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The plain fact at Lesley is...
The Plain Fact at Lesley Is... 

by

DAVID O. TOMPKINS
Assistant to the Vice President

The accompanying Special Report reviews the crucial financial problems that face private educational institutions — problems that well could result in a crisis for non-tax supported colleges. It is predicted that some colleges may not survive the next few years, and others may lose their identity through merger.

At Lesley, we are taking a more optimistic view. Our problems are real, and they are many; however, we feel that Lesley has a mission, a role to fulfill in society, which insures a future for our college for many years to come. Let me briefly review why we believe this is true.

Lesley is unique, it is innovative. We hold no brief for a particular educational philosophy. We examine the old in light of the new, try out the new, throw out or modify old and new ideas that are not useful, and change our thinking to accommodate new ideas that have special merit.

Many colleges and universities — both state and private — say they also do these things. And they do to some extent. But the fact is that very little scientific research really has been done in the field of education. This is the void that we believe Lesley is uniquely equipped to fill.

We can do this because we are not a multiversity with many separate entities, but we are a small, closely knit community, able to span and examine the entire educational process. As we study learning, we learn from each other — students, faculty and staff. At hand are our three experimental schools for children for testing and observing new ideas. Lesley is, then, a "laboratory for learning" which, through the outreach of its faculty and graduates, is making and will continue to make many significant contributions to the field of education.

As long as there is a knowledge explosion — a doubling of facts and ideas to be learned every 10 years — there will be a need for developing better techniques for teaching and learning, and our nation will need colleges such as Lesley to provide them.

There are many practical problems, however, that Lesley must face.

We have looked at the financial and physical plant needs for the next five years, and we are extending these projections to ten years. The challenges are great and the picture is not totally bright. To properly assess where we are and where we are going, let us take a quick look into the past.

Lesley College traditionally has relied on income from tuition and fees alone to operate its physical plant and provide quality education for its students. This has been an admirable goal and a substantial achievement, especially since most private colleges and universities have long relied on an increasing number of gifts from alumni, friends and business to balance their budgets and to make capital improvements. However, Lesley has only recently begun seeking gifts from these sources in order to strengthen its financial structure.

When Dr. Don A. Orton became President in 1960, he recognized that the day was soon coming when the College would have to increase its income, as the cost of education was soaring and threatened to outstrip Lesley’s current resources.

He saw immediately that faculty salaries were dangerously below the competitive level for the New England area. He foresaw that the College would have a difficult time keeping its top-flight professors and would have trouble recruiting qualified people in the future. He made upgrading of professors’ salaries his top priority goal.
Further, to implement the College’s philosophy of education, Dr. Orton saw the need to enlarge the population of students and, comparably, the campus facilities.

The results of these moves have been dramatic:

- The gap has narrowed considerably between Lesley salaries and those of other institutions and is closing a little more each year, despite the fact that the national average professor’s salary continues to rise at the rate of 7% per year.
- Undergraduate enrollment has risen from 363 students in 1960-61.
- Fourteen additional properties have been purchased and renovated for classroom and living quarters. This brings the total number of college-owned buildings to 28.

All this has been accomplished without sacrificing quality. In fact, quality has been enhanced and the reputation of Lesley College has been advanced. As evidence, the ratings of employers of our graduates are increasingly complimentary. Another kind of evidence is the interest that the Federal Government has recently taken in the work at Lesley. Federal support for specific research programs increased from $15,750 in 1964-65, to $124,181 in 1966-67, and will likely continue to increase.

Another measurement of Lesley’s quality is its library. It now occupies well over twice the area assigned to it in 1960-61, but it continues to burst at its seams. Book holdings have increased from 17,000 to over 37,000 volumes in the last seven years, and an excellent microfilm area assigned to it in 1960-61, but it continues to burst at its seams. Book holdings have increased from 17,000 to over 37,000 volumes in the last seven years, and an excellent microfilm area has been installed. The total spent on the library last year was $25,000, a six-fold increase over 1960-61.

The cost of maintaining and upgrading the Lesley tradition, however, has come high. Since 1960-61 the budget of the college has increased from under $750,000 to nearly $2 million. This has been substantially met by a 57% increase in tuition and fees and a 57% increase in enrollment. Other help has come from foundations and government grants for graduate programs, research, and library development. Gifts from individuals have been increasingly helpful in improving salaries and scholarship programs. Several individuals and groups of parents and alumnae have been particularly interested in purchasing library books.

As with most organizations, Lesley's future progress is made not so much by giant bounds forward as by thoughtful, steadily planned, steady increments of growth.

Dorothy Orton
President

What is the future financial picture at Lesley?

TUITION AND FEES: Although some additional increases in tuition may be projected for the future, their magnitude cannot be expected to rival that of the last seven years. Lesley is currently competitive in its fee structure with similar institutions and plans to continue in this position.

ENROLLMENT: Further, enrollment is near the maximum level desired to effectively implement the “laboratory for learning” educational objectives of the College, so that substantial increase in the number of students is no longer a practical answer to Lesley's financial needs.

And yet, the cost of providing quality education at Lesley—as elsewhere—continues to rise rapidly. Clearly, additional sources of income must be realized. Just to continue present programs, John G. Tucker, our Treasurer, predicts a deficit by 1969-70 unless those sources are found. State colleges and universities may rely more and more on federal and local government, as well as private gifts, to meet the challenges that lie ahead. Lesley, an independent institution, must count almost solely on the private sector to provide the funds needed to continue.

PRIVATE GIFTS: In looking ahead toward these needs, the College, with the aid of interested alumnae, parents and friends, established an Office of Development in 1961-62, to identify and cultivate potential sources of income. Since that time, the College has been successful in attracting foundation and government grants for special programs, and in initiating broad-based annual giving programs.

Income from all areas has risen steadily each year, but the percentage increase (22% last year) has barely kept pace with the percentage increase in the college budget (21% in 1966-67). Much greater understanding among all its constituencies of the needs of Lesley must be realized in the years ahead.

Thus far, we have talked only about the educational program of Lesley College, and the financial needs relating to it. There is also concern for the physical facilities in which the program is conducted.

A progressive, innovative, experimental and quality institution requires a modern, flexible plant and latest educational equipment in order to provide a maximum experience for its students and its faculty. Except for White Hall, a dining and living complex, and Stelbling Hall, the main classroom building and library, Lesley is principally housed in renovated dwellings, some of which are 19th century vintage.

For the past several years, Dr. Orton and his faculty and staff have been developing plans for a new Lesley campus to be built on the present site. In December, the Trustees approved a Master Plan which integrates the “laboratory for learning” concept into a modern, urban, academic setting. Since then, the plan has been acclaimed by architectural critics as a possible answer to the physical plant needs that face urban colleges and universities everywhere. The Trustees will unfold the plans for capital development in the months ahead to all of the College's constituencies and will ask the support of all to help complete the Lesley “dream.” The new campus will be Lesley's laboratory—it is crucial to the College's future in education.

We have taken a hard look at the present and future of Lesley, and it is a picture of uncertainties, but there pervades a sense of optimism and excitement about the future.

The plain fact at Lesley regarding the potential crisis it faces perhaps is best summed up by President Orton in his 1966-67 Annual Report to the Corporators of the College:

"The future history of Lesley will be written in simple terms: the degree to which each segment of the College—students, faculty, administrators, parents, alumnae—will choose to commit themselves and act in her interest."
Alumnae Day was scheduled in answer to the request of Alumnae for a program that would be generally academically oriented, but at the same time would remain uniquely "Lesley."

The entire affair was considered a program of continuing education. "Continuing" because education is just that. No other field of study changes so fast and affects so many. Elementary teachers must continue to be informed of developments, both theoretical and practical, that will affect their careers as teachers of young children.

VIDEO TAPEING

Alumnae then attended presentation-discussion sessions in the Classroom Building. In one session, Dr. Elmer E. Van Egmond, Dean of General Education, told the "alumnae students" how Lesley student teachers can use video tapes to become better teachers. He explained that the girls watch a TV monitor immediately following a five-minute, video taped teaching session to see the effect of their presentation and discover where they need practice. A supervising member of the Lesley faculty observes the lesson and evaluates the trainee's techniques while both watch a playback on the TV screen. The short lessons are called "Micro-teaching" and combining this technique with video tapes is relatively new in teacher education. To the delight of his Alumnae audience, Dr. Van Egmond had a tape of three very familiar faces: Dr. Leslie M. Oliver, Mrs. Alma B. MacCormack and Dr. Russell G. Schofield.

MATCH BOX LEARNING

In another class, Dr. George L. Miller, Dean of Teacher Education, joined Mr. Fred Kresse of the Children's Museum of Boston to demonstrate another innovative Lesley project. Dr. Miller and Mr. Kresse are conducting a workshop for Lowell, Massachusetts, elementary school teachers that will provide them with theory and experience in producing MATCH Boxes similar to those developed by the Children's Museum. A MATCH Box is a self-contained "system" of materials and activities designed for a subject or subject area by relying largely on non-verbal forms of communication between the teacher and children. Dr. Miller explained that activities are designed to make learning the product of the children's own actions. The children learn primarily from what they are doing rather than from what they are being told. Each MATCH Box has an underlying teaching strategy that is set forth in its own teachers' guide, expressed in a series of specific lesson plans.

"Paddle-to-the-Sea", the Box which was demonstrated to Alumnae, traces in miniature an Indian's canoe journey through the Great Lakes to the sea. Some materials in this Box were charts and templates of the Great Lakes; ore and grain samples; a model of a breeches buoy; and canal locks and fur trading artifacts.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS AT LESLEY

Some Alumnae attended a class led by Dr. Boris Gertz, Director of Graduate Programs, who discussed Lesley's Graduate Program for teaching perceptually handicapped children. Dr. Gertz spoke of the Graduate School's development of a new Master's Degree Program in Special Education for prospective and experienced teachers. He talked about the practicum experiences at the Walter F. Dearborn School, one of Lesley's three Schools for Children. The comprehensive graduate program gives the Les-
Levy student a well-rounded approach to language and learning skills in which reading, spelling, and use of symbols are combined in one unit as part of a spiral curriculum. Dr. Gertz explained that the program makes use of the latest techniques in visual and auditory motor skills, speech, eye-hand coordination in language arts and learning theory. He noted that Lesley College is now producing the learning specialists which are so sorely needed in local school systems.

MORE NEW APPROACHES TO TEACHING AND LEARNING

Alumnae who registered for a session on special approaches to teaching and learning met for an hour and a half with Dr. Irene G. Casper, Assistant Professor in Education. Dr. Casper told her class that a number of professors have been experimenting at Lesley with different approaches toward the improvement of teaching and learning. Some examples are: 1. the use of Pass-Fail instead of letter grading in selected areas; 2. deliberate attention to how a class is working together to learn, as well as the content it is trying to master; and 3. pilot projects in which a group of three or four faculty members take responsibility for teaching a group of students in a team teaching context instead of meeting these same students in separate course meetings. Dr. Casper also explained the human relations laboratory, a unique approach to learning which focuses upon personal, interpersonal and group experiences in the "Here-and-Now." She pointed out more specifically that human relations training emphasizes the use of direct experience in order to provide the depth from which insights and skills can be acquired.

After classes, Alumnae returned to White Hall Lounge for a group summation and question and answer period. Marion Stringham, Dean of Students, joined Dr. Orton and the other discussion leaders to answer questions ranging from Lesley's curriculum to dorm life and student activities.

In closing, President Orton gave Alumnae a "sneak preview" of some of the things behind plans for the new Lesley campus. He explained that the campus will be built to facilitate continuous learning and to study the phenomenon of learning, wherever and whenever it occurs.

As Alumnae were preparing to leave, they could be seen and heard gathering in small groups, excitedly talking about the morning’s program and the many changes in Lesley during the past few years. It is a certainty that when these Alumnae and others return for next year’s Alumnae Day, they will find even more changes at Lesley that will reflect the new and vigorous directions being taken by the College in the field of Higher Education.

The Junior Class played host to over 150 families at Lesley’s annual Parents’ Weekend, May 3, 4, and 5. A full and varied program of events was planned around the theme, "It’s About Time!"

Highlighted during the weekend were a "Junior Class Revue" on Friday evening; parent-daughter-faculty discussion groups on Saturday morning; a class song competition; a Dean’s Tea; and a night at the Boston Pops on Saturday evening.

The "Junior Class Revue," written and produced by members of the Junior Class, drew a large crowd at Rindge Technical High School in Cambridge. There were laughs galore as the audience viewed students' spoofs on college life.

On Saturday morning, Lesley's faculty treated parents and their daughters to a variety of discussion groups ranging from on-campus life to off-campus concerns.

A sample human relations laboratory was held as part of the morning's discussion period. The lab enabled parents to learn first-hand how a group of this nature functions during this learning experience. Other activities included parents' participation in an art workshop; discussions on student teaching-what it is, how it functions; new trends in psychology; contemporary problems off-campus; and "New Revoit in the Classroom."

A Class Song Competition was held on Saturday afternoon, each class having the responsibility for writing their own lyrics and arranging the music. The judges, members of the faculty and administration, had a difficult time determining the winners, since all of the renditions were good, but top honors for this year went to members of the Sophomore Class for their rendition depicting the "trials and tribulations" of the Sophomore girl.
The Dean’s Tea and a cocktail hour provided opportunities for parents and daughters to chat with members of faculty and administration during the latter part of the afternoon. It was at the cocktail hour, held at the Holiday Inn, that parents who have recently become charter members of the Lord Newark Association at Lesley College were presented with plaques in recognition of their membership.

The evening at the “Pops” on Saturday night was well attended and the musical treat provided a welcome close to the Weekend’s more formal festivities.

After a leisurely Sunday morning brunch at White Hall, parents took a tour of the daughters and were homeward bound, each mother and father having contributed with their daughters to a highly successful Parents’ Weekend at Lesley College.

The name of the Association comes from the Scottish origin dates by the Lesley clan whose Scottish origin dates back to the eleventh century. Edith Lesley Wolfard, founder of Lesley College, was a direct descendant of this branch.

There were five Lords Newark, the first of whom — and most distinguished — was David Leslie, born in 1601. A soldier by profession, he assisted the English Parliament against King Charles I in 1643. He later fought gallantly against Oliver Cromwell in defense of Scotland and with Charles II in England.

During the battle of Yorkshire, he was taken prisoner and committed to the Tower of London. After the Restoration, David Leslie once again came into favor with the ruling forces, and the king immediately created him a Peer of Scotland, bestowing upon him the title of Lord Newark.

Beatrice is by no means a stranger to Lesley College. Before she took office as President for the year 1967-1968, she served as Treasurer of the Alumnae Association for two years. During that time, she was Chairman of two Homecoming weekends. It was this versatile and charming woman who was responsible for bringing the reunion weekend back on campus, where weekend guests could stay in the dorms, and enjoy the fun and conviviality that comes from the warm atmosphere found in college life.

As President of the Alumnae Association, Beatrice has worked very closely with the Alumnae Office in building a strong and effective Board of Directors. She has stressed the importance of giving each member a definite job, and has made it possible for the Alumnae Association to touch upon many areas for an increased membership and a variety of Alumnae programs. As a result of these efforts, the Board was active this past year in the areas of undergraduate relations, clubs, continuing education programs, scholarship, magazine, and, of course, Homecoming.

On behalf of Lesley Alumnae and all other members of the Lesley Community, our sincerest thanks are extended to Beatrice Marden Glickman for her concern for, and devotion to, the College and the Alumnae Association.

To the incoming President of the Lesley College Alumnae Association, 1968-1969 to be announced at Homecoming), we say welcome.

Charter Membership Open in Lord Newark Associates

The Lord Newark Associates has been formed by those who are vitally concerned with the College's continuing quest for academic excellence and overall service to the community and nation. The purpose of the Association is to provide an annual sustaining fund to be used in the persistent effort to achieve the goals of the College.

The name of the Association comes from the distinguished Lord Newark branch of the Lesley clan whose Scottish origin dates back to the eleventh century. Edith Lesley Wolfard, founder of Lesley College, was a direct descendant of this branch.
personal satisfaction of directly contributing to the advancement of education by their gifts to a college in which they have particular interest.

Additional information about membership may be obtained by writing the Lord Newark Association, President's Office, 29 Everett Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, or by calling (617) 868-9600, ext. 64.

LESLEY STUDENTS OBSERVE STEP-UP NIGHT
Lesley students have revived the tradition of Step-Up Night. The ceremony, held on May 7, marked the occasion when each class stepped up into the next year, and seniors officially became members of the Alumnae Association.

A candlelight ceremony was held in the amphitheater at the College. It began with a procession of the Senior Class, garbed in caps and gowns. Dean of Students, Marion Stringham, welcomed the group and was followed by Gay Hale of the class of 1968, who gave her impressions of Lesley over her four years here as a student. At that time, the Senior Class President, Helena Murphy, presented Dr. Orton with her class' gift to the College. Mrs. Alma B. MacGormack, Senior Class Advisor, introduced the seniors to the President of the Alumnae Association, Beatrice Marden Glickman '40. The seniors, standing, were inducted into the Association, as Beatrice lit the candle of the Senior Class President, symbolizing the seniors' new status as alumnae. Dr. Elizabeth Berglund presented the Junior Class to the school as next year's upperclass. The program ended with a duet sung by Mary Condlin '68 and Marcel Gulden '69.

AROUND THE CAMPUS
Dr. Ronald O. Lipsett, internationally known educator and program director of the Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge at the University of Michigan, was awarded an honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters from Lesley College at the annual Winter Convocation on February 5th.

Dr. Elmer E. Van Emgmond, Dean of General Education, has been elected a Fellow of the N.T.L. Institute of Applied Behavioral Science, formerly the National Training Laboratories. The Institute operates year-round working laboratories for consultation, training, research and publication.

Mrs. Edwin O. Reischauer, wife of the former U.S. Ambassador to Japan, told Lesley students on January 24 that world peace may depend on how intelligently today's teacher educates Americans about the non-western world. Mrs. Reischauer was participating in the President's Seminar series which brings guest lecturers to campus throughout the year.

A scholarly article entitled "A Bookseller's Account Book, 1546," by Dr. Leslie M. Oliver, professor of English at Lesley, appeared in the Harvard Literary Bulletin, April, 1968. Dr. Oliver reported his discovery of a sixteenth century fragment of the manuscript part of the business records of a stationer or bookseller, listing sales of books, papers, and other items with quantities and prices. Included is a bill of sale to an Irish dealer, by which the manuscript can be dated. Dr. Oliver succeeded in deciphering the difficult sixteenth century handwriting and identifying many of the books listed.

The opening day of the 92nd annual convention of the American Association on Mental Deficiency, held in Boston, May 1-4, was designated "Lesley Day" in honor of 45 Lesley students who volunteered their time to help staff the conference. The girls, all studying special education, assisted in registration, information booths, press room activities, and as audio-visual aids assistants. The girls worked under the guidance of Mr. Allan Zalk, Director of Lesley's Carroll-Hall School.

The Plain Fact Is... our colleges and universities "are facing what might easily become a crisis"...
STATE-SUPPORTED UNIVERSITY in the Midwest makes a sad announcement: With more well-qualified applicants for its freshman class than ever before, the university must tighten its entrance requirements. Qualified though the kids are, the university must turn many of them away.

A private college in New England raises its tuition fee for the seventh time since World War II. In doing so, it admits ruefully: "Many of the best high-school graduates can't afford to come here, any more."

A state college network in the West, long regarded as one of the nation's finest, cannot offer its students the usual range of instruction this year. Despite intensive recruiting, more than 1,000 openings on the faculty were unfilled at the start of the academic year.

A church-related college in the South, whose denomination's leaders believe in strict separation of church and state, severs its church ties in order to seek money from the government. The college must have such money, say its administrators—or it will die.

Outwardly, America's colleges and universities appear more affluent than at any time in the past. In the aggregate they have more money, more students, more buildings, better-paid faculties, than ever before in their history.

Yet many are on the edge of deep trouble. "The plain fact," in the words of the president of Columbia University, "is that we are facing what might easily become a crisis in the financing of American higher education, and the sooner we know about it, the better off we will be."

The trouble is not limited to a few institutions. Nor does it affect only one or two types of institution. Large universities, small colleges; state-supported and privately supported: the problem faces them all.

Before preparing this report, the editors asked more than 500 college and university presidents to tell us—off the record, if they preferred—just how they viewed the future of their institutions. With rare exceptions, the presidents agreed on this assessment: "That the money is not now in sight to meet the rising costs of higher education . . . to serve the growing numbers of bright, qualified students . . . and to pay for the myriad activities that Americans now demand of their colleges and universities. Important programs and necessary new buildings are
being deferred for lack of money, the presidents said. Many admitted to budget-tightening measures reminiscent of those taken in days of the Great Depression.

Is this new? Haven't the colleges and universities always needed money? Is there something different about the situation today?

The answer is "Yes"—to all three questions.

The president of a large state university gave us this view of the over-all situation, at both the publicly and the privately supported institutions of higher education:

"A good many institutions of higher learning are operating at a deficit," he said. "First, the private colleges and universities: they are eating into their endowments in order to meet their expenses. Second, the public institutions. It is not legal to spend beyond our means, but here we have another kind of deficit: a deficit in quality, which will be extremely difficult to remedy even when adequate funding becomes available."

Other presidents' comments were equally revealing:

> From a university in the Ivy League: "Independent national universities face an uncertain future which threatens to blunt their thrust, curbs their leadership, and jeopardizes their independence. Every one that I know about is facing a deficit in its operating budget, this year or next. And all of us are hard-put to see where we are going to get the funds to meet the educational demands of the coming decade."

> From a municipal college in the Midwest: "The best word to describe our situation is "despair." We are operating at a deficit of about 20 per cent of our total expenditure."

> From a church-related university in Missouri: "Only by increasing our tuition charges are we keeping our heads above water. Expenditures are galloping to such an extent that 1 do not know how we will make it out in the future."

> From a church-related university on the West Coast: "We face very serious problems. Even though our tuition is below-average, we have already priced ourselves out of many of our students. We have gone deeply into debt in order to meet the educational demands of the coming decade."

> From a state university in the Northeast: "For the first time in its 150-year history, our college has a planned deficit. We are holding our heads above water at the moment—but, in terms of quality education, this cannot last long without additional means of support."

> From a state college in California: "We are not permitted to operate at a deficit. The funding of our budget at a level considerably below that proposed by the trustees has made it difficult for us to recruit staff members and has forced us to defer very-much-needed improvements in our existing activities."

> From a women's college in the South: "For the coming year, our budget is the tightest we have had in my fifteen years as president."

What's gone wrong?

Talk of the sort quoted above may seem strange, as one looks at the unparalleled growth of America's colleges and universities during the past decade:

> Hardly a campus in the land does not have a brand-new building or one under construction. Colleges and universities are spending more than $2 billion a year for capital expansion.

> Faculty salaries have nearly doubled in the past decade. (But in some regions they are still woefully low.)

> Private, voluntary support to colleges and universities has more than tripled since 1958. Higher education's share of the philanthropic dollar has risen from 11 per cent to 17 per cent.

> State tax funds appropriated for higher education have increased 44 per cent in just two years, to a 1967-68 total of nearly $4.4 billion. This is 214 per cent more than the sum appropriated eight years ago.

> Endowment funds have more than doubled over the past decade. They're now estimated to be about $12 billion, at market value.

> Federal funds going to institutions of higher education have more than doubled in four years.

> More than 300 new colleges and universities have been founded since 1945.

> All in all, the total expenditure this year for U.S. higher education is some $18 billion—more than three times as much as in 1955.

Moreover, America's colleges and universities have absorbed the tidal wave of students that was supposed to have swamped them by now. They have managed to fulfill their teaching and research functions and to undertake a variety of new public-service programs—despite the ominous predictions of faculty shortages heard ten or fifteen years ago. Says one foundation official:

"The system is bigger, stronger, and more productive than it has ever been, than any system of higher education in the world."

Why, then, the growing concern?

Re-examine the progress of the past ten years, and this fact becomes apparent: The progress was great—but it did not deal with the basic flaws in higher education's financial situation. Rather, it made the whole enterprise bigger, more sophisticated, and more expensive. Voluntary contributions grew—but the complexity and credentials of the nation's colleges and universities grew faster.

Endowment funds grew—but the need for the income from them grew faster.

State appropriations grew—but the need grew faster. Faculty salaries were rising. New courses were needed, due to the unprecedented "knowledge explosion." More costly apparatus was required, as scientific progress grew more complex. Enrollments burgeoned—and students stayed on for more advanced (and more expensive) training at higher levels.

And, for most of the nation's 2,300 colleges and universities, an old problem remained—and was intensified, as the costs of education rose: gifts, endowment, and government funds continued to go, disproportionately, to a relative handful of institutions. Some 36 per cent of all voluntary contributions, for example, went to just 55 major universities. Some 90 per cent of all endowment funds were owned by fewer than 5 per cent of the institutions. In 1966, the most recent year reported, some 70 per cent of the federal government's funds for higher education went to 100 institutions.

McGeorge Bundy, the president of the Ford Foundation, puts it this way:

"Great gains have been made; the academic profession has reached a wholly new level of economic strength, and the instruments of excellence—the libraries and
Each new attempt at a massive solution has left the trustees and presidents just where they started.

—A foundation president

Laboratories—are stronger than ever. But the university that pauses to look back will quickly fall behind in the endless race to the future."

Mr. Bundy says further:

"The greatest general problem of higher education is money. . . . The multiplying needs of the nation's colleges and universities force a recognition that each new attempt at a massive solution has left the trustees and presidents just where they started: in very great need."

The financial problems of higher education are unlike those, say, of industry. Colleges and universities do not operate like General Motors. On the contrary, they sell their two primary services—teaching and research—at a loss.

It is safe to say (although details may differ from institution to institution) that the American college or university student pays only a fraction of the cost of his education.

This cost varies with the level of education and with the educational practices of the institution he attends. Undergraduate education, for instance, costs less than graduate education—which in turn may cost less than medical education. And the cost of educating a student in the sciences is greater than in the humanities. Whatever the variations, however, the student's tuition and fees pay only a portion of the bill.

"As private enterprises," says one president, "we don't seem to be doing so well. We lose money every time we take in another student."

Of course, neither he nor his colleagues on other campuses would have it otherwise. Nor, it seems clear, would most of the American people.

But just as student instruction is provided at a substantial reduction from the actual cost, so is the research that the nation's universities perform on a vast scale for the federal government. On this particular below-cost service, as contrasted with that involving the provision of education to their students, many colleges and universities are considerably less than enthusiastic.

In brief: The federal government rarely pays the full cost of the research it sponsors. Most of the money goes for direct costs (compensation for faculty time, equipment, computer use, etc.) Some of it goes for indirect costs (such "overhead" costs of the institution as payroll departments, libraries, etc.). Government policy stipulates that the institutions receiving federal research grants
H ere are some of the harsh facts: Operating expenditures for higher education more than tripled during the past decade—from about $4 billion in 1956 to $12.7 billion last year. By 1970, if government projections are correct, colleges and universities will be spending over $18 billion for their current operations, plus another $2 billion or $3 billion for capital expansion. Why such steep increases in expenditures? There are several reasons:

1. Student enrollment is now close to 7 million—twice what it was in 1960.
2. The rapid accumulation of new knowledge and a resulting trend toward specialization have led to a broadening of the curricula, a sharp increase in graduate study, a need for sophisticated new equipment, and increased library acquisitions. All are very costly.
3. An unprecedented growth in faculty salaries—long overdue—has raised instructional costs at most institutions. (Faculty salaries account for roughly half of the educational expenses of the average institution of higher learning.)
4. About 20 per cent of the financial "growth" during the past decade is accounted for by inflation.

Not only has the over-all cost of higher education increased markedly, but the cost per student has risen steadily, despite increases in enrollment which might, in turn, be expected to lower the unit cost. Colleges and universities apparently have not improved their productivity at the same pace as the economy generally. A recent study of the financial trends in three private universities illustrates this. Between 1905 and 1966, the educational cost per student at the three universities, viewed compositionally, increased 20-fold, again such an exorbitant increase of three-to-four-fold. In each of the three periods of peace, direct costs per student increased about 8 per cent, against a 2 per cent annual increase in the economy-wide index.

Some observers conclude from this that higher education must be made more efficient—that ways must be found to educate more students with fewer faculty and staff members. Some institutions have moved in this direction by adopting a year-round calendar of operations, permitting them to make maximum use of the faculty and physical plant. Instructional devices, programmed learning, closed-circuit television, and other technological systems are being employed to increase productivity and to gain economies through larger classes.

The problem, however, is to increase efficiency without jeopardizing the special character of higher education. Scholars are quick to point out that management techniques and business practices cannot be applied easily to colleges and universities. They observe, for example, that on strict cost-accounting principles, a college could not justify its libraries. A physics professor, complaining about large classes, remarks: "When you get a hundred kids in a classroom, that's not education; that's show business."

The college and university presidents whom we surveyed in the preparation of this report generally believe their institutions are making every dollar work. There is room for improvement, they acknowledge. But few feel the financial problems of higher education can be significantly reduced through more efficient management.

O thers claim that higher education will continue to rise. To meet their projected expenses, colleges and universities will need to increase their annual operating income by more than $4 billion during the four-year period between 1966 and 1970. They must find another $8 billion or $10 billion for capital outlays.

Consider what the 514 means for a typical private university. A recent report presented this hypothetical case, based on actual projections of university expenditures and income:

The institution's budget is now in balance. Its educational and general expenditures total $24.5 million a year.

Assume that the university's expenditures per student will continue to grow at the rate of the past ten years—7.5 per cent annually. Assume, too, that the university's enrollment will continue to grow at an even faster rate of the past ten years—3.4 per cent annually. Ten years hence, the institution's educational and general expenses would total $70.7 million.

At best, continues the analysis, tuition payments in the next ten years will grow at a rate of 6 per cent per year; at worst, at a rate of 4 per cent compared with 9 per cent over the past ten years. Endowment income will grow at a rate of 3.5 to 5 per cent, compared with 7.7 per cent over the past decade. Gifts and grants will grow at a rate of 4.2 to 6 per cent, compared with 6.5 per cent over the past decade.

"If the income from private sources grew at the higher rates projected," says the analysis, "it would increase from $24.5 million to $50.9 million—leaving a deficit of $15.8 million, ten years hence. If its income from private sources grew at the lower rates projected, it would have increased to only $43 million—leaving a shortage of $27.8 million, ten years hence."

In publicly supported colleges and universities, the outlook is not brighter, although the gloom is of a different variety. Says the report of a study by two professors at the University of Wisconsin:

"Public institutions of higher education in the United States are now operating at a quality deficit of more than a billion dollars a year. In addition, despite heavy construction schedules, they have accumulated a major capital lag.

The deficit cited by the Wisconsin professors is a computation of the cost of bringing the public institutions' expenditures per student to a level comparable with that at the private institutions. If the enrollment growth expected by 1975, the professors calculate, the "quality deficit" in public higher education will reach $2.5 billion. The problem is caused, in large part, by the tremendous enrollment increases in public colleges and universities.

The institutions' resources, says the Wisconsin study, "may not prove equal to the task."

Moreover, there are indications that public institutions may be nearing the limit of expansion, unless they receive a massive infusion of new funds. One of every seven public universities rejected qualified applicants from their own states last fall; two of every seven rejected qualified applicants from other states. One of every ten raised admissions standards for in-state students; one in six raised standards for out-of-state students.

W ill the funds be found to meet the projected cost increases of higher education? Colleges and universities have traditionally received their operating income from three sources: from the students, in the form of tuition and fees; from the state, in the form of legislative appropriations; and from individuals, foundations, and corporations, in the form of gifts. (Money from the federal government for operating expenses is still more of a hope than a reality.)

Can these traditional sources of funds continue to meet the need? The question is much on the minds of the nation's college and university presidents.

1. Tuition and fees: They have been rising—and are likely to rise more. A study of the "prestige" institutions has passed the $2,000 mark. Public institutions are under mounting pressure to raise tuition and fees, and their student charges have been rising at a faster rate than the average tuition increase.

The problem of student charges is one of the most controversial issues in higher education today. Some feel that the student, as the direct beneficiary of an education, should pay most or all of its real costs. Others disagree emphatically: since society as a whole is the ultimate beneficiary, they argue, every student should have the right to an education, whether he can afford it or not.

The leaders of publicly supported colleges and universities are almost unanimous on this point: that higher tuitions and fees will erode the premise of equal oppor-
Tuition: We are reaching a point of diminishing returns.

—A college president

It's like buying a second home.

—A parent

Students, many such institutions find that raising their tuition is inescapable, as costs rise. Scores of presidents surveyed for this report, however, said that mounting tuition costs are "pricing us out of the market." Said one: "As our tuition rises beyond the reach of a larger and larger segment of the college-age population, we find it more and more difficult to attract our quota of students. We are reaching a point of diminishing returns."

Parents and students also are worried. Said one father who has been financing a college education for three daughters: "It's like buying a second home."

Stanford Professor Roger A. Freeman says it isn't really that bad. In his book, Crisis in College Finance?, he points out that when tuition increases have been adjusted to the shrinking value of the dollar or are related to rising levels of income, the cost to the student actually declined between 1941 and 1961. But this is small consolation to a man with an annual salary of $15,000 and three daughters in college.

Colleges and universities will be under increasing pressure to raise their rates still higher, but if they do, they will run the risk of pricing themselves beyond the means of more and more students. Indeed, the evidence is strong that resistance to high tuition is growing, even in relatively well-to-do families. The College Scholarship Service, an arm of the College Entrance Examination Board, reported recently that some middle- and upper-income parents have been "substituting relatively low-cost institutions" because of the rising prices at some of the nation's colleges and universities.

The presidents of such institutions have nightmares over such trends. One of them, the head of a private college in Minnesota, told us: "We are so dependent upon tuition for approximately 50 per cent of our operating expenses that if 40 fewer students come in September than we expect, we could have a budgetary deficit this year of $50,000 or more."

State appropriations: The 30 states have appropriated nearly $4.4 billion for their colleges and universities this year—a figure that includes neither the $1-$2 billion spent by public institutions for capital expansion, nor the appropriations of local governments, which account for about 10 per cent of all public appropriations for the operating expenses of higher education.

The record set by the states is remarkable—one that many observers would have declared impossible, as recently as eight years ago. In those eight years, the states have increased their appropriations for higher education by an incredible 214 per cent.

Can the states sustain this growth in their support of higher education? Will they be willing to do so?

The more pessimistic observers believe that the states can't and won't, without a drastic overhaul in the tax structures on which state financing is based. The most productive tax sources, such observers say, have been preempted by the federal government. They also believe that more and more state funds will be used, in the future, to meet increasing demands for other services.

Optimists, on the other hand, are convinced the states are far from reaching the upper limits of their ability to raise revenue. Tax reforms, they say, will enable states to increase their annual budgets sufficiently to meet higher education's needs.

The debate is theoretical. As a staff report to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations concluded: "The appraisal of a state's fiscal capacity is a political decision [that] it alone can make. It is not a researchable problem."

Ultimately, in short, the decision rests with the taxpayer.

Voluntary private gifts: Gifts are vital to higher education.

In private colleges and universities, they are part of the lifeblood. Such institutions commonly budget a deficit, and then pray that it will be met by private gifts.

In public institutions, private gifts supplement state appropriations. They provide what is often called "a margin for excellence." Many public institutions use such funds to raise faculty salaries above the levels paid for by the state, and are thus able to compete for top scholars.

A number of institutions depend upon private gifts for student facilities that the state does not provide. Will private giving grow fast enough to meet the growing need? As with state appropriations, opinions vary.

John J. Schwartz, executive director of the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, feels there is a great untapped reservoir. At present, for example, only one out of every four alumni and alumnae contributes to higher education. And, while American business corporations gave an estimated $300 million to education
in 1965-66, this was only about 0.37 per cent of their net income before taxes. On the average, companies contribute only about 1.10 per cent of net income before taxes to all causes—well below the 5 per cent allowed by the Federal government. Certainly there is room for expansion.

(Colleges and universities are working overtime to tap this reservoir. Mr. Schwartz's association alone lists 117 colleges and universities that are now campaigning to raise a combined total of $4 billion.)

But others are not so certain that expansion in private giving will indeed take place. The 46th annual survey by the John Price Jones Company, a firm of fund-raising counselors, sampled 50 colleges and universities and found a decline in voluntary giving of 8.7 per cent in 12 months. The Council for Financial Aid to Education and the American Alumni Council calculate that voluntary support for higher education in 1965-66 declined by some 1.2 per cent in the same period.

Defining these figures gives them more meaning. The major private universities, for example, received about 26 per cent of the $1.2 billion given to higher education—a decrease from the previous year. Private liberal arts colleges also fell behind: coeducational colleges dropped 10 per cent, men's colleges dropped 16.2 per cent, and women's colleges dropped 12.6 per cent. State institutions, on the other hand, increased their private support by 23.8 per cent.

The record of some cohesive groups of colleges and universities is also revealing. Voluntary support of eight college associations gained 10.8 per cent. Members of the Great Lakes College Association gained 5.6 per cent, and Western Conference universities, plus the University of Chicago, gained 34.5 per cent. (Within each such group, of course, individual colleges may have gained or lost differently from the group as a whole.)

The biggest drop in voluntary contributions came in foundation grants. Although this may have been due, in part, to the fact that there had been some unusually large grants the previous year, it may also have been a foretaste of things to come. Many of those who observe foundations closely think such grants will be harder and harder for colleges and universities to come by, in years to come.

Feeling that the traditional sources of revenue may not yield the necessary funds, college and university presidents are looking more and more to Washington for the solution to their financial problems. The president of a large state university in the South, whose views are typical of many, told us: "Increased federal support is essential to the fiscal stability of the colleges and universities of the land. And such aid is a proper federal expenditure."

Most of his colleagues agreed—some reluctantly. Said the president of a college in Iowa: "I don't like it . . . but it may be inevitable." Another remarked: "On the question of federal aid, everybody seems to be running to the same side of the boat."

More federal aid is almost certain to come. The question is, When? And in what form?

Realism compels this answer: In the near future, the federal government is unlikely to provide substantial support for the operating expenses of the country's colleges and universities.

The war in Vietnam is one reason. Painful effects of war-prompted economies have already been felt on the campuses. The effective federal funding of research per faculty member is declining. Construction grants are becoming scarcer. Fellowship programs either have been reduced or have merely held the line.

Indeed, the changes in the flow of federal money to the campuses may be the major event that has brought higher education's financial problems to their present head.

Would things be different in a peace time economy? Many college and university administrators think so. They already are planning for the day when the Vietnam war ends and when, the thinking goes, huge sums of federal money will be available for higher education. It is no secret that some government officials are operating on the same assumption and are designing new programs of support for higher education, to be put into effect when the war ends.

Others are not so certain the postwar money flow is that inevitable. One of the doubters is Clark Kerr, former president of the University of California and a man with considerable first-hand knowledge of the relationship between higher education and the federal government. Mr. Kerr is inclined to believe that the colleges and universities will have to fight for their place on a national priority list that will be examined with a number of other pressing
Problems: air and water pollution, civil rights, and the plight of the nation's cities, to name but a few.

One thing seems clear: The pattern of federal aid must change dramatically, if it is to help solve the financial problems of U.S. higher education. Directly or indirectly, more federal dollars must be applied to meeting the increasing costs of operating the colleges and universities, even as the government continues its support of students of building programs, and of research.

In simpler times, there was little cause for friction. Public institutions received their funds from the states. Private institutions received their funds from private sources. No longer. All along the line, and with increasing frequency, both types of institution are seeking both public and private support—often from the same sources:

- The state treasuries: More and more private institutions are suggesting that some form of state aid is not only necessary but appropriate. A number of states have already enacted programs of aid to students attending private institutions. Some 40% of the state appropriation for higher education in Pennsylvania now goes to private institutions.

- The private philanthropists: More and more public institutions are seeking gifts from individuals, foundations, and corporations, to supplement the funds they receive from the state. As noted earlier in this report, their efforts are meeting with growing success.

- The federal government: Both public and private colleges and universities receive funds from Washington. But the different types of institution sometimes disagree on the fundamentals of distributing it.

Should the government help pay the operating costs of colleges and universities by making grants directly to the institutions—perhaps through a formula based on enrollment?

The heads of many public institutions are inclined to think so. The heads of many low-enrollment, high-tuition private institutions, by contrast, tend to favor programs that operate indirectly—perhaps by giving enough money to the students themselves, to enable them to pay for an education at whatever institutions they might choose.

Similarly, the strongest opposition to long-term, federally underwritten student-loan plans—some envisioning a payback period extending over most of one's lifetime—comes from public institutions, while some private-college and university leaders find, in such plans, a hope that their institutions might be able to charge "full-cost" tuition rates without barring students whose families can't afford to pay.

In such frictional situations, involving not only billions of dollars but also some very deep-seated convictions about the country's educational philosophy, the chances that destructive conflicts might develop are obviously great. If such conflicts were to grow, they could only sap the energies of all who engage in them.

If there is indeed a crisis building in American higher education, it is not solely a problem of meeting the minimum needs of our colleges and universities in the years ahead. Nor, for most, is it a question of survive or perish, "colleges and universities are tough," as one president put it; "they have survived countless cataclysms and crises, and one way or another they will endure."

The real crisis will be finding the means of providing the quality, the innovation, the pioneering that the nation needs, if its system of higher education is to meet the demands of the morrow.

Not only must America's colleges and universities serve millions more students in the years ahead; they must also equip these young people to live in a world that is changing with incredible swiftness and complexity. At the same time, they must carry on the basic research on which the nation's scientific and technological advancement rests. And they must be ever-ready to help meet the immediate and long-range needs of society, ever-responsive to society's demands.

At present, the questions outnumber the answers.

How can the United States make sure that its colleges and universities not only will accomplish the minimum task but will, in the words of one corporate leader,
NOTHING IS MORE IMPORTANT than the critical and knowledgeable interest of our alumni. That interest leads to general support. It cannot possibly be measured in merely financial terms.

—A university president

provide "an educational system adequate to enable us to live in the complex environment of this century?"

> Do we really want to preserve the diversity of an educational system that has brought the country a strength unknown in any other time or any other place? And, if so, can we?

How can we provide every youth with as much education as he is qualified for?

> Can a balance be achieved in the sources of higher education's support, so that public and private institutions can flourish side by side?

> How can federal money best be channeled into our colleges and universities without jeopardizing their independence and without discouraging support either from the state legislatures or from private philanthropy?

The answers will come painfully; there is no panacea.

The report on this and the preceding 15 pages is the product of a cooperative endeavor in which scores of schools, colleges, and universities are taking part. It was prepared under the direction of the group listed below, who formed Editorial Projects for Education, a non-profit organization associated with the American Alumni Council. Copyright © 1968 by Educational Projects for Education, Inc. All rights reserved; no part may be reproduced without the express permission of the editors. Printed in U.S.A.
NORTH SHORE MASSACHUSETTS

President: Marilyn English Riley ’59
5 Tapley Rd., Lynnfield Centre, Mass.
Secretary: Siss Rubin Cohen ’25

A pot-luck luncheon for members of the North Shore Club was held at the home of Marilyn English Riley ’59, President of the Alumnae group. The luncheon was planned as a fund raising project in support of the Alumnae Association’s Scholarship.

The Club is also planning to hold a coffee hour in the fall, to which they are inviting Lesley students from the North Shore area.

SAN FRANCISCO AND BAY AREA CALIFORNIA

President: Beryl Seeley Congrove ’34
2505 Melendy Dr., San Carlos, Calif.
Secretary: Joan Berlino Amore ’59
606 Capuchito Dr., Millbrae, Calif.

Chinese dishes were enjoyed by all at the annual spring luncheon of the San Francisco and Bay Area Club, on Saturday, May 4. Lesley ’56 made all the arrangements for the get-together at the Sai-Yon Restaurant in Chinatown in San Francisco. Her efforts were well-rewarded with a grand turn-out from club members.

Our two California clubs are working hard, so far away from Lesley. They plan to exchange membership lists and ideas for club activities in hopes of establishing a stronger organization in the state of California.

WORCESTER COUNTY MASSACHUSETTS

President: Nancy Gore Golf ’65
14 Dick Dr., Worcester, Mass.
Secretary: Marjorie Ryan Igne ’32

The Worcester County Club held its annual Spring Luncheon at the College on Saturday, April 6. The occasion marked the fifth anniversary of the Club. Members returned to campus as guests of the College for a Continuing Education Program, sponsored by the Alumnae Association. President Orton, Mrs. Mark V. Crockett, and Beatrice Morris Glickman ’30, President of the Alumnae Association, joined the Club members at an anniversary luncheon following the morning program. A check was presented to the library to finance a book shelf in honor of Mark V. Crockett. and Mary Bergemini Tewksbury, who worked so hard in arranging the luncheon.

1919
Mary Benjamin Freeland of Derry Village, N. H. and Mrs. E. Ward of Newton Centre, Mass., were among the guests at Alumnae Day.

1920
Ada E. Gracie joined Blanche Lewis Freedlander for the Alumnae Day program at the College in April.

1923
Margaret Carroll Sampson represented her class at Lesley’s Alumnae Day.

1924
Edith Holton Robbins of Short Hills, N. J. represented Dr. Orton and Lesley College at the inauguration of James G. Fuller as President of Farleigh Dickinson University on May 8.

1925
Catherine Cloty Bogg is now making her home at Monty Meadow Lane, N. Chelmsford, Mass.

1919
Florence D. Poley, 1348 Commonwealth Ave., Brighton, Mass., is teaching a special class in Boston. Those who remember Florence will be interested in learning that she still wears a size 7 dress.

1920
Teresa Morgan Gracie is teaching in Lawrence, Mass. The Graneys live at 5 Albion St., Lawrence.

1923
Alma Johnson Harper is teaching in Arlington, Mass. Alma and husband, Francis, live at 11 Bright Rd., Belmont. She and “Jeth” Lytique Manor get together quite often.

1924
Mary J. Hannigan is living at 325 Brownell Rd., New Bedford, Mass., “May” is teaching in New Bedford, and spends her free time traveling and playing golf.

1925
Elizabeth Arnold Hopkins, 34 Washusset Rd., Wellesley, Mass., tells us that she has a daughter, a son, and six grandchildren. Elizabeth’s husband, George, is in real estate.

1923
Margaret Crocker Hamel and husband, Edward, make their home at 61 Mayflower Rd., Newton, Mass. Margaret’s husband is a physician.
and 17 grandchildren! The husband, Russell, is the principal of Falmouth Economics in Boston.

Mary McCarron Meade's Falmouth, Mass., is conducting a private school. As John and Bertha got fed up with the Florida weather and Bertha Donahue Hartwell now living in Alexandria, Va., at 1803 Stratford Dr. the 25er's who got together last summer at Mary and husband, Frank, died gardening, taking off for Jamaica for a few weeks. Ruth Truesdale Meserve retired so that she could teach the homebound, and three daughters Moakley's live at 149 Adams St., Lexington, Mass. Newton, Mass., informs us that she has one grandmother for the first time. Her husband, Frank, died in Florida this February as John and Bertha got fed up with the Florida weather and took off for Jamaica for a few weeks.

We hear that the lovely California climate. Miriam worked in a children's home in her return, Mariam worked in a children's home in 1931.
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1938
Francois Babour Bone represented her class for Alumnae Day in April.

1939
Myrtle Pierce Auerbach joined many friends on campus in April when she attended Alumnae Day.

1940
Beatrice Meredith Glickman, President of the Alumnae Association, was present to greet many returning graduates on Alumnae Day.

1946
Among the group from the New England area who were on campus for Alumnae Day was Ethel Doris Berghaus.

1948
Selma Ohevitz Bell, Mary Keefe Jones, and Evelyn Blondes Lamb enjoyed seeing each other once again when they returned to Lesley for Alumnae Day. Evelyn served as co-chairman for registration.

1949
Joyce Gansburg Aaron of 4 Squauntum Rd., Paxton, Mass., has been named to direct the Jewish Community Center in Dracut, Mass., for the past 13 years. Ann has been teaching in the Dame School in Medford.

1950
Marguerite Allison Delany once again provided a very gracious touch to an Alumnae Association program when she served as chairman for refreshments on Alumnae Day.

1951
Ruth Eichler Bookett was one of many alumnae back on campus this spring for Alumnae Day.

1952
Jean Cogan Mcconn joined Anne Strick Macfar for Alumnae Day. Jean and Anne worked very hard as chairmen for their class' 15th reunion last June. Since then, Jean has served on the Alumnae Board of Directors as co-chairman of club activities.

1953
Ellen MacKearney, Nancy Morrisey, Doris MacGregor Henderam, and Donna Crawford made a lovely addition to those alumnae who returned to Lesley for Alumnae Day in April.

1954
It was good to see Elizabeth Carlie Bacewicz back on campus for Alumnae Day.

1955
Elaine Barron Alexander was present at the inauguration of Hugh Gloster as the seventh president of the Alumnae Association, was present to greet many returning graduates on Alumnae Day.

1956
Maurine Green Stone and husband, Hugo, on the birth of their third child, Tania Anne, born in February, 1956. The Liepmanns have two other daughters, Suzanne, 8½ and Karen, 9.

1958
Congratulations to Barbara Yarlett Liepmann and husband, Hugo, on the birth of their third child, Tania Anne, born in February, 1956. The Liepmanns have two other daughters, Suzanne, 8½ and Karen, 9.

1959
Sylvia Oppenheim Goodwin writes that she and husband, Bob, have moved to Marblehead, Mass., where Bob is an instructor of English. The Goodwins make their home at 4 Dodge Rd., in Marblehead.

1960
Barbara Streiffer Gladstone participated in the Alumnae Day Program in April. It was good to see some members from the class of 1959.

1961
Marlene Steinman Churches and husband, Martin, are proud to announce the birth of Suzanne Beth, Suzanne joins her brother, Donald, 4½, at the Churches' home at 21 Valley View Rd., Simsbury, Conn.

1962
Susan Doherty Levine and husband, Howard, make their home at 2100 Linwood Ave., Fort Lee, N.J. The Levines have one son, Jonathan Alan, born in September, 1961.

1969
Joyce Merrill Shepard served as co-chairman of registration for Alumnae Day.

1970
Sandra Rhodes Schlitz writes that she and husband, Howard, have been stationed at Edwards General Air Force Base, Mo., since June, 1966, while Richard is serving his two-year dental internship. Sandra says, "Our son, Michael Louis, was born in May, 1967. The Schlitzes are 16 miles outside of Kansas City, and hope that if any members of the class of 1962 are in the area that they will give them a call."
Harold and Susan Prydzona Brownstone are the joy–
ful parents of a daughter, Amy Gayle, born in Feb–
ruary, 1967, and a son, Larry, born in July. Amy is:
aspirations to receive a degree in Electrical Engineer–
ing in June, 1969, at New York University. The Brown–
tones, present address is: 459 B 22 St, Far Rockaway, L. I., N. Y.

Marilyn Brown Lange was back on campus in April
to participate in the Alumnae Day Program.

Jean Lahue Stone, 3206 E. 56 St., Long Beach, Calif.,
inform us that her husband, Larry, is a dental offi–
cer with the U. S. Public Health Service in Long
Beach. The Stone's two daughters, Mary, 2, and
Jill, who was born in February of this year. Carol and
her family will be moving back to Boston in July
where her husband will enter Tufts to specialize in
Orthodontics.

Francine Branden Tenebaum and husband, Bob, live
at 348 Lincoln St., Watertown, Mass. The Tenebaums
were married in July. Francine is now teaching
first grade in Watertown. Bob is a market analyst
for the Carter's Ink Company, in Cambridge.

Barbara Roffman Wider is now living at 335 Con–
gressional Lane, Rockville, Md., while her husband,
Jerry, goes research work with the National Institute
of Health for two years. The Widens have two sons,
Judd Harold, born in January of this year, and Todd
Michael.

1965

Janet Blanchard Bowker informs the Alumnae Of–
fice that she and husband, Dave, are living in Exon
Centre, Va. Dave is working for the New England
Telephone Company, and Janet is teaching second
grade in Exon.

Bety Neuwosser Evans writes that her husband, Dave,
has been working on his Ph.D. at M.I.T., in Electrical
Engineering, and is expecting to complete his studies
next year. Bety has given up kindergarten teaching for
a few years to raise her first child. The Evans are the
prospective parents of Judith Park, born October,
1967.

Nancy Gore Gulf, President of the Worcester County
Alumnae Club, attended Lesley with members of her
family for Alumnae Day, and for the Club's 50th anni–
versary luncheon which followed the morning pro–
gram.

Elizabeth Kleinwaks joined other alumnae on campus
for the Alumnae Association's first Alumnae Day
Program.

Myra Muter, of 310 Summit Ave., Brighton, Mass.,
stopped in at the Alumnae Office in February. Myra
has been teaching at the Horace Mann School for the
Dead for the past two years. It was good to see Myra,
and have the opportunity to chat.

1966

Congratulations to Mikes Ruckman on her marriage to
Alan Vinslet. Helen's husband is a financial analyst
with Salomon and Brothers. The Vinslets will reside at

Lynda Graham informs us that she is teaching sixth
grade at the Hartley School in Wellesley. Lynda is
planning a trip to Greece this summer.

Jean Mayo is now Mrs. David B. Mayo, Jr. The
Mayo's are living at 60 Bennington St., Apt. 1, New–

Susan Tuley Patten returned to campus in April for
the Continuing Education Program, sponsored by the
Alumnae Association.

Bunnie Hertz Ross and her husband, Irv, have a
daughter, Elizabeth Rachel, born June, 1967. Irv is
an accountant with a firm in Washington, D. C. The
Rosses make their home at 5231 Arnold Lane, Falls
Church, Va.

Arline Guth Seifer and husband, Robert, announce
the birth of Donald Franklin, born February, 1968.
The Seifers are making their home at 60 Berkshire
Rd., Harledey, N. Y.

Joan Wiss married David Nobis on January 30,
1968, in San Antonio Del Golfo, Venezuela. Joan's
husband has been working in the Peace Corps for the
past two years, as an industrial arts teacher and
school director. The couple will be living in Texas.

1967

Pamela Baughman and Margaret O'Neill Yawumas
were among the New England area alumnae who re–
turned to campus for Alumnae Day on April 6.

S. Laura Abrams Hill and husband, Daniel, are living
at 671 Merrimac Ave., Pacific Grove, Calif. Laura
was teaching second grade at the Underwood school
in Newton until her marriage in March.

Suzanne Leipsig writes that she is now Mrs. Richard
Henderson. Susan's husband is a senior at M.I.T.,
studying African Politics, and is in Rhodesia. Susan is
presently teaching kindergarten in the Quincy School
System.

Sandra Lavelle McLaughlin and husband, James, are
living at 15208 Pintoberg Court, Apt. B, in Laurel,
Md. Sandy is teaching first grade at the Quarterfield
Elementary School. Her husband is an analyst for the
Department of Defense at Fort Steeles, Md.

Diane Rose Orsont of 1208 Clements Bridge Rd.,
Burlington, N. J., writes that she and her husband,
Mark, are now living in New Jersey, where he works
for R.C.A. The Orens' daughter, Michelle Beth,
was born on Christmas Day.

Sheila Russo married Gerald Sprinsky last June. The
Sprinkys are now living at 14 Rollole Rd., in Framingham, Mass. Sheila is teaching a special class
at the Peter Noyes School in Sudbury.

Susan L. Schofield is now living at 14 Chen送给 Rd.,
Brookline. Susan writes that she is a research as–
sistant for a Material and Infant Health Study for
the Children's Hospital in Boston.
**PRICE AND INFORMATION**

**LESLEY COLLEGE CHAIRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/Chair</th>
<th>Basic Cost</th>
<th>Mass. Sales Tax*</th>
<th>Total Cost**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captain's Cherry</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
<td>$41.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Arms</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>40.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Rocker (Black Only)</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>33.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Chair (Black Only)</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>25.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Out-of-state residents are not required to pay Mass. Sales Tax. Mass. residents must add sales tax to basic cost in order to obtain total cost of each chair.

** Nominal shipping charges will be due upon delivery to destination. Chairs will be shipped directly from Gardner, Massachusetts. Allow two-four weeks for normal delivery.**

Examples of Shipping Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gardiner, Mass., to</th>
<th>Shipping Cost (approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>$4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LESLEY COLLEGE CHAIR ORDER FORM

( Please Print )

Person Making Order ___________________________ Date of Order (Date)

(Name) ___________________________ (Street)

(City, State, Zip)

Please order _______ Lesley College chairs (s)

Type: _______ Captain’s Chair

__________ Cherry Arms _______ Black Arms

__________ Boston Rocker (Available in black only)

__________ Side Chair (Available in black only)

Ship to:

( Name )

(Street)

(City, State, Zip Code)

Enclosed is a check for $_____
(Make checks payable to Lesley College Alumnae Association)
This covers the cost of the chair(s) plus the Massachusetts Sales Tax if it is applicable. *

Nominal shipping charges will be paid by the purchaser at the time of delivery.

* Out-of-state residents are not subject to the Mass. Sales Tax. Mass. residents must include the sales tax in the total cost of each chair. See Price and Information Sheet.

The Lesley Alumnae Review is a publication of Lesley College, 29 Everett Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Articles in the Lesley Alumnae Review are the express opinions of their authors and are not necessarily shared by Lesley College.
TRADITION REVIVED, Lesley College seniors light candles symbolizing their acceptance into the Alumnae Association during Step-Up Night ceremonies. The tradition was revived by this year's senior class.