. Our talented fund raising and fiscal staffs are doing well on that task and can see it to completion. It is the spiritual costs that may be too high. What are the costs?

First, there are the philosophies of education and of community life that are embodied in the new campus plan itself, The Urban Academic Village. We must remember in discussing the proposed new campus that the plan is not just to construct the usual dormitory

Second, we soon will be facing the accreditation process again. If, when the visiting team comes, we have only our present facilities and no immediate plans for better ones, then they should turn us down. At least I would if I were on the team. Our facilities do not match our mission, and they miss by too far to be tolerated over an additional span of years. We need our new campus to maintain our accreditation.

Third, we need our new campus because it is such an unusually creative solution to a very complex set of important social and educational problems.

I consider this possibility a very hazardous cost that has not been explored, at least not during the past two years. It is a cost for several reasons. The "laboratory for learning" concept, to yield to produce an integrated, solid curriculum, capable of exciting faculty and students. The collaborative decision making process has already become discredited, and a new form of internal communication—constituency power—is in a nascent form of development. The highest cost may well be to Lesley's ability and willingness to experiment with new forms in the future. In short, the new campus plan may be too specifically designed for one style of pedagogy and campus life. It could become a burden to our spirit in the years ahead as new academic and social challenges, possibly requiring totally new answers, present themselves. Indisputably, in the name of a forward-looking fusion of architectural concept and educational philosophy, we may be giving new life to the most insidious vice of the teacher training college—philosophical and methodological dogmatism. To the degree that this may be so, the present campus plan represents a very serious intellectual and spiritual debauch for the future.

The second cost rests in the moral plane. It has to do with our willingness to deal with a social injustice—specifically, employment disadvantages suffered by black and Puerto Rican workers—at the same time that we build a campus. The efforts of an ad hoc committee to include minority worker employment guarantees in the construction contract language may be on the verge of success. But, even if this is so, we are only at the beginning of what may prove to be a very trying road. The inclusion of minority employment guarantees in the contract may encourage bidding, may inflate bids so that are, in substance, and, if a bid is accepted, may provide numerous reasons for work interruptions which compliance grievances are settled. Should any or all of these possibilities come to pass, taking a firm stand for the rights of minority workers may come to seem too threatening to Lesley's interests—a new campus, or at least some new facilities—to be pursued.

The temptation to abandon the minority workers' cause if the going becomes difficult must be avoided, lest we be "de-moralized" the very step forward that new facilities can symbolize for Lesley as an institution. Our college in its corporate actions as an institution of higher learning should strive to act with courage and leadership when moral issues are involved. This means embodying in our policies the same values of justice and humanity that are so often read about and discussed in our classes. Seldom will we have the opportunity as an institution that we have now to bring our actions toward social injustice into harmony with our words and concerns.

Many critics of today's colleges point out that our institutions of higher learning should strive to become by the 1960's too willing to accept and practice values which perpetuated the larger society but which were not worthy of the honesty and self- criticism necessary to the necessity of life. One result was that society itself was deprived of a source of challenge and example from which the amelioration of injustice can follow. We must be aware of this as we decide how to use our new facilities. We have an opportunity to serve the larger society in the best tradition of the academy by repudiating the de facto racism that permeates America's social and economic life, and by making it clear that we will build only if and when we are sure that our vital justice will be served to the minority workers.

Should we not choose this admirable difficult and risky path, then, while we may get a campus more easily, we will have paid an undiminished price for moral bearing and independence. Demoralization is too high a price for a college to pay for new buildings.

"some of the beauty of Lesley College will be destroyed if and when the proposed new campus is built"—Corinne Gall

"the new campus will bring forth long lost alumnae who will take a great deal of interest in Lesley"—Lorraine Shapiro

"building this concept...requires living with it and through it with awareness of the dignity of all individuals concerned"—Norman Dee

"our period of grace is past"—George Miller

"the spiritual costs may be too high"—Paul Fideler
What? When? How Much? What Do We Do in the Meantime?

By Jim Slattery

Barring new complications, Lesley College sometime in October will invite contractors to bid on the construction of Phase I of the new campus. Contractors who accept the invitation will be sent copies of drawings, specifications and the contract (which includes a strong equal employment opportunity clause).

Subcontractors—those who wish to do the plumbing or air-conditioning, for example—will have thirty days to submit their bids. The lowest bids from subcontractors go to prime contractors who then make total estimates.

In late November or early December, prime contractor bids will be opened. If a bid is received at a price we can pay (no more than about $4 million), construction will begin within thirty days, unless delays have made it more practical to wait until spring (i.e. March). If the bids are too high, we must begin again, and there will be no new buildings this year, if ever. However, the odds at the moment are favorable; we expect to receive an "acceptable" bid.

Once construction begins and for the next eighteen months, the Lesley community will endure some noise and inconvenience. Essentially that is the price we pay for being small and in Cambridge. (We believe it is amply offset by the advantages of being small and in Cambridge.)

Buildings to be demolished are: the old Oxford, Gray and Crocker residence halls, Mellen Hall (the Treasurer's office), Brownie Music Building, and the wood frame portion of the library, including the microfilm section, the library office and the Library of Congress classification system.

During construction, classes now held in the Brownie Music Building and the Psych Lab will be put elsewhere on campus and in rented facilities off campus. This will require tight scheduling and some walking, but the distance will never be as great as that travelled by students on larger campuses every day.

The basement floor of the Administration Building will become the library office area, and bookstacks will be added in the main library. Classrooms will be made for library reader space whenever they are empty. Faculty mailboxes will remain where they are, but the faculty lounge—short-lived amenity—will become the microfilm library. Faculty offices will be more crowded; there may be no bookstakors; and we still don't know where the Treasurer's office will be.

Phase I Facilities

A year from next June, Phase I should be completed. It will include five modules or units, two on one side and three on the other side of a pedestrian mall. The modules will be separated from each other by stair towers. One module, five floors tall and next to the present classroom building, will be entirely devoted to the new library. (More will be added to the library in a later phase.)

The new library will include the curriculum library and a materials shop for work in various media (slides, films, transparencies, etc.), seating at carrels, tables and two lounge-reading areas, a study room, a typing room, rooms for a small seminar section, the library office and the Library of Congress classification system.

During construction, classes now held in the Brownie Music Building and the Psych Lab will be put elsewhere on campus and in rented facilities off campus. This will require tight scheduling and some walking, but the distance will never be as great as that travelled by students on larger campuses every day.

The basement floor of the Administration Building will become the library office area, and bookstacks will be added in the main library. Classrooms will be made for library reader space whenever they are empty. Faculty mailboxes will remain where they are, but the faculty lounge—short-lived amenity—will become the microfilm library. Faculty offices will be more crowded; there may be no bookstores; and we still don't know where the Treasurer's office will be.

Phase I will provide so many new facilities that the building of the later two phases will not cause anywhere near the inconvenience that this first will.

Who Pays?

We expect Phase I to cost approximately $3.5 million—$4 million for construction and $1 million for other costs. The money is coming from a combination of private gifts (much from Trustees, some from foundation donations, parents, alumnae, faculty and friends), government grants and loans, and bonds (essentially registered). None of the money is available for anything but construction; it was granted specifically for that purpose.

Loans must be repaid; they are essentially mortgages on the buildings. When Phase I is completed, residence fees will include a portion of the mortgage payments on residence halls, making fees slightly higher, but not much since current mortgages are already included. Since academic buildings are involved too, a portion of future tuition costs (perhaps as much as $200) will go for mortgage payment.

No one, however, will be paying nation or residence fees for these buildings until they are completed and being used. Present fees are not being used to finance buildings for future students.

Lesley College is small and as colleges go, financially poor. Phase I of the new campus may also become symbolic of a new phase for the College as a community, for it will offer us not only new facilities but also a new environment.

The motto of the Lesley family was once "Crip Fast." That motto may be appropriate as the bulldozers shake our classrooms; it is certainly appropriate that we grip fast our purpose, our reason and our sense of humor as we go through the growing pains ahead.