2019 William E. Drake Lecture: "Dealing with 21st Century Diversity: Lessons from Coordinate Colleges for American Women"

By Linda C. Morice, Professor Emerita, Educational Leadership,

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

I am honored to give the William E. Drake Lecture at the 2019 annual meeting of the Educational Foundations Society. Today, more than ever, this organization plays a much-needed role in promoting research and teaching in the historical, philosophical, ethical, and social foundations of education.

My lecture explores how history can help us understand the present and prepare for the future in U. S. higher education. The title is "Dealing with 21st Century Diversity: Lessons from Coordinate Colleges for American Women." While everyone here knows what *diversity* means, *coordinate college* is less understood. Let me begin by defining that term and describing the context in which coordinate colleges existed in the United States. Then I'll draw some parallels between challenges faced by the coordinates of the past, and those of present colleges and universities. Finally, I'll conclude by discussing lessons that coordinate colleges offer higher education in dealing with diverse student populations today.

Coordinate colleges were all-female institutions connected by governance, faculty, finances, or admissions to older, all-male colleges and universities. They drew on the example of Cambridge University in England which, after 500 years of educating men, established two women's colleges within the larger institution--Girton College (in 1869) and Newnham College (in 187l). In the U.S., the best-known, early examples of coordinate colleges are Radcliffe (affiliated with Harvard) and Barnard (affiliated with Columbia), although many existed throughout the country. Brown, Penn, Tufts, Rutgers, Middlebury, Colby, Tulane, Georgia, Richmond, Rochester, Virginia Tech, Case Western Reserve, Carnegie Mellon, and Hobart and William Smith all had coordinate colleges for women. Most were established in the late 19th and early 20th centuries—often by first-wave feminists, and many in the Northeast. Sometimes the early coordinates provided an entering wedge into the men's school, thereby expanding women's educational opportunities. In other cases, coordinate colleges were established to *curtail* women's education. Here the effort was to corral women already at the institution to protect the reputation of the men's college or, conversely, to keep women from winning all the honors. In all cases the coordinate colleges were a hybrid between a men's and a women's institution, stopping short of full coeducation.

In researching these hybrids, my attention was drawn to *the three* liberal arts institutions in the U. S. that were initially all-male but established coordinate colleges for women after World War II. They were Long College for Women (founded at Hanover College in Indiana in 1947), Kirkland College for women (founded at Hamilton College in upstate New York in 1968), and The Coordinate College at Kenyon (established in Ohio on the Kenyon College campus in 1969). My interest in these schools was prompted by several factors: I had attended and graduated from one of them (Long College at Hanover) and was aware of many inaccuracies about coordination in the historical record. The three schools had colorful stories set against a backdrop of four major social movements in the mid-to-late twentieth century in civil rights, student rights, antiwar protest, and women's liberation. Their experiences anticipated the widespread rush to coeducation in the U. S. in the early 1970s that continues to shape campus life today. Moreover, the colleges had ample primary and secondary sources for my research, including board minutes, transcripts of student interviews, memoirs of key administrators, court records, correspondence, newspapers, and college publications. Finally, to the best of my knowledge, no one had ever written a book on the coordinate college as a model. I have since written such a book, published in 2019 by Peter Lang. It is titled *Coordinate Colleges for American Women: A Convergence of Interests, 1947-78* and is the latest volume in the "History of

Schools and Schooling" series edited by Alan Sadovnik and Susan Semel. (Book flyers are available at the SOPHE conference registration desk, and I have a few copies available for signing if anyone is interested.)

My research revealed that each coordinate college was created to meet the *converging interests* of the founding institution and not to improve the education of women. These interests were peculiar to the individual campus. For example, one school wanted to avoid bankruptcy by increasing student enrollment without a proportional increase in faculty. That institution felt it could best maintain its academic standards by admitting women who were better students than its second tier of male applicants. Another school wanted to reinvigorate its ossified curriculum by adding courses that allegedly appealed to women. Two institutions wanted to improve men's social opportunities by having women on campus—a move officials believed would also benefit recruitment. One school wanted to access the estate of a wealthy businessman who left a large bequest for the establishment and maintenance of a women's college. Although the three coordinates addressed these and other needs, they were short-lived, and by 1978, were absorbed into their founding institutions—creating the three larger, coeducational colleges that exist today.

Currently, Hanover, Hamilton, and Kenyon are national liberal arts colleges in good financial standing. Each has a slight majority of women students,

consistent with national enrollment patterns. Each has been led by a woman president. Yet each school made mistakes with its coordinate college, largely by focusing on *institutional needs* rather than the needs of female students. While the coordinate colleges fall squarely within the narrative of women's educational history, they are also part of the story of *diversifying* U. S. higher education. Admittedly, their experience was one of adding middle and upper-middle-class white women to campuses that previously enrolled only middle and upper-middle-class white men. Nevertheless, this "baby step" (by current standards) rocked the norms of the previously-all-male colleges, resulting in unanticipated consequences. These colleges' past mistakes can provide lessons for current diversification efforts.

Mark Twain is frequently quoted (perhaps inaccurately) as saying, "History doesn't repeat itself, but it often rhymes." With that sentiment in mind, I have explored the major lessons to be learned from the post-World War II coordinate colleges. This morning I'll begin by presenting six problems these institutions confronted. Then I'll discuss how lessons from the coordinate colleges' experiences might help higher learning institutions educate more diverse student populations today.

Problem 1: Anonymous Institutions and Invisible Students

Only one institution—Hamilton—could tell me the number of female students annually enrolled in its coordinate college. This surprised me, since knowing that number would have been beneficial in planning for housing, programming, staffing, and health services. Nevertheless, Hanover and Kenyon only kept consistent records of the *total number of students* per year, going back to the early nineteenth century when these colleges began. During the years in which Hanover and Kenyon operated a coordinate college, they did so with a single undergraduate curriculum, taught in coeducational classes. By contrast, Hamilton and its coordinate (Kirkland) had separate administrations, boards, and curricula--with cross-registration occurring between the two campuses. Given this structure, the collection of female student enrollment data at Kirkland would have been necessary. However, in time I understood that for most liberal arts colleges, the *total number of students* was the bottom line, due to unique challenges they faced in the postwar era. (More about that later.) Beyond enrollments, I found that gender differences at the three schools were either emphasized or ignored, depending on institutional need.

Even more surprising was my discovery that these coordinate colleges were shrouded in anonymity. Many students who entered Kenyon's Coordinate College or Hanover's Long College for Women had no idea they were enrolled in a women's school when they arrived on campus. Although Kenyon's Coordinate

College lacked its own name (administrators hoped in vain that a wealthy donor would claim this naming opportunity), the first women were quickly made aware that they were not Kenyon students. They were excluded from the annual Freshman Sing and prevented from signing the matriculation book that featured the names of Kenyon alumni Rutherford B. Hayes, Paul Newman, and E.L. Doctorow. The women objected, noting they had applied to Kenyon, not the coordinate college of Gambier, Ohio. One woman even said she could not imagine receiving a diploma that said, "The Coordinate College of Kenyon College."

Eventually I learned that the anonymity of these schools and marginalization of their students could be traced back to the late 1800s with the establishment of the "Harvard Annex," Radcliffe's predecessor. Because of Harvard's reluctance to recognize the Annex in any official way, the women tried to be as inconspicuous as possible. The Annex built no structures but instead rented rooms and later a house, disguising its nature from the outside. In the words of historian Sally Schwager, the women "simply pretended that the college as a physical entity didn't exist." My research revealed that coordinate colleges' anonymity has persisted up to the present. For example, the official 2016 Bicentennial publication of the State of Indiana described Long College as "a fiction set up to admit women to Hanover." In fact, Hanover began admitting women students in 1881 and ceased to be coeducational only for 31 years when it operated a coordinate college.

Problem 2: Insufficient Planning

The three coordinate colleges in my study were founded with insufficient planning. Only three months elapsed between Hanover College's agreement with trustees of the Henry C. Long estate and the arrival of students at Long College for Women. Since Hanover had been coeducational since 1881, the sophomore, junior, and senior women who returned to campus in 1947 were simply transferred to the coordinate college without their permission. Freshman women were largely unaware they were enrolled in a coordinate college when arriving at the school.

Planning (or lack of it) also impacted campus building projects. While Hanover did not immediately begin construction to accommodate its coordinate college, Hamilton and Kenyon did. On both campuses, male architects designed buildings they imagined were uniquely suited to women. Kenyon's architects thought the existing Gothic, stone buildings were too symmetrical and masculine-looking for women students. Instead they opted for warm colors on buildings of brick and aggregate. They designed living units with a curved appearance "to enhance the feminine and informal atmosphere of the coordinate college." Despite this forethought, female students encountered a shortage of restrooms on campus. Due in part to a state laborers' strike, the new buildings were not finished when the women arrived—forcing half of them into temporary housing in community residences. This proved confusing since the women had no place to call home. In

addition to these oversights, Kenyon gave no thought to female athletics, and had inadequate provisions for women's health.

Hamilton's architect also planned new construction with women in mind. The trustees hired a "flamboyant large-thinking man" from Harvard's Graduate School of Design who "delighted in pointing out the 'feminine' aspect" of his "circular" campus for Kirkland, the coordinate college. Kirkland's president recalled the discussion:

> …and there was also some specific talk about the studied absence of any clock tower or similar phallic centerpiece. Let Hamilton have its steeples and towers; Kirkland would be a receptive, circular, open plan. The trustees were a good deal more interested in the practical fact that the plan would allow all-weather movement. As it developed over time, the circle became squared. But one corner of it, happily, was designed to be left open to the surrounding fields. (144)

Like Kenyon, the Kirkland campus was still a construction site when the first female students arrived. A subsequent evaluation by the Middle States Association faulted the school for giving insufficient thought to student services--especially academic and personal counseling. It also determined that Kirkland had too few female faculty for a women's college. Apart from the oversights named in the report, administrators did not fully plan for cross-registration between Kirkland

and Hamilton. Kirkland had an innovative instructional program involving classes based on discussions, written evaluations rather than grades, and senior projects. Hamilton, by contrast, was staunchly traditional. Its faculty complained that the small classes at Kirkland (necessitated by its innovative approach) meant that male students could not always get the Kirkland classes they wanted. This and other cross-registration issues strained the relationship between the two campuses, and ultimately contributed to Kirkland's demise.

Problem 3: Stereotyping of New Students; Failure to See the Institution from Their Perspective

In 1967 Kenyon ran an ad in *Time* magazine to attract female applicants to its coordinate college. The ad targeted men with the headline, "Would You Want Your Sister to Attend This College?" The graphics included a perfume bottle, a stylish woman's shoe, and flowers— suggesting superficial concerns on the part of college women. Four years earlier, Betty Friedan had authored *The Feminine Mystique*, the best-seller that played a major role in launching Second Wave Feminism. Although gender equity was barely on the public's radar screen when Friedan wrote her book, the *Time* advertisement clearly showed that ideas of Second Wave Feminism had not reached Kenyon. In anticipating the arrival of new students, officials thought the women would focus on the humanities, allowing Kenyon to strengthen its offerings in that area as men gravitated toward the

sciences. In fact, women did not choose different fields of study than those selected by men. And beyond stereotyping, the female students encountered instances of discrimination and harassment.

Kenyon's campus newspaper referred to the Coordinate College as a "skirt school." Misogyny reared its head in graffiti, as in a sign on one restroom door stating, "MEN ONLY…THIS HAS BEEN CHANGED BACK TO A MEN'S ROOM." A porta-potty serving construction workers was labeled "OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF WOMEN." When women ate in the main campus dining hall, they had to "parade" down the middle of the tables while fraternity men seated on either side conspicuously assessed them. Kenyon's first female students discovered the college locked their residences at 9 p.m., but the men's dorms were never locked. Men could enter and leave the campus as they wished, while women students had to sign out in a logbook--providing their name, escort, destination, and time of departure. When the dean of the Coordinate College asked female students to define how their new school would relate to Kenyon (with respect to women's and men's interactions in residential buildings), the women expressed a desire for no rules in their dorms. The dean denied the request, explaining that women's rules couldn't be more liberal than the men's. With this information, the women changed their curfew to be consistent with Kenyon's.

Women who attended Kenyon's coordinate college described many cases of promiscuity and sexual assault when later interviewed by the school's women studies students. Documents reveal that Kenyon officials of the late 1960s and early 1970s responded to such behavior in two ways: (1) they wanted to discourage premarital sex by confining women to their dorms; and (2) they denied that rapes occurred on the campus. In the former case, Kenyon's provost worried about leaving men and women alone in the library stacks. Noting that "Two people who are interested in each other cannot study together well," he proposed banning women from the stacks in the evening. (The Coordinate College thereby received a small reference library for women's use.) In 1977, the dean of Kenyon College told the campus newspaper, "We have not had any cases of rape at Kenyon." He suggested this was due to a responsible student body, the school's location far from an urban area, and the degree of care that Kenyon people exhibited toward one another.

Hamilton College also ran an ad in *Time* magazine to recruit its first class of Kirkland applicants. Directed to parents, the ad asked, "When you send your daughter to college, will she get an education?" Besides touting Kirkland's innovative instructional program, the ad (perhaps inadvertently) reminded readers of the widely-held view that women's colleges were less rigorous than men's. A clue to Hamilton's underlying assumptions about its coordinate college can be seen

in a 1964 draft of the proposed four aims of Kirkland. Some of the expressed purposes were to "educate a wife able to share fully the experience of an educated husband in such a way that she grows with him while inspiring her children," and to "give women both the academic tools and the necessary confidence to carry on careers appropriate to the varying stages of their lives—before marriage, on a part time basis during motherhood and on a full time basis when their children are grown."

Given these expectations, Kirkland officials were surprised to discover the views held by women students who arrived on campus in September 1968. In keeping with Kirkland's embrace of participatory democracy, officials had agreed that no rules could be imposed from above; rather, they should emerge from discussions and debates in the group. This principle was immediately put to the test when women students discussed dormitory rules. One young woman, in a large, violet hat, stood up and advocated for no rules at all, amid cheers from the group. The administrators chose not to intervene. For two weeks, men roamed Kirkland's residence halls before a student committee drafted new rules. Men were then allowed to visit in the dormitories between 11 a.m. and 7 p.m., and then again from 11 p.m. to 2 a.m. However, the rules were rarely enforced. The liberal dormitory visitations and the innovative curriculum created an unfortunate impression at Hamilton that Kirkland women were promiscuous and lacking intellectual rigor.

On the Hanover campus, the residences for Long College women were locked each evening at designated times (10 p.m. on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday; 11 p.m. on Wednesday and Sunday, 12 midnight on Friday, and 12:30 on Saturday). Women students were required to complete a sign-out sheet for all absences from their residence after 7 p.m., all daytime absences from Hanover, and all vacation absences. By the late 1960s, senior women could request a key to their residence which they had to return by 9 a.m. the following day. Male students, by contrast, could come and go as they pleased in residence halls that were always unlocked.

One famous example of gender discrimination against a 1957 alumna of Long College involved Carol Warner Shields, winner of the 1995 Pulitzer Prize for Fiction. Shields earned—by virtue of her grades and writing—the John Livingston Lowes Award, which the English faculty bestowed on a graduating senior. However, the Hanover English Department decided to give the award to the next-highest ranking student (a man) because it would benefit his career. Shortly after graduation, Shields married and then had five children before beginning graduate study at 33.

Problem 4: Faculty Reluctance/Resistance

Carol Shields' experience suggests the important role faculty played in affirming or limiting students at the coordinate colleges. Inasmuch as male professors were predominant at each of the schools, young women had few role

models. At Kenyon, the most intransigent opponents of female enrollment were members of the faculty who had low expectations of, and condescending attitudes toward, women students. Kirkland, on the other hand, suffered from being subordinate to Hamilton--its older, larger, and richer neighbor. This characterization was reinforced by a prevalent view that women's colleges were intrinsically inferior to men's colleges. Hamilton professors saw Kirkland faculty as their inferiors. Since Kirkland emphasized teaching, its faculty members were thought to publish less than Hamilton faculty, adding to the negative perception of their credentials.

Problem 5: Failure to Recognize External Forces Impacting Student Experience

The post-World War II coordinate colleges began in an era of change that accelerated over time. The longstanding legal concept of *in loco parentis*, which placed colleges in a parental role with respect to their students, began to erode as early as 1961 when the U.S. Supreme Court defined a person over 18 years of age as a legal adult. Other court rulings granted students the right of due process and defined the relationship between a student and a college as largely contractual. The courts held that if students paid their tuition and met the college's requirements, they were entitled to a diploma. The erosion of *in loco parentis* diminished the college's role in student discipline, thereby giving student affairs professionals a

new focus on educating undergraduates in making appropriate choices and decisions.

Campus rules initially established at the coordinate colleges, as previously described, were out of step with this shifting legal climate. So were some requirements and practices related to women. Title IX--a 1972 directive for gender neutrality in higher education institutions that accepted federal funding--had a far-reaching effect on college athletics. Most higher education institutions greatly expanded women's athletics to comply with it. (At all three coordinate colleges, women's sports had lagged woefully behind the men's.)

Finally, the coordinate colleges largely failed to anticipate the rush to coeducation that occurred in the U. S. from the late 1960s to the early 1970s. The trend directly affected Kirkland in New York, because female students formerly barred from the most prestigious schools in the country could now apply to them. Although the SAT scores of the first Kirkland students were comparable to those of Hamilton men, the women's scores slipped by comparison as top applicants chose Ivy League schools over Kirkland. The score disparity weakened Kirkland's relationship with its founding institution.

Problem 6: A Poor Business Model

Coordinate colleges evolved from what I am charitably calling a "business model," albeit a poor one. Kenyon, for example, spent the last part of the

nineteenth century surviving on student tuition and the sale of large tracts of land. It was one of many liberal arts colleges of the era facing financial problems. After a period of unchallenged leadership in higher education, the role of the liberal arts college lessened as other institutions became dominant—especially state universities, which were cheaper than private colleges. Nevertheless, Kenyon developed a strong academic reputation by hiring prestigious senior professors and creating programs with a national reach. However, the college spent beyond its means, operating on a deficit each year from World War II through 1965. By 1968 the local bank in Gambier, Ohio would no longer extend credit to Kenyon. Administrators thought the school's salvation rested in a new coordinate college that would provide an immediate infusion of cash.

Hanover was founded on the banks of the Ohio River, near the bustling town of Madison, Indiana. After river transport declined, and the railroad bypassed the area, Hanover suffered from isolation. When President Albert Parker came to the college in 1929, it was struggling under a heavy debt. His search for donors revealed the large, untapped estate of Indianapolis lumber and real estate magnate Henry C. Long. In order to meet the specifications of Long's will, Parker had to establish a women's school—even though Hanover had been coeducational since 1881.

In its early years, Hamilton College had financial problems, with a budget that ran an annual deficit. Students failed to pay their bills and could graduate by merely signing a note for debts incurred over the past four years. However, during the postwar era Hamilton became the most financially secure of the three institutions I studied. This was largely because its president, Robert McEwen, was a skilled fundraiser. He envisioned Kirkland College as the first of many satellite campuses around Hamilton, in the mode of the Claremont Colleges in California. However, that concept never materialized. McEwen died before the coordinate college opened, leaving its implementation to others. Kirkland lacked access to Hamilton's endowment and was in the unrealistic position of having to become self-supporting within a short period of time. Its educational philosophy (requiring a low teacher: student ratio) was expensive. During the financial downturn of the 1970s, Hamilton increasingly viewed Kirkland as a drain on its resources. In 1977 it announced the withdrawal of support that Kirkland needed to survive, and then absorbed the coordinate college. Citing efficiency and a changed legal climate for women, Hanover College asked the probate court to permit the amalgamation of Long College into a greater Hanover, which occurred in 1978. Six years earlier, Kenyon had become coeducational by absorbing its coordinate college, noting the women's desire to become Kenyon students.

The three coordinate colleges left powerful lessons, derived from each of the six problems they encountered. But are these lessons applicable to current colleges and universities with much more diverse student populations? Recent articles in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* suggest they are. Let's turn our focus to the six lessons learned from the coordinate college experience and their implications for higher education today.

Lesson 1: While institutional interests need to be protected, it is important to focus on the needs of students.

This lesson cautions institutions of higher learning against marginalizing students who differ from the school's historic clientele. Given American college student demographics, that's a tall order. The country's 17 million undergraduates vary in age, race, ethnicity, wealth, and family background. Therefore, as Goldie Blumenstyk told *Chronicle* readers, "It's time college leaders think about college the ways students do." She urged higher education to "recognize it is a system and start acting like one." Many institutions operate on the incorrect assumption that students pick a college, enroll, and graduate 2 or 4 years later. This hasn't been the norm for some time, with students following more of a "swirl" than a straight path. One-third of students transfer from one college to another before earning a degree. They are more likely to switch from a 4-year college to a 2-year college than the other way around. Often, transfer and part-time students have fallen through the

cracks in institutional data collection. Blumenstyk contends, “Small liberal arts colleges have never made a concerted effort to be partners with community colleges. If they did, they’d immediately diversify the population.”

Institutions should also be aware that their reporting of increases among “Students of Color” may mask declines in individual groups within that category. Another important demographic, First Generation College Students, is often tallied imprecisely. At some schools the term suggests neither parent attended college; at others it means neither parent earned a bachelor’s degree. The equally ambiguous term Legacy may sometimes indicate *a parent’s or grandparent’s attendance* at the school--and other times their receipt of a *degree*. As a result, the same undergraduate can be characterized as both a Legacy and a First Generation College Student—each of which requires a different level of institutional support.

Lesson 2: College officials need a clear grasp of their institution in its entirety, based on good data and comprehensive planning.

Planning—especially enrollment planning—is critical to ensuring the health of a college and university today. However, the *Chronicle* reported in May of this year that a broad swath of private colleges across the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic region were expected to miss their fall enrollment goals—some for the first time. The shortfalls are attributed to several factors, including sensitivity to tuition and other costs, a decline in the number of high school students, questions about the

value of a college degree, and the ease with which students can apply to multiple institutions. Books with titles like *The Handbook of Strategic Enrollment Management* (with chapters on such topics as markets, pricing and financial aid, and student retention) suggest that planning will continue to be important for higher education institutions in the foreseeable future.

Lesson 3: Student stereotyping should be avoided at all costs; college and university personnel should work to ensure that campuses are safe places that foster student growth.

This lesson cautions colleges against stereotyping new students and/or failing to see the institution from their perspective. Some colleges have done that inadvertently. Sarah Lawrence College in Bronxville, New York was founded in 1926 as a women's school with a focus on educational innovation. Beginning in 1951, it admitted men to its graduate program and the following year to its theatre program. However, the number of male students increased very slowly because, as one *New York Times* reporter said in 1984, "Names like…Sarah Lawrence conjure[d] up 1950s images of white gloves and afternoon teas." It has remained one of the most expensive colleges in the country. Fast forward to 2019 when the *Chronicle* published an article titled, "Yes, Students at Sarah Lawrence are Demanding Free Detergent. But There's More To It Than You Might Think." A group of student activists called "The Diaspora Coalition" staged a sit-in to

advance a list of demands that included better resources for students of color and a more diverse faculty. Among other issues, they wanted Sarah Lawrence to provide detergent and fabric softener on a consistent basis for all students, faculty, and staff. The request was met with widespread ridicule, given the college's patrician image. However, the *Chronicle* pointed out that Sarah Lawrence students paid $800 per year for laundry—a hefty price for someone on financial aid. Other items, such as housing during winter break, amounted to a total that was beyond the means of some students. The *Chronicle* article left readers with a question: Would students be willing to have larger classes to have their basic needs met?

Lesson 4: Faculty need information and understanding so they can lend their support to diversification efforts.

A diversity initiative will certainly be more successful if faculty support it. The most common way to cultivate that support is through meaningful professional development. Currently, 7 out of 10 higher education faculty are not on the tenure track. Many of them must cobble together part-time appointments to earn a living wage. In these cases, providing good professional development can be a challenge. A recent *Chronicle* article reports that colleges are stepping up professional development for adjuncts in response to the shrinking number of tenured and tenure-track appointments. This is likely to be an ongoing concern.

Lesson 5: College officials should pay attention to external factors that affect the institution and students.

With respect to this lesson, I can remember several years ago when the chancellor of my university thought the demographic downturn among college-age persons could easily be met by recruiting international and online students. My campus began a concerted effort to establish relationships in China. Recent developments suggest American higher education leaders should be attuned to factors beyond their campuses that affect international students. There has been an overall leveling of this group's numbers in the U. S. and a continued decline in the admission of *new* international students. Institutions experiencing the decline have cited a visa-application process that deters international enrollments. Other factors are an increasingly competitive global market for higher education (in Canada, the U.K., and Australia); the cost of higher education in the United States; and the social and political environment here. Some international students have indicated they felt unwelcome in the U. S., had concerns about their physical safety, were bothered by policies and debates about immigration, or had misgivings about race relations here. Others had concerns about getting a job in the U.S. after completing their education.

Lesson 6: Each college should employ sound fiscal practices that will allow it to reach its goals.

This lesson is reflected in a recent *Chronicle* article by Eric Kelderman, who describes a current, "broken business model" in higher education. He cites a common practice among private colleges to discount tuition by more than 50%--which translates into less tuition money. Kelderman reports this practice has caused several colleges in New England to shutter their doors or announce plans to close. Others have been forced to take strategic steps such as finding new campus uses during down time, instituting more affordable housing and dining options, and increasing the number of adult learners and community college transfers. Kelderman writes that the challenge of insufficient tuition money cannot be overcome by spending more on financial aid or conducting better marketing. Here it is useful to recall that coordinate colleges of the post-World War II era were established when officials concluded that bold action was needed to ensure the economic survival of their schools.

So I leave you with the historic lessons of the coordinate colleges for women, and their potential for helping us understand current educational problems. In closing, I want to express my appreciation for your support of the Educational Foundations Society, which allows ideas to be nurtured and shared annually through the Drake Lectures. May they continue for many years to com**e!**