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This report was prepared by a special committee, the President's Committee on General Education.
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The committee was at work during the academic year 1952-53 and handed its report to the Deans and Faculty of Yale College and the Freshman Year in September, 1953. The report is now in the hands of the College Committee on the Course of Study whose recommendations must be approved by the College Faculty before any actual changes are made in the Curriculum.
Anyone who claims to be thinking about contemporary education in the colleges must level a critical eye, not only at them but also at the community they serve. The adequate definition of a liberal education is certainly still to be made; society on the other hand has still to reach a point where it would know how to use that education if it came to exist.

The President's Committee on General Education is obliged then to see the context of its recommendations as a complex one. Our first point of common agreement as a committee, however, was that we would not attempt a theoretical study of college education but would concern ourselves with the possibilities of our own Yale situation. At the same time it was apparent that the way of Yale is only one aspect of the problem faced by every university college. And there has been in addition a growing recognition over the past few years that though the break between school and college is often divisive, it does not represent a true division -- that in order to think constructively about the first years of college we must ask ourselves how they can best use and extend the education of the schools.

Of these ways of regarding non-specialized education, that which concerns itself with the university college has been most carefully explored. Since the war, for example, detailed and widely divergent studies have appeared from Harvard, Chicago, Columbia and Yale -- each designed to present both a method and a rationale for undergraduate education. The well-known Harvard report is preoccupied with defining an education able both to confront and to utilize the great diversities of a democratic society. The Chicago study, on the other hand, seeks to discipline that diversity by imposing on it a fixed and ultimately abstract system of human values.

The statement and practice of Columbia and Yale seem to fall between these two. Columbia has standardized the syllabi for its basic courses, but at the same time it has allowed freedom for the individual competence of the teacher. Yale, traditionally inclined to build first on its own experience, adopted a standard program which reconciled the universal concern for general education with its own inherited program of distribution and a pilot program, Directed Studies, which experimented with the possibilities of a fixed syllabus. One might say that the Columbia program prescribes a group of books and problems, the Chicago program a set of attitudes by which to approach books or problems, and the Harvard program a set of attitudes to result from the study of books and problems. The Yale program, on the other hand, while it recognizes the usefulness of books and problems and the importance of attitudes puts its chief emphasis on exposing the student to the great traditional areas of intellectual concern.

These patterns of theory and practice largely ignore the different and equally important questions which arise from the attempt to fuse the work of school and college. A recent study, General Education in School and College, attacks this problem of how to avoid "the wasteful duplication
of educational experience," and answers it by defining on the one hand essentials of non-specialized education which both schools and colleges can accept, and on the other hand ways of educating students which really make the best of their training and talents.

In addition to these national attempts to solve the problem of non-specialized education, we were able as a committee to take advantage of careful and detailed thinking at Yale which underlies the present curriculum of the first two years. The Report of the Committee on the Course of Study, adopted by the Yale College Faculty in 1945, describes certain general ends for undergraduate education. As the report presents the standard program for the B.A., "it is to provide the student, in school and college, with the fundamental studies, to acquaint him with the great fields of knowledge, to make him a reasonably competent person in a limited field, and to bring him to that maturity which ought to distinguish the young graduate of Yale."

Yale's experience since the war in meeting these general ends has inevitably suggested certain modifications of the pattern adopted in 1945; the events of the last eight years provide in this way a pragmatic parallel to the general thinking which has gone on across the country. And since our concern as a committee has been with the first two years of a Yale education, we have leaned heavily on that local experience in defining the most pressing problems of non-specialized education which we face. We have tried to avoid the provinciality of assuming that Yale's way is best merely because it is Yale's; but equally we have tried to see actual problems and possible solutions as they exist here.

II

The problems faced by the University, as the committee sees them, are of four chief kinds: the first is that of enormous diversity in the background, motivation and previous training of students. As Yale has become a national university it has inevitably had to cope with an increasing range of standards and kinds of college preparation. Simultaneously with this broadening of Yale's range, however, there has been an increasing conflict and dispute over standards in the schools themselves, so that in the last twenty years the university has experienced a drastic increase in the diversity which would in any case have grown as its admissions policy continued to broaden.

Dispute in the schools has produced a variety of attitudes toward the colleges, from one extreme which asserts that by their failure to maintain requirements they have subverted standards in fields like the classics to the other which insists that they have no right at all to interfere with the
self-determined standards of the schools. Wherever truth lies, these arguments have compounded the already difficult problem of divergent student backgrounds.

The second general difficulty which Yale faces grows in part from this problem of diversity; it is the necessity to teach basic but not college work on the one hand -- remedial English, elementary language and elementary mathematics -- and to include training programs like ROTC on the other. Time must be yielded up and any potential order of the curriculum broken into to make room for these studies. Even if we grant the fact that they are often necessary, it is dangerous to let them limit our concept of the education we should give.

These first two problems are external in the sense that their origins are not in the University's control; there are in addition two further problems, the product of powerful 'internal' forces. The first is an often legitimate failure of the student to commit himself to the work Yale offers; the second, allied to this failure of interest, is the great and complex problem of student maturity -- or lack of it. Taken together, these forces put a definite limit on Yale's effectiveness in the early years of college.

We say 'legitimate failure,' because at the moment Yale is not making the best possible use of the time of many of its most able students. If an undergraduate duplicates work he has done before or if he moves at too slow a speed for his abilities, he first loses his interest in and then his respect for the education he is getting. We may argue that if he were more mature he would see that his boredom is usually only temporary, but we must take the undergraduate as we find him and admit that he sometimes loses drive early in his college career which he may never regain.

The drag of student immaturity on the impact of Yale's present curriculum is more difficult to describe or measure. But it is apparent that beyond the particular man who finds his work easy or repetitive stand a whole community of students who find their work secondary in comparison with the 'important' affairs of life -- their ten or twenty hours a week given to the News or Record or basketball team. It would be wrong, of course, to maintain that Yale's host of activities are in themselves a sign of immaturity; they are sometimes of educational value, but their exfoliation makes it clear that a majority of the students put second things first.

The effect on the curriculum of this sort of student preoccupation is at times both insidious and cumulative. As able but preoccupied undergraduates spend less time on their work, the quality of what the faculty can expect of them inevitably declines; the result of this decline is a further slump in their interest and a progressive failure of their studies to make a real demand on them.
Yale is faced, then, with the problem of student immaturity defined as a failure to recognize the importance of the work which stands at the center of college life. This immaturity has many contributing causes -- the adolescent compulsion to go the way of the crowd, for instance, rather than the individual way of learning. But behind the undergraduate zeal to deify the unimportant stands a false myth of Yale -- the Yale of casual but big-time activity, the Yale glorified and made famous by Owen Johnson, Ralph Paine and the rest. Their extremes of emphasis on activity and the 'real' world reflect a quality which is a part of Yale's past but also an influence on its present.

The student who expects these qualities of Yale has already taken a long step toward making them the ones he will find here. The reputation which Yale has at many of the best secondary schools tends to nourish this myth and to ignore the educational opportunity (which Yale makes available to all its students) of discussion classes, seminars, and some of the most distinguished teaching in the country. This false reputation has two evil effects, in the opinion of the committee. First, it causes Yale to lose some of the best potential candidates for admission; and second, it draws many of those who do come here toward a News or a WYBC which embodies the slick but naive attitudes encouraged in any case by the perennial patterns of undergraduate life, and equally by many dominant assumptions of our whole culture. Just as in a trivial way the university is confused by society's everyday patterns so that though the faculty work on Saturday no one else seems to, so in a more significant way students are supported by society's stock values in accepting many of the weakest aspects of Yale's past.

One additional limitation of the first two years deserves attention. Students and faculty alike tend to feel that the major is the crucial part of the undergraduate curriculum, and that the rest of the four years merely prepare for or adorn it. This feeling has two effects. The students tend to go along passively but plaintively from requirement to requirement, often asking nothing more than to be carried by the conveyor belt. And the faculty either give less time to the planning and teaching of the first years, or work hard at a departmental course but expect it to have no primary purpose beyond that of feeding the major.

Pressure of many kinds, then, has been brought to bear on the first two years: gross inconsistencies of preparation with their attendant bafflement or boredom, the clamor for courses which may train but do not always educate, the worship of false gods by the undergraduates, the eagerness of Departments to prepare students for specialized work. The result of their combined action has often been an indifferent and easy dismissal of the first years by many of those concerned. And this dismissal in turn contributes to the later failures of students to meet the demands of professional school and the responsibilities of society. As several graduate Deans told the committee, Yale is still not fulfilling the need for men with the power to make
judgments about complex subjects and to present those judgments coherently and precisely. If the college produces graduates who know a good deal about Spenser or Bismarck, economics or chemistry, but relatively little about the disciplined use of the mind, it cannot honestly claim to call them educated.

III

What are the means at hand for meeting such of these problems as can be met explicitly? What in particular can be done to give order to the first two years?

With regard to standards for admission, we approve the Board of Admission's statement about secondary school study [Terms of Admission, p. 9] which constitutes our only present means of setting standards for students before admission. At the same time we hope that certain recommendations made in the body of this report will provide further support for the Board's efforts to raise standards in the schools.

The present curriculum, with whose aims we agree, has three specific ways of guiding the student: first, by the four basic requirements (English, a modern language, a science, and some formal training in systematic thinking); second, by a distributional program which exposes the student to certain great fields of study; and finally by a system of exemptions which permits well-trained students to by-pass one or more basic requirements. In the light of our general definition of the problems Yale faces we should like to consider briefly each of these aspects of the present pattern of the first two years.

1) Basic Studies

The basic studies bring into sharp focus a general difficulty which we have already mentioned -- that of giving time to work which may not be of college level no matter how useful as a training subject. These studies raise expectations which in practice they do not and probably cannot satisfy. An elementary course in English or the Classics cannot be expected to carry the whole burden of training in writing and speaking. The study of a modern language is commonly carried to the point where its real usefulness would begin; but there, the requirement having been met, it is dropped. 'Systematic thinking' tends to exist in a vacuum, to become (through its separation from English composition and from other work one might legitimately think about) either an unused tool or an esoteric specialty. The requirement in the sciences is by its general nature part of a student's distributional program, but the basic courses are commonly organized as though they were valuable only as tools for further scientific work.
The individual courses which satisfy these requirements are often excellent, and the requirements themselves are in areas of great importance. But it is still true that if the schools were doing their job we would not need the Basic Studies in anything like their present form. And as a result it is also true that in their present form they tend to fall between training skills and true discipline; often they are satisfactory for neither purpose. Though they are supposed to underlie and support all the rest of the curriculum, too often they are for the student an inert mass quite unrelated to his intellectual life.

2) The Program of Distribution

There can be no doubt of the value of the various fields included in our present distribution program, if one regards them as individual subjects of concentration. It seems to us, however, that the problem of the relation between the various requirements is largely unresolved. The original solution, that of Requirement VI (Interrelationships of Knowledge), was perhaps an inevitable failure. Given the range of disciplines covered by the distributional requirements, it is not surprising that students find it impossible to establish solid relationships among them — particularly at the point in their careers where they are having their first encounter with many fields of study.

The need for coordination remains, because without it the whole distributional program becomes distorted from its proper meaning. The large number of term courses which can be combined to satisfy requirements, for example, tends to mis-define the concept of distribution as a mere series of hurdles, a mechanical way of avoiding over-concentration but by no means the profitable experience in the major disciplines originally intended.

There is, furthermore, no intellectual sequence or correlation in the program of distribution; it prescribes a series of courses in different areas, but they may be elected in any order, and they form a staggering and perhaps useless variety of possibilities. The common result is that all the courses move on the same intellectual plane — a plane determined by the abilities and training of freshmen. The causes of indifference among sophomores are many, but one for which the faculty should hold themselves responsible is the failure to provide intellectual demands which grow from and beyond the work of freshman year. At the moment every course used by sophomores to satisfy a distributional requirement can be taken as an elective by freshmen. When one adds the fact that many men do not complete their requirements until junior year, it becomes apparent that elementary and often repetitious study dulls more than half the education Yale gives.
3) The System of Exemptions

Our present exemption system is clearly designed to remedy a major difficulty already mentioned, that of the range of preparation and ability in our entering students. Despite this estimable purpose, however, the system poses problems for many students.

The average student who has had a mediocre preparation is untouched by the system of exemptions, which is usually right and proper. The average man with excellent secondary training, however, presents something of a problem to us and to himself. For he has often already taken the equivalent of certain of our basic courses, while his entrance record is not sufficiently good to exempt him from them. Indeed he may well have been advised by his school to repeat a course it has already taught him; he will do fairly well with little work, and the school will not run the risk of being shamed by his performance. In any case Yale makes demands which he feels he has already met, and the ensuing boredom often blights the first two years.

Exemptions may save the able and well-prepared man from this waste, but often he is merely translated to a temporary intellectual limbo where he finds it impossible to do demanding work in his major field of interest until junior year, though our exemption implied he would be ready for it as a sophomore. The fact that he is allowed to enter an upperclass lecture course does little to help capitalize on his superior abilities, since at best it is conducted at a mass level which puts no strain on him. And it is sometimes true that, despite the attempt of certain schools to anticipate our courses, a student of ability would benefit more from fresh and demanding basic work than from a complete exemption which may leave an important gap in training. The able and well-prepared man, like his less skillful but equally well-trained classmates, is caught by a system not at the moment primarily and positively directed to his capabilities.

In the present system of exemptions, then, we find the same quality of self-defeat which marks the basic and distributional requirements. The general purpose of each kind of requirement is wise and valid; but in practice the basic studies slump toward mere tool-training, the distributional program scatters toward disorder, and the system of exemptions gives freedom for advanced work but fails to ensure it.

IV

Our last remarks, like others which we have made, suggest the need for a redefinition of the first two years.
a) Yale must find a more effective way of relating its curriculum to the host of school backgrounds from which students come. It is apparent that at the moment this cannot be done by any direct means; but the first two years of Yale should be designed so that a student with a proper secondary education may take full advantage of it when he gets here. He should receive college credit for the truly advanced work he has already done. In this way not only will the individual student benefit but the schools will have an incentive toward adequate preparation which seems for the most part to be lacking at the moment; and most important of all, the University will have at last a specific means of bringing a constructive influence to bear on them.

b) If one side of the coin of school-college coordination is a need for influence on the schools, the other is a need for adequate and imaginative demands on students after they get to college. From the time he enters Yale a student must be challenged to his individual maximum. This means that the level at which he starts his work should be adequate to his preparation and ability, and it also means that his ability should play a major part in deciding the speed with which he moves from grade to grade of difficulty in the work of the first years.

If this recognition of a student's training and ability is sound, furthermore, it seems only fair to accept in principle its logical consequence: it should be made feasible for him to receive his B.A. in seven years from the start of high school.* This does not mean that such a seven-year program should be accepted as the normal pattern; but particularly since the majority of these superior students go on to graduate and professional work, Yale would be encouraging both them and the schools if it made the option a live one.

c) The most specific and at the same time most complex need of the first two years is for a more carefully coordinated course of study. We feel that such a course of study should serve a number of particular purposes.

1) It should make possible a genuine continuity of courses within a given area. This continuity is needed by those who will not go on to major in the area even more than by those who will; those who take only two courses in the social sciences, for instance, have at the moment little chance of understanding the common concerns or insights of the particular subjects they study.

* The committee is aware that with a proposal of this sort many problems stand between suggestion and action. Someone must decide, for instance, which of the able students are to spend four years in school, and which ones four years in college. But the principle of flexibility seems to us important enough to be worth the work involved.
2) As we suggested earlier, there should be a steadily increasing difficulty and maturity during the work of the first two years; before they commit themselves to a major, students need to learn how certain specific studies relate to one another; but they need equally to learn that the introduction to a study is never the full truth about it.

3) The need to provide basic training in certain fields must be met; given the present state of the secondary schools, the colleges will continue to do a part of their job for them. But at the same time Yale should set standards of achievement for all students to meet during the first two years. Their deficiencies on entrance should be recognized and treated as such, with the result that an ill-prepared student must do extra work to meet standards adequate for his better-prepared fellows. The standard for the first two years, in short, should have a high floor rather than a low ceiling.

4) One constant clamor of undergraduate 'fearless journalism' is for independence and responsibility. As the faculty knows all too well, this usually means a cry for privilege rather than independence. But it is perhaps time to call in the mortgage by giving the students some genuine responsibility for the success of their first two years at Yale. The material they work with should be in blocks rather than fragments; the method they work by should be a radical break from the daily prodding of the schools.

5) Implicit in these ends which should be served by the first two years is a general need for development in the university of the importance of coherent non-specialized study. We have already mentioned the inevitable and valid reasons why the major looms large in all eyes. We have no intention of calling its importance into question; rather we would like to raise the first two years to something like its level of intellectual excitement and coherence.

At the same time it seems probable that if the first years come to make full use of student interest and skill, they will raise certain questions about the major as it now stands. There are, for example, solid grounds for asking whether a course giving highly specific training in a single field is the only valid preparation for a major in that field. The experience of Directed Studies suggests that this is by no means the case. Further, is the major itself designed to be an appropriate exercise-ground for the mind, or is it patterned as a kind of junior graduate school? It has not been the task of the committee to answer these questions, but it seems to us that they deserve careful consideration if Yale's four year education is to justify itself as a whole.

Beyond the problem of the intellectual continuity between the years of general education and the years of the major stands the general
need for a proper respect of the first years in themselves. They must be recognized, by students and faculty alike, as of equal importance with the major though different from it in means and achievement. All too often at the moment a recognition of the value of the first two years is defeated by the very nature of the lip-service paid to a 'well-rounded education', or to 'cultural studies'. The teacher who looks at education in this way usually regards his own bailiwick as central and the rest as mere -- even if desirable -- adornment. The committee rejects a view of education which makes such arbitrary distinctions, and recognizes instead the different but equally valid kinds of intellectual training which the great areas of knowledge imply.

There seem logically to be three of these areas -- the natural sciences and mathematics, the social sciences and history, and the arts. These areas may properly be regarded as jointly concerned with man's effort to understand and control himself and his physical and social environment. Each area, however, has a distinguishable focus and a distinguishable method. The natural sciences and mathematics are concerned with the world of nature and seek by insight, observation, experiment, and analysis to discover the recurrent patterns of interaction among natural phenomena. The social sciences and history are concerned with the world of society. The historian's preoccupation is with the past of man and society, how they have become what they are. The social scientists seek by insight, observation and analysis (and to a lesser degree by experiment) to discover the recurrent patterns of interaction among men, groups of men, and man-made institutions.

In the sciences, then, general education may best be served by the logical - mathematical analysis of the world of nature; in the social sciences and history it may be encouraged by work with a variety of descriptive ways of indicating order in man's world. The arts are distinguished by the fact that their order already exists in the material studied. The student who works with them learns to deal with intuitive symbolic ways of interpreting experience, ways which combine into one order the rational, the descriptive, and the evaluative.

We have repeatedly expressed our concern for increased coordination and coherence in the first two years. Yale can call a man sufficiently prepared only if, when he goes on into his major, he has had some direct and sustained experience with the kind of intellectual operation demanded by the three great areas of study. These areas differ from one another in the evidence they seek, the questions they ask of it, and therefore the aspects of full objective reality which they describe. But a man is not educated merely because he is exposed to work of the three different kinds; he is educated if he has used his mind in the different ways, and used it for understanding rather than for mere memorization or for some supposed though abstract purpose of discipline.
A year in a course, or even two years in two disparate courses, will not give this kind of education, however much information they present. A student needs in addition to use a foreign language at least well enough so that it can be brought to bear on the area of his chief interest, but it should be an instrument and extension of that interest rather than a self-limited requirement.

In the body of this report the committee suggests certain ways in which it seems that these proper ends of the first two years may be served. Behind our specific proposals, as behind the more general discussion of the Introduction, stands one purpose; to establish a concept of undergraduate Yale which has intellectual development—in a broad and not merely a technical sense—at its center. A recognition of the difficulties described in the Introduction, and a consideration of the proposals we now suggest, may do something toward achieving this end.
Plan A.

The committee first proposes a modification of the present curriculum for the B.A. degree, which takes its departure from the analysis and criticism outlined above and looks towards the more ambitious goals and program defined later in Plan B. Plan A assumes a five-course program each year for the first two years, a program like our present arrangement whose first purpose is to realize the prevailing distributional objectives and at the same time to offer a full variety of prerequisites for the majors to come. In addition, however, the committee has tried to achieve more progression and sequence in a discipline and more concentration in an area of knowledge than is general at present, and in this way to achieve something of the two-year coordination basic to Plan B.

I. Entrance Requirements and Placement

Under this heading three aspects of Plan A must be specifically mentioned. (It should be recognized that many of the following procedures already exist; often the committee merely suggests a new use for existing information.)

1) Entrance Requirements: Except for the more general suggestions made earlier in our preliminary remarks, we feel that entrance to Yale should be handled very much as at present. School record, C.E.E.B. scores, and the predicted average seem to provide adequate estimates of a student's ability and readiness for college work. In the light of the Andover report and our experience with the Ford Scholars, we would urge that the Board of Admissions be allowed to decide in consultation with the schools whether to require graduation from the twelfth grade for every applicant, though it will undoubtedly be the case with the great majority in the predictable future. In some cases the student might well be urged to come to college earlier, in others to obtain college credit for additional work in school.

2) Language Proficiency: In addition to the normal procedures for admission, every candidate should be tested for his degree of competence in English and one foreign language. This can be done through C.E.E.B. examinations, either in January or March in the last year of school. In English the present Verbal Aptitude test by adding an essay question, and in the foreign languages the present achievement tests, seem satisfactory to the committee. In English the level of competence should be set somewhere near the bottom of the present English 15 group and in foreign language at the level required at present for exemption. The purpose of
these tests in language skills is to determine whether the entering student has previously achieved the minimum facility required; if he has not he must take work in these basic subjects until this level is attained. In the case of the foreign languages, as will be seen below, the achievement of this minimum does not absolve the student from further language work in college, but merely means that he is ready to use this skill.

3) Placement: So far under Plan A two aspects of the admissions procedure have been mentioned: those tests which the Board of Admissions would require for admission and those tests - either a part of or in addition to admission - which the committee would recommend to determine language proficiency. In addition the committee is particularly concerned that Yale determine on entrance the degree of competence which the candidate has achieved in literature, American history, one science, and mathematics. In time certification by the schools might be accepted here. For the present, C.E.E.B. will probably have to be demanded of most applicants.

These tests should preferably be taken late in the last year of school. If they can be conveniently used also for admission purposes, that is time saved. But they are to test a certain subject-matter achievement as well as aptitude; therefore neither the existing social studies nor verbal aptitude test is appropriate for this purpose, though possibly the science and mathematics examinations as given at present could be used. The American history examination should test the students' knowledge of the principal events and broad outlines of the history of his own country as well as his skill in analyzing and interpreting this history. In literature he should be tested on his knowledge of certain literary works or movements and should display a certain critical faculty in appraising them. In mathematics and science again a certain minimum quantity and quality of achievement, the details of which should be spelled out by our own scientists, should be demanded. The purpose of these examinations is three-fold. First they represent a way of establishing a minimum or floor in the three great areas of knowledge which define the students' work for the first two years. Second, his performance in these examinations should help the student and his counselor determine which one of these areas should be his area of concentration, in which he will do half his work during his first two years and within which he will often choose his major. Finally, if the faculty should recognize the possibility of a student's anticipating and
securing credit towards a Yale degree in secondary school (thereby helping him towards graduation in less than the conventional four years), examinations of this sort offer a practical way of controlling the process.

II. Distributional Requirements

Under Plan A, the subjects available for study are divided into three main areas and a fourth category called training subjects. The three areas are:

I) Natural Sciences and Mathematics, which includes logic and statistics.

II) History and Social Sciences.


The definitions implied by these three divisions are self-explanatory. By literature is meant work in literature in any language, ancient or modern. Certain disciplines, philosophy and classics for instance, would find themselves divided among several areas. Logic is included in the first area, political philosophy in the second, ethics and aesthetics in the third. The rationale behind these three divisions was presented in the introductory section of this report. As areas of content they have a certain obvious legitimacy, but the committee would consider the courses in the separate areas to be related also as regards function—i.e., in the way they interpret or relate their material. In the fourth category—the training subjects—are located the grammar or elementary work in any language, including English, and the ROTC courses.

Under Plan A every student would take four courses from one area and two courses from each of the others during his first two years. In addition he has two courses for use either in the training subjects (to complete a deficiency in his basic language skills as revealed by his tests on entrance) or in ROTC. In all three areas the courses would be arranged at two levels: introductory and advanced. In his area of concentration (where he is to take four courses) the student would take two second level or advanced courses after his first two courses, thereby securing a certain amount of progression in strength. In each of his two areas of non-concentration the student would normally take an introductory and an advanced course rather than two introductory courses. The student who is deficient in both English and a foreign language could not take ROTC. The student who is deficient in one training subject might take ROTC, but he must still satisfy his concentration requirement in sophomore year. Finally, at the end of his sophomore year every student would take a comprehensive examination on his work in his area of concentration.
To illustrate these distributional arrangements in greater detail, some sample offerings in the three areas are outlined below. On the basis of present elections the committee would prophesy that the percentage of students concentrating in the three areas would run roughly as follows: Area I: 10%; Area II: 60%; Area III: 30%. This distribution should be borne in mind while reading the following descriptions.

Area I Science and Mathematics

In this area the distinction between concentrator and non-concentrator is clearly drawn. The former would in fact be a future science major. In the light of present thinking about and teaching of elementary science at Yale, the committee would encourage the departments to offer for the concentrator the traditional courses in Mathematics and Science, with their present natural and often inevitable sequences.

For the non-concentrator who has to take two courses in the area, the committee suggests courses at the introductory level in mathematics, science, and logic, which would serve the general education interests of the non-scientists. Progress at Yale in this area as in the country at large has so far been uneven. Dramatic failures and considerable successes have been achieved, none of which need be rehearsed here. The committee is convinced that vital work in this area, terminal in nature and intended for the non-specialist, can and should be conducted at the college level; that such work must be designed and organized by men in these fields who are sincerely enthusiastic about the job to be done and firmly supported in their efforts by their departments and by the university administration. In mathematics the approach of the present Mathematics 11 appealed to the committee, as did the inclusion of some statistics.* In the sciences, the present Physics I, Science II, Science III, and the proposed revival of Science I, all seemed to be working in different ways towards the right goals, though no one of them has yet completely arrived. In the teaching of logic the committee recognizes the present dilemma of the Philosophy Department whose logicians have moved far away from the elementary field and whose staff of experienced teachers has been over-extended in recent years. If more general education work in science and mathematics for the non-concentrator could be perfected, the Philosophy Department might be able to handle more efficiently a reduced share of the present burden.

Area II History and the Social Sciences

In this area at least six courses at the introductory level seem possible: three in history, which would resemble the present History 10, 20, 21, one in classics, Classical Civilization 20, and two

*On the utility of statistics, see the report of the Director of the Student Appointment Bureau for 1951-2, p. 7; for their educational value, see A. N. Whitehead, The Aims of Education.
in social science, both new. The first of these -- an introduction to the policy sciences--would be located in the fields of politics and economics. The second--an introduction to the behavioral sciences--would incorporate material from psychology and sociology. Again the second-level or advanced courses would cut across fields: the history of political theory, political and economic institutions or analysis; economic history; man and society. For history and most of the social sciences a program of concentration in Area II should offer a superior background for the major because of the work in related disciplines. The Department of Economics may be concerned for that irreducible minimum of work in the logic of economics required for entrance to their major. The committee felt, however, that this material could be worked in at both levels of the new courses, in conjunction with politics or history, to the great profit of the future majors in economics. The experience of Directed Studies has already demonstrated how much cooperative effort between history and the social sciences can be achieved at the level of general education; it has also demonstrated how much remains to be done.

Area III The Arts: Literature, Music and the Visual Arts

Here, the committee envisages three courses at the introductory level: a literature course, a course in the visual arts and a course in music. The first would resemble Literature I rather than any of the present introductory courses in English in that it would include great works chosen from ancient and modern literatures, English and foreign. The second and third courses might well be the present first courses in the history of art and music. At the advanced level the courses offered in this area might build onto the elementary work in a variety of ways. Here philosophy -- where it concerns aesthetics and value -- would come into its own, either in conjunction with further work in literature or in the non-verbal arts. Since the essence of Plan A is progression but not specialization, these advanced courses should cut across or combine fields rather than concentrate in one department. In literature, for instance, since a sequence of two courses is possible here, there is no reason why the most exacting demands of a department could not be met with a profitable breadth to spare of work in useful related fields. The advanced level courses in this area do not exist at present, but there is much offered in literature, the non-verbal arts, and philosophy which could be rearranged for this purpose.

IV Organization

1) Administration: A modification of the present Freshman Year is one implication of the committee's Introduction as well as of its positive recommendations in Plan A and in Plan B to follow. We say modification deliberately, and it is with some hesitation that we say even so much. The Common Freshman Year has for thirty years been a guardian of two
central qualities in Yale education: vigorous and devoted undergraduate teaching, and a responsible and rewarding undergraduate social life. These qualities are as important as ever, but shifts in the whole pattern of the college suggest that it is time to separate them from one another.

Developments in the country at large support the rising interest at Yale in a coherent administrative and curricular pattern for the four undergraduate years. The recent literature on the subject studied by the committee, the testimony given by undergraduate and graduate Deans in the course of the year, the consideration of the common ground for both kinds of evidence, all point to the need for education which so far as possible is continuous rather than fragmented, coordinated rather than merely sequential.

As the new University policy on Appointments and Tenure makes clear, furthermore, the individual departments and the administration are now committed to recognize able teaching as a prerequisite for advancement from instructor to assistant professor. Concurrently with this development of a college-wide concern for teaching quality at the introductory level, has come an increasing awareness that the present division of undergraduate faculties is an artificial one. Neither the teaching needs nor the curricular problems of the undergraduate years can be legally and officially subdivided without a considerable duplication of effort. It might be wiser to look toward a single Yale College administration and faculty which would be functionally divided when necessary for the carrying out of the particular and often separate responsibilities of the first two or the last two years.*

Freshman Year as a social rather than an educational unit will be as necessary as ever. Until the millennium arrives and freshmen can be taken directly into the colleges, they must have the unique opportunities which Freshman Year gives for freedom and order -- freedom to form new associations and interests, order by which to learn the ways of the community. The Counsellors provide genuine guidance without mere coddling; and though they should be aided by the faculty in giving advice on courses and majors, they are integral to the best use by the freshman of his privileges. The structure of Freshman Year is in this social area completely justified by its success, even though its formal educational function should now be fused with that of Yale College. It gives orientation and yet a diversity of experience upon which the success of the colleges depends in the ensuing three years.

2) Faculty for the First Two Years: The committee has shared the concern of many others on the campus over the gradual disappearance of a more corporate faculty life at Yale. Because of size and other factors neither

*The basis for work in Engineering provided by the present Freshman Year can be continued by Yale College under whatever conditions the faculties of the Engineering School and Yale College ultimately determine.
the Yale College faculty nor that of Freshman Year is at present able to provide an arena wherein the young academic acquires a sense of participation as a teaching member of a college community. By its very nature his department tends to have too limited a horizon and is often too hierarchical in organization to afford the young man much chance to try his wings. The fellowships of the residential colleges, it is true, provide a most profitable meeting-ground for men from varied disciplines, but their usefulness must remain of an informal sort. The committee feels that the condition in which the Yale faculty now finds itself and the particular needs of Plan A suggest a possible reorganization of the faculty on the following lines.

The faculty concerned with the first two years would be divided into four parts, each part corresponding to one of the areas of instruction or to the category of training subjects. Any member of the faculty teaching in the first two years would belong automatically to one of these faculties, but membership in them would not disqualify him from serving on any other faculty in the university. These four faculties of the first two years would be under the ultimate authority of the Dean of Yale College who would appoint their chairmen; together they would comprise the Faculty in General Education.

Their chief purpose would be to organize the courses and supervise the general examinations in their particular area. As at present, these courses would be subject to the approval of the Yale College faculty and its Committee on the Course of Study, but a faculty in general education would have the same power to propose courses as a department now does. To staff these courses, the faculties in general education would request the assignment of instructors from the various departments. The departments, one would assume, should place roughly one third of the teaching time of their members at the disposal of general education, with the other two thirds being distributed between the last two undergraduate years and graduate work. The faculty in each area would prescribe the syllabus and pick the examiners for the general examination to be taken by all concentrators in the area. The divisions of the faculty in general education into the four areas might well provide smaller units of 50-60 members who would assume genuine responsibility and direction for the courses in the area.

All giving instruction in general education would hold departmental appointments, but the faculties in general education might profitably exercise the same initiative in suggesting appointments as is now the case with such interdepartmental programs as Directed Studies or American Studies.

2) General Examinations: At several places in this report the Committee has expressed its interest in general examinations; indeed they represent the heart of the proposals which follow in Plan B. The general examination as a balance to over-specialization or to the excessive departmentalization of the separate course has much to recommend it. In addition,
the interdepartmental character of the work in general education for the concentrator in Plan A can probably be best appraised through a general examination. The committee is not advocating more testing as an educational goal in its own right. Indeed, we would hope that quizzes if not examinations in the separate courses would tend to decline in importance as the general examinations showed their worth. Our conviction is rather that the present course unit has become over-emphasized, with the unfortunate result that the student tends to identify a discipline with a course or even an instructor and often loses the intellectual stimulus that a larger sense of responsibility for a defined area of knowledge might give him.

It is in this context that we suggest general examinations for the concentrator in each area at the end of his second year. Two examinations of three hours each, offering different papers to suit the various combinations possible in each area, should provide an adequate appraisal of the student's achievement. The examinations might give additional data for determining the student's future major. No one would be allowed to progress into the upper two years without passing these general examinations, though a re-examination would be permitted in September of junior year.

3) Teaching Methods: The methods of teaching create some of the more glaring anomalies and inconsistencies of the first two years of college. To provide both qualified and stimulating instruction during this period has long concerned departments and administration. And no doubt, as the recent Andover report made explicit, many students who come from independent schools experience an actual decline in the quality of their instruction during this critical period. The committee can produce no easy solution to the general problem. Clearly the answer is a concerted and continuous effort by all concerned, faculty and administration alike: greater attention to the recruitment of likely candidates for the teaching profession, more careful processes of selection in the graduate school with an eye to the candidate's promise as a teacher; endless care in appointments to our own faculty; the maintenance of a proper proportion of experienced teachers from all departments in the work of the first two years (Freshman Year has performed possibly its most important function in this regard); and finally the extensive use of on-the-job training in the separate courses through weekly briefing sessions and any other devices useful in helping the beginner learn his job. In this last connection the committee notes that great variation now exists in the first two years with respect to the amount of time and emphasis placed on this kind of training; each department must take full responsibility for providing and rewarding good undergraduate teaching.

More specifically in relation to Plan A, the committee would hope that all the different kinds of teaching--lecture, discussion, and laboratory--would be intelligently used at the appropriate places in the first two years. It would like to think that no course in the first two years should be composed exclusively of lectures. Some instructors, however, can make a greater contribution in lecture than in discussion (and vice-versa!).
and some subjects or parts of subjects are best handled in lecture and others in discussion. All the committee would ask is that the teaching arrangements of the first two years be objectively reviewed; that all traditions—whether it be the English Department's love of small sections or the scientist's loyalty to his venerable blend of lecture and laboratory—be formally reviewed with only one question asked: What is the best possible selection of material, and the best possible way of presenting it to these students with the teaching resources at our command?

4) Counselling: Again the committee has frequently stressed the importance of proper academic counselling for the undergraduate throughout his stay. This should begin on arrival. In fact such an important item as his freshman schedule should not be framed by correspondence as is now the case. The present freshman orientation week offers a perfect opportunity for faculty counselling and the framing of schedules after arrival in New Haven. If, as Plan A suggests, language proficiency and advanced placement should be appraised and exploited more extensively, it is essential to have some machinery for faculty counselling which would continue over the first two years of a student's career. The above suggestion is not intended to disparage the great contribution of the present freshman counselling system which has done much to ease the transition from school to college and is a model of its kind. It has probably been weakest in the area of academic advice, the point where the committee suggests buttressing. Otherwise the freshman counsellors should certainly continue. The counselling of sophomores, at present conducted largely in the colleges, leaves much to be desired. The decentralizing of the task among the Colleges is probably realistic, but within the Colleges some thought might be given to concentrating the counselling into fewer hands. Again the faculty in the different areas under Plan A might provide a more effective way of organizing the counselling of the second year. In general the committee felt that we tend now at Yale to distribute the counselling task among so many hands that either much waste motion is expended or the proper job never gets done at all.

5) Writing and Composition: In its discussion with the graduate deans the committee was struck with their agreement on their basic demand of entering candidates: a reasonable proficiency at speaking and writing the English language, and the ability to make a deliberative judgment based on evidence. As concerns writing, the traditional ostrich-like reaction of undergraduate education has been to refer the matter back to the schools, or in desperation to dump it in the lap of the English Department. The obligation is not so easily avoided. As long as the schools fail to do their part, the college in good conscience must fill the breach. And experience has proved the fallacy of dumping the job on the English teachers; what touches all must be taught by all. The teachers and courses of the first two years must assume a common, joint responsibility in enforcing a decent standard of writing. Through the faculties in the separate areas a concerted effort should be made to spread a common standard throughout all courses, to
insist on essay work in all courses, and to penalize sloppy writing everywhere and anywhere it appears. As for the student with a genuine deficiency in language skill, he should be detected on entrance and made to work in the category of training subjects until the deficiency has been remedied.

6) **Foreign Languages:** At the moment Yale's attitude on the foreign language requirement seemed most unrealistic to the committee. A certain amount of language is required in the great majority of cases for entrance. Another standard of competence has been established as a basic requirement for the B.A. degree. The main purpose, however, behind these arrangements is to bring the student to the point where he can read the literature of a foreign culture. Yet at present the overwhelming majority of the students never proceed to the realization of this purpose but stop once the minimum has been attained.

The committee believes in the value of foreign language study. It advocates progression as far as four years if possible in one language for entrance. It would maintain the present language requirement for the B.A. degree and under Plan A would suggest that the student be made to use this reading knowledge in his area of concentration and that the general examination include a section to test his ability to read the foreign language of his choice. If such an attempt to make him use his foreign language at the level of general education should succeed, something similar might then be tried in the field of his major.
### Curriculum Pattern: Plan A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area of Concentration</th>
<th>Area of Non-concentration</th>
<th>Training Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freshman Year</strong></td>
<td>Introductory Course</td>
<td>Introductory Course</td>
<td>Language or ROTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introductory Course</td>
<td>Introductory Course</td>
<td>Language or ROTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introductory Course</td>
<td>Introductory Course</td>
<td>Language or ROTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophomore Year</strong></td>
<td>Second Level</td>
<td>Second Level</td>
<td>Language or ROTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Level</td>
<td>Second Level</td>
<td>Language or ROTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Comprehensive Examination**

**Note:** Among the three main areas (Natural Science-Math, History-Social Science, The Arts) the student will choose to concentrate in one of the three, but he must do some work in all of them (for description of the Areas, see pp. 21-4).

1) **Area of Concentration:** A student will take two courses each year from his area of concentration; in his sophomore year the two courses will be second-level advanced courses, building on the work of his first year (see pp. 23, 24).

2) **Areas of Non-concentration:** A student will take one course each year in each of the other two areas. Normally, the second year course in each case will be a second-level or advanced course (see pp. 23, 24).

3) **Training Subjects:** A student has available one course each year for work in language or in ROTC. The student who is deficient in both English and a foreign language could not take ROTC. The student who is deficient in one training subject might take ROTC, but he must still satisfy his concentration requirement in sophomore year thus postponing some of his work in an area of non-concentration until junior year.

4) **Comprehensive Examination:** At the end of sophomore year every student will take a comprehensive examination on his work in his area of concentration.
Plan B

Here follows a proposal which would involve much more drastic alterations in the present curriculum. If this plan is to be put into action the decision must be made whether to approach it by employing Plan A as a transition or whether to inaugurate Plan B by making a clean break with the existing system. There are merits in each method; the end is to achieve most fully, by the most feasible means, the highest educational values obtainable in the first two years.

Plan B assumes the same basic organizational elements as exist in Plan A: that is to say (1) the same entrance requirements, (2) the establishment of a "floor" in language proficiency, (3) placement tests in English literature, the sciences, mathematics, and American history, (4) the organization of the curriculum into the general areas of the natural sciences and mathematics, history and the social sciences, arts, and training subjects, and (5) the same allocation of the student's time to each area as that under Plan A. But within this general framework would exist a different scheme of study and instruction.

Central in the program is a general examination at the end of the second year. Within each area of the curriculum would be created a specific number of examination syllabi, based on the reading of set books or the coverage of certain fields or levels of knowledge, depending upon the nature of the material. The entering student, advised in his choices on the basis of his placement tests, would select the syllabi upon which he is to be examined. The work of his first two years then consists of a study of the syllabi in preparation for the general examination, in place of the course system as constituted at present.*

This proposal is intended to introduce both continuity and direction into the freshman-sophomore curriculum. As the introduction suggests, we find the present course offerings "minced into such infinite numbers of little quillets" that the student sees no more purpose to his labors than the vaulting of eight hurdles before reaching the straight-away of his major. Moreover, with all term exams in effect being final exams as at present, the student is not obliged to sustain his knowledge over a period of time long enough to absorb it as a part of his intellectual experience. After thirteen weeks he is tested for two hours, and thereafter he may cheerfully discard what he has temporarily acquired.** Thus we feel that whereas the basic and distributional requirements do not fulfill their purpose adequately, the introduction of broad and purposeful continua in the three great branches of learning over the

* For a detailed description of sample syllabi, see Appendices II and III.
** This generalization applies, of course, more to the fields of the arts, history and the social sciences, than to the natural and physical sciences, where in broad outline the major is begun in freshman year and the work is normally cumulative.
first two years will more nearly achieve the ideals of the general curriculum.

The inauguration of this program, we conceive, would demand a revision of traditional procedures at four important points: (1) the organization of the course of study, (2) methods of instruction, (3) scheduling of classes, and (4) academic discipline. There are obviously numerous ways in which such revisions might be made. After prolonged consideration of many possibilities, we present the following suggestions.

1. The Organization of the Course of Study

The examination syllabi would be set in each of the three areas by a specially constituted board representing the faculty in that area and composed of three elements: those giving instruction in the first two years, those giving instruction in the last two years, and outside examiners from the graduate school and/or neighboring universities. Through such a mixture of elements we hope to see the establishment of syllabi properly balanced in the interests of the student, his instructor, the expectations of the majors, and continuing development of knowledge in the various fields of study.

We do not intend that there should be mutually exclusive faculties for the first two years, the last two years or the Graduate School. Rather, we believe that where rigid distinctions exist they should be broken down. Every department has an equal obligation to each of these three levels of instruction, but each will profit by interaction and interchange of personnel among them. Thus, as occurs in some departments at the moment, it would be wise, except in particular cases, to vary the teaching assignment of its members from time to time. The examination boards then would be made up, not of distinct and possibly conflicting elements, but of men with knowledge and experience derived from all three levels and with special interests in terms of their current assignments.

The construction of examination syllabi will be, of course, a complex and exacting task. Since each syllabus draws upon materials now taught separately by different departments, it will demand cordial cooperation and mutual forbearance among the representatives of the different disciplines. There will be need for careful investigation to determine the feasibility of linking various studies now separate. We have not prepared a complete set of suggested syllabi, as being beyond our competence, but to test the practicality of our proposal, we shall forward to the Course of Study Committee sample syllabi in two of the three areas.* Each is the product of lengthy discussion, and each seems

*Appendices II and III. In the present fluid state of undergraduate teaching in the sciences, it seems wise to refer even the most tentative syllabus to a committee of teachers from the area.
to us a practical and workable course of study. On the basis of these samples, we shall also outline subjects for further syllabi which it may be possible to develop in detail.

2. Methods of Instruction

We propose to use the two standard types of instruction, the discussion class and the lecture, but to employ them in a new pattern adapted to the examination syllabus.

For each syllabus which he elects, the student would attend one 75-minute discussion session a week. Here he examines the set materials in detail, partly to extend his knowledge of them, partly to acquire the logic and method of the approach to truth taken by the branches of learning involved, and partly to improve and develop his powers of reading, writing, and reasoned judgment. Instructors from the departments cooperating on the syllabus would alternate in leading the discussion as the nature and order of the materials dictate. A rough calculation based on the present size of the faculty makes it seem possible to keep the size of these sessions to about fifteen students.

The faculty of each area would then request the departments involved to offer a series of lectures, two hours a week, to provide narrative and descriptive background for a study of the materials prescribed by the syllabus. Again, the nature and order of the materials would determine when the different departments make their offerings over the course of the first two years, and lecturers might choose to give a set series or to alternate with those of another department.

Attendance of discussion classes would be compulsory, with no cut allowance; for the discussion class would be, in our eyes, the heart of the teaching program. Short of a genuine tutorial system, teaching by means of discussion in small groups is the most effective method of education. Moreover, with the set examination syllabus as a goal, the educational process becomes a matter of cooperation between teacher and student instead of an issue of discipline between taskmaster and pupil. Thus, rather than prolong the teaching attitudes of secondary school, as colleges tend to do at present, we plan to put the student in a position where he bears an increased and increasing responsibility for his own education.

We would stress the point by making attendance at the lectures voluntary. This would do away with the onerous business of seating, attendance, and order in the crowded lecture hall. But more important, it would place a premium upon the excellence and usefulness of the lecture. Discussion leaders would recommend lectures germane to the syllabus.
The student would absent himself at his peril, but if he found the lectures uninformative, repetitive, unintelligible, or too elementary, he would do right to use his time in other ways.

With a basic minimum of class attendance required, the emphasis would be placed where it properly belongs, not upon regular formal appearances in the classroom and the passing of quizzes and short tests, but upon the acquisition, understanding, and "control" of a given body of knowledge, calculated in breadth and depth to develop the student's intellect to the fullest in the time allowed. The student might then cease to worry about what a particular teacher "wants". He might cease to search for "guts" with which to meet minimum requirements. He might rather set his sights upon the standard level of learning and competence established by the general examination.

3. Scheduling of Classes

The most feasible method of scheduling the curriculum would probably be to set lectures and the drill classes in the training subjects in the morning and discussion sessions in the afternoon.

Under such an arrangement it would be possible to allot particular morning hours on specified days of the week to the lectures offered for each syllabus, thus avoiding conflicts. Particular hours each day also might be allotted to the training subjects so that steady and regular drill could produce an acceptable level of competence in the minimum time.

All discussion sessions could then be set from 1:45 to 3:00. No student would have more than four discussions a week; those below standard in the training subjects would have only three. There would thus be considerable flexibility for planning the students' time, though such a concentration of classes might demand the creation of more small rooms. See Appendix I.

We propose also that the curriculum be organized on a five-day week. The loss of the sixth morning is regrettable, but attendance at Saturday classes under the present system suggests that there is little profit in continuing them.

4. Academic Discipline

The only formal grades would be those awarded on the general examination. These would constitute the qualifications for all academic honors, scholarship awards, and admission to a major.
The student would not be allowed to pass singly the examinations for different syllabi before the end of his second year. That would defeat our purpose of requiring sustained knowledge in a given field. It would encourage secondary schools to anticipate the work done in college for the purpose of easing their students' task, and thereby it would tend to increase the overlapping of school and college curricula. If his placement tests in a given field show that a student has anticipated college work by excellent training in school, he should then be advised to elect a syllabus which extends or broadens his knowledge.

Any student, however, who is prepared to stand the general examination at the end of his first year would be encouraged to do so. If successful, he would enter the major in his second year and take a three-year degree. Thus we would put a premium upon high intelligence and excellent school training.

Should a student fail one part of the examination whenever taken, he would be allowed a make-up in that part in the following fall. Should he then fail, he must retake the general examination the next spring. Some such proviso would be necessary to prevent "soldiering" through a second or third year. Should a student fail more than one part of the general examination, his career at Yale would be terminated.

Though we believe that the general examination should constitute the sole measure of achievement, it would doubtless be unwise to provide no measures of progress during the first two years. We would not, however, continue the present "marking system". Instead we would provide three general methods of testing and recording progress.

First, discussion leaders would require sufficient reports and papers to reveal the caliber of the students' work. Written criticism and conferences would inform the student of the level of his achievement.

Second, discussion leaders would file with the dean at the end of every term a written report, in which the student's progress is appraised. Copies of this report would be sent to parents.

Third, each field would offer a "progress examination" at the end of the first year, based on that year's work but corrected by the same standards of excellence required in the general examination. The grades would be merely indicators, but useful advice could be given the student on the basis of his achievement.

By these methods of academic discipline we hope to strengthen the bonds of co-operation between teacher and student. We hope also to make clear to the student his full share of responsibility for his own education. In cases where the student fails to respond, the general examination, with its impersonal board of examiners, would determine the outcome.
Curriculum Pattern: Plan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Year</th>
<th>Sophomore Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democracy in America</td>
<td>Contemporary Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Economic Life in America</td>
<td>Art and Literature since the Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Science and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concentration</th>
<th>Area of Non-concentration</th>
<th>Training Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of Concentration</td>
<td>Area of Non-concentration</td>
<td>Training Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy in America</td>
<td>Government and Economic Life in America</td>
<td>Language and ROTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Europe</td>
<td>Art and Literature since the Renaissance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Science and Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comprehensive Examinations

Note: The chart above shows the two-year schedule of a student who chooses to concentrate in history and the social sciences.

1) **Area of concentration:** A student will choose two two-year continua in his area of concentration; his selection must meet the standards of breadth as prescribed by the faculty in his area.

2) **Areas of non-concentration:** A student will in his first two years choose one continuum in each of these areas, and from the same group of continua available to the concentrator.

3) **Training subjects:** As in Plan A, a student has the time-equivalent of one course available each year for work in language and ROTC. The student who is deficient in both English and a foreign language can not take ROTC; the student deficient in one training subject may take ROTC, but in part as an addition to his normal course of study.

4) **Comprehensive Examination:** At the end of sophomore year the student will take comprehensive examinations, two in his area of concentration and one each in his areas of non-concentration,
### Appendix I - Possible Class Schedule under Plan B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Foreign Language Drill</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td>Drill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>History and Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>ROTC or English Language Drill</td>
<td>ROTC or English Language Drill</td>
<td>ROTC or English Language Drill</td>
<td>ROTC or English Language Drill</td>
<td>ROTC or English Language Drill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II

The Syllabus in the Arts

As one of the three main areas in which a student must train himself, the arts have the special job of teaching him the symbolic-intuitive ways of interpreting reality. These are the ways of understanding which reach the individual directly through the senses or through language; they have in common an evocation both of the immediacy of events and, ultimately, of some final way of valuing them.

In this sense the arts are distinct from what are commonly called "the humanities," which should logically include all the major disciplines of nonspecialized education. What we are calling the arts have in common a concern for kinds of knowledge which are both formal and intuitive, which embody the order of metaphysics and the unpredictability of experience.

The student needs to learn how the arts work both from the past and in the present; and why he needs some competence in them if he is to deal with his own experience and tradition as well as with the values which his generation will reform and recreate from that tradition for its own purposes. Competence in this area of human perception and knowledge should be built from three chief kinds of training and experience: 1) the direct study and understanding of a work of art, 2) a sense of temporal continuity and change in art forms, 3) a sense of the values in an art form which exist beyond a specific moment in time.

Before we select from among the infinite possibilities of study in this area, these three desired ends should be explained in some detail.

1. The Direct Understanding of a Work of Art

Here we are concerned to see a student show that he can apprehend the order, structure, and meaning of an artistic whole, and that he can convey his understanding coherently and effectively. At the end of two years we expect him to be able to take a poem, a painting, or a piece of music new to him and which he has not studied under authority or instruction, show the appropriate way of approaching the work, and as the end-product of his analysis defend a personal and intelligent opinion about it. We expect this training to provide a general alertness to experience as well as a development of critical powers to cope with the bombardment of mass-methods in sight, sound, and word to which an individual in our society is increasingly exposed. We expect the development of sensitivity to quality, uniqueness, personality in human expression; and we hope for an initial awareness of the concept of man implied by such sensitivity.
2. The Great Traditions

In the living history of a culture there are certain relationships between individual works of art which demand study. The older historically oriented survey courses run the danger of simply piling up successive abstractions of "works" or "periods" without providing a grasp of a tradition's being and meaning. We look to something more useful and more directly connected with the student's own place in his living culture. At the end of two years the serious student should be able to deal with at least one large aspect of the Western tradition in literature, and at least one in some medium other than that of the verbal arts. By this we mean that the student should have some perception of development in artistic form over a considerable period of time; he should be able to sense continuity and scale in artistic achievement.

While we would stress the main stream of Western culture (Greco-Roman-Judaic-Western Medieval-Renaissance) there might be room for the study of tradition in other cultures, including the so-called "primitive" as well as Oriental.

3. The Scope of Existence of a Work of Art

We expect a student to show his awareness that a work of art both exists in chronological time and escapes it. To put it another way, we expect him to master the history of a restricted period of literature or art and also to show a grasp of the formal principles which underlie the work (as distinct from the historical nexus or even description of it), and which no amount of description of the events or mores of its time alone can convey or explain. Here he would confront a paradox; a work of art is something, someone made it at a particular point in time - and yet if it is well made the "laws" which govern it and the life which animates it are not to be derived from or restricted to one time or place. A student must learn how to interpret this quality of enduring and historically renewable power in the light of our other two chief concerns.

The historian and the philosopher should enter in here, then, where the fundamentals of understanding have been mastered. They should make clear why their methods diverge and, therefore, what is the range of valid kinds of insight about a work of art. It is time, in short, that differences of approach between historian and philosopher were capitalized on to enlarge the student's understanding. Since the philosopher deals for the most part with questions of value implicit in the work of art or suggested by the work of art, it seems fitting that he should enter general education late rather than early in the treatment of the arts. Here also the traditional ethics-aesthetics branches of philosophy might find their most fruitful place in the curriculum, enlivening and generalizing on the data given by methods of direct analysis and historical insight - and thus providing a goal of judgment and an estimate of value which may give meaning to the sequence as a whole.
The precise problems to be faced in achieving these general ends in the arts differ considerably from those in the social and exact sciences. They are of two chief kinds. First, the various separate literatures are still in the process of defining their common task of making the best of the European tradition available to students. Second, the formal and historical community between the verbal and the non-verbal arts has for teaching purposes hardly been explored at all. As a result, we recognize both the difficulty and the necessity of making proposals which demand substantial revision of the teaching offerings in this area. We do so, not because we feel that these changes can or should be made hastily, but because we wish to suggest certain possibly fruitful eventual patterns by which the arts can be taught so that they support and help to interpret one another.

It would be naive to overlook the concrete difficulties in the way of giving life to this interaction. Certain traditional alignments of material and therefore of departments tend to separate the other arts from literature, and to ignore the attitudes and methods which they hold in common. We respect these distinctions, but feel that they can give way to more flexibility in the first years of college than in the later years when the need for specialized work is dominant.

As distinct from the Social Sciences, where combinations of material may exist potentially in courses now separate, and where there is at many points a common method of teaching, we suggest in the arts two-year continua some of which may need a good deal of work both in construction and in method of teaching before they can function with real effectiveness. Among the infinity of materials and attitudes which exist in the area, the following may indicate the kind of approach we have in mind.

1. Literature and Criticism

A study of certain chief traditions in European literature, and a substantial training in practical criticism (rather than theory).

2. Art and Literature Since the Renaissance

Major works and concepts in literature and the history of art, 1600-1914. (See below.)

3. Music and Literature Since the Renaissance

Major developments and traditions, with particular attention to structure and idiom, 1600-1914.

4. Roots of Western Civilization, Christian and Classical

Patterns of thought basic to the European tradition, as seen in the chief Hebrew, Classical and early Christian writers and philosophers.
5. The Arts in America

The development of American culture from the seventeenth century to the present, as seen in its literature, architecture, philosophy and art.

6. Foreign Literature, the Arts, and Criticism

Major works, traditions, and assumptions of the classical, Romance or Germanic languages and cultures.

7. Art and Music: Practice, Theory, Criticism

Practical and technical study of art or music, combined with historical and critical study of both.

The non-concentrator would do work in one of these seven two-year sequences, the concentrator in two. To present the pattern in more detail, we might take the example of a student who elected Art and Literature since the Renaissance.

As we have already suggested, this sequence like the others would have three general aspects: the interpretation of individual works, the understanding of important traditions, and the philosophic-historical assessment of art in society. The specific subjects and problems would in this syllabus largely coincide with the 'documents' employed.* These documents would include a considerable range of illustrative material, from Delacroix' Journal to the Preface to Lyrical Ballads. Their center, however, would be an interrelated group of books and 'monuments' of independent quality as works of art.

The pattern in which a student would use his time over the two-year period would be determined by the following chief topics and materials included in the examination syllabus:

1. Mannerism, its applications to Art and Literature

Hamlet, Donne, Songs & Sonnets

Michelangelo and certain northern artists

2. Milton & The Baroque

Paradise Lost

Samson Agonistes

Italian & Northern Art Forms

* This arrangement is properly and inevitably somewhat different from that of the Social Sciences below.
3. Neo-Classicism - 17th and 18th Centuries

Racine
Molière
Dryden
Pope
French & English Art
Poussin, Versailles
Inigo Jones

4. Sense & Sensibility (Romantic Classicism, 1760-1820)

Pride & Prejudice
Rousseau, Autobiography
Wuthering Heights
David
Brothers Adam
Piranesi
Ledoux

5. High Romanticism

Wordsworth
Keats
Turner (Ruskin)
Delacroix
Pugin
6. 'Realism' and the Problem of Reality: A

Great Expectations
Crime & Punishment
Courbet and the early use of metals in Architecture
Impressionists
Browning and Tennyson

7. Realism and the Problem of Reality: B

Yeats
Eliot
A Passage to India
Post-Impressionism and Symbolism
Cubism
Sullivan and Wright

The teaching would, as in the Social Sciences, be a combination of lecture and discussion. For a number of reasons the majority of the lectures would be on the non-verbal arts, while in the discussion classes the verbal and the non-verbal could be brought together. The lectures, then, would make material available for intelligent future discussion, and would provide one kind of training in the interpretation and understanding of works of art. At the same time lectures would be given on the context of both literature and art, in support of the detailed relating of the two in the discussions.

For the discussion groups, where the privilege of individual interpretation is so important, we should develop a group of teachers who could deal with non-verbal as well as verbal art. The need is particularly acute because there are such sound reasons for staying away from the conventional or parody form of co-ordination between the two -- the superficially 'cultured' or narrowly esthetic. We feel, however, that success in this area depends on training a group of teachers with breadth as well as depth. For the purposes of non-specialized education we do not think that they need to be experts in art as well as literature, but we do see the need for growth from the provinciality of field into the liberality of discipline. We must not defend ourselves against one kind of triviality only to maintain another.
Appendix III

History and the Social Sciences

Of the numerous possibilities for the establishment of interdepartmental syllabi in this area, the committee suggests those listed below, not as definitive but as an approach to the problem of reorganization. It will be noted that in each case the syllabus is based upon a synthesis of the materials provided by existing courses, the purpose of which is to establish a conceptual link between the old and the new. But the ultimate aim is to establish a set of syllabi justifiable, not because they perpetuate old courses in a new form, but because they represent an improved framework of study built upon the natural interdependence of the materials and disciplines involved.

1. Democracy in America: Past and Present
   (History 20, Political Science 11b)

2. European Government and Society: Past and Present
   (History 10, Political Science 10a)

3. The American Economy: Past and Present
   (History 20, Economics 11)

4. The Economic Life of Europe: Past and Present
   (History 10, Economics 11 with European orientation)

5. Government and Economic Life in Contemporary America
   (Political Science 11b, Economics 11)

6. Government and Economic Life in Contemporary Europe
   (Economics 11 with European orientation, Political Science 10a)

7. Man and Society
   (Psychology 10a, 20b, Sociology 10)

To indicate the manner in which a syllabus may be constructed, we outline one below for 1. Democracy in America: Past and Present. An examination of the content of History 20 and Political Science 11b reveals a very considerable duplication of the materials used and notable similarities of approach in the most recent period of American history. There is evidently much room for cooperation between the two departments and much profit to be gained by a synthesis of subject matter through the elimination of overlapping, and the introduction of important materials hitherto unused.
I. The Field to be covered by the Examination

A. General

1. The general narrative of United States history in its major aspects.

2. The powers and functioning of federal, state, and local governments in the contemporary United States.

B. Specific

1. The role of nationalism, sectionalism, and federalism in the growth of the United States.

2. The evolution of the political theory underlying American government.

3. The historic and contemporary problems of foreign policy and national security.

4. The impact of urbanization upon American life.

5. The implications of changing social and ethnographic patterns.

6. The expansion of the government's role in the economy.

7. The role of the Supreme Court in the development of constitutional law.

8. The process of policy formation in the contemporary United States.

II. The Materials to be studied in preparation for the Examination

A. General

1. A text on American history of the type represented by Faulkner's *American Political and Social History*.


B. Documents

2. Additional documents germane to the specific subjects of the examination, grouped in problems, or chosen for individual study (e.g., classic political theorists, court decisions, tracts, statutes, legislative hearings and debates, statistical surveys, speeches).

III. The Methods of Instruction for the Examination

A. Lectures

Over the two-year period the two departments might choose to offer several series of lectures pertinent to the general field of the examination and the general materials to be studied. After careful consideration the committee considers it wiser for the Departments to provide one joint course of lectures, continuous and closely integrated by the persons assigned to the task. This method would avoid repetition and permit flexibility. The historian would carry the major burden in the first year, the political scientist in the second. But by way of example the political scientist could offer in conjunction with his colleagues one or more lectures on the Constitutional Convention and the development of judicial review in the early period, while the historian similarly could introduce lectures in the later period to give historical perspective to a study of the New Deal program.

If this method were employed, the program would carry the student's examination of U. S. history and government from the origins to 1912 by the end of his freshman year. His second year would then be devoted to the contemporary scene.

B. Discussions

In the lectures the experts from the separate departments or disciplines in the area should be encouraged to bring together their specialties with a minimum of duplication. In the discussion sections, however, all those sharing the teaching, regardless of training or departmental origin, should ultimately prepare themselves to handle all the different materials under study. As the committee has already suggested, the separation between departments and general education is destructive of both; appointments must be made through the departments, and no man should be expected to teach only in general education. At the same time, however, experience at Columbia and here at Yale in Literature I and History I seems to prove that the creation of a pool of instructors drawn from different departments and carrying responsibility there but carefully briefed for service in the program is the best way to ensure continuity and enthusiasm.
Appendix IV

Entrance Examinations

This appendix attempts to explain in greater detail the purpose, form, and timing of the various examinations to be taken by the entering student. Here the committee acknowledges its indebtedness to the Report on General Education in School and College which proposed an experiment in advanced placement in one of its Appendices, emphasizing the importance of placement tests in attacking "wasteful duplication of work between school and college" and the need to provide a stimulus for "progression in strength." A carefully conceived examination system is needed not only to appraise candidates for entrance but also to ensure their most efficient progress after they get in.

The committee proposes the following purposes for the examinations:

1) Entrance
2) Basic skills--language
3) Placement
4) Possible College Credit for work done in school

These will not necessarily represent separate or new sets of tests. Most of the tests required are already in existence and can be easily adapted to suit different purposes.

1) Entrance Examinations: The committee has assumed that every candidate would take at the March examination session of the CEEB preceding his proposed entrance to Yale, if not before, the same battery of aptitude and achievement tests as are now the rule. In the first instance these examinations would serve to decide his admission to Yale.

2) Basic Skills-Language Proficiency: The committee feels that the examinations in English and a foreign language, as taken above for entrance, should also be used to determine whether the candidate has achieved a minimum proficiency in basic language skills. At present this is attempted by the general system of exemptions and placements. We are suggesting the more deliberate separation of the two functions in the belief that today it is vital for applicants and secondary schools alike to realize the existence of a basic minimum or floor in language proficiency in English and in one foreign language.

The present Verbal Aptitude test and English Composition test, especially when the essay section is perfected, should be adequate for this purpose in English. The achievement tests in foreign language are satisfactory as now set, with the possible addition of "objective questions of aural comprehension
based on standardized recordings" as suggested in the Report on General Education. The committee feels that the level of competence should be established somewhere near the bottom of the present English 15 group and at the present level of exemption in foreign languages. By singling out the applicant's performance in these particular tests for separate scrutiny, Yale would make clear the fact that he is expected to attain a certain minimum facility on entrance and that if he has not done so he must consider himself to be entering Yale with an actual deficiency in this area, to be made up as quickly as possible.

3) Placement: Both Plans A and B propose testing the applicant on entrance in literature, American history, one science, and mathematics. The nature and purpose of these examinations are set out in some detail on pages 18 and 19 of this Report and need not be repeated here. If the student is to progress at the most effective and profitable pace through his education in school and college, he and his counselors must determine on entrance both how far he has advanced into the three great areas of knowledge which define his work for the first two years, and where his particular concentration will probably lie. In some cases new tests may be needed, but they represent developments in testing which the CEEB might well be willing to sponsor since they may have a more general appeal than to Yale alone. These examinations could be kept to a reasonable number if they were taken in June, before the end of the school year, but only by those who had been granted final admission to Yale.

4) College Credit: A fourth and last purpose of examinations on entrance is envisioned by the committee. Recent experience here at Yale with the Ford Scholars, as well as the conclusions of the Report on General Education, argues that a certain number of students can and should complete the school-college sequence in something less than eight years. Some of this group may be better advised for social reasons to stay in school while progressing into college work. The Yale faculty, in the committee's opinion, must recognize the possibility of a student's anticipating and securing credit towards a Yale degree in secondary school. The most practical way to realize this possibility is a system of anticipatory examinations. The Report on General Education discussed an experimental set of examinations for placement in some detail, and the committee heartily supports their recommendations. Indeed, there is no reason why these anticipatory examinations for college credit and the examinations discussed above under placement could not in fact be the same examinations, with those who were proposing to apply for college credit obliged either to achieve a minimum score or to work through to a certain level of achievement in the test.

Conclusion: The committee thus urges a redefining or expansion of the purpose of the present tests rather than an extensive increase in their number. Throughout we have been motivated by the need to bring the work of school and college into as continuous a pattern as possible. So far the discussion has virtually
ignored the mechanical problems involved in any increase in the number of examinations. Some new tests would have to be perfected which means time, men, and money for experimentation. In particular, placement tests and those to cover the work of freshman year might lead to an impossible proliferation of examinations unless the different colleges could agree through the CEEB on a common series. Again, the faculty has usually favored essay examinations. The CEEB has had to use objective tests in increasing numbers, not only for reasons of mechanics and economy but also because they have rightly mistrusted the validity of a single essay question. If the faculty were to insist on a considerable number of essay questions, grading would immediately become an issue. The committee suggests that both the examinations for placement and those for college credit be taken after the applicant has been admitted to Yale, or at least that any essay questions be sent on here to New Haven for correction. This would require a local team of readers in considerable numbers, enough to handle 1000 essays in English, for example, but the operation might still be simpler and more economical than having them corrected elsewhere. Besides the additional problems of the CEEB and the colleges, any increase in examinations would mean more trouble and expense for the students and the schools, including possible changes in the present time-table for the examinations.

The committee is only too aware of these difficulties and has no pat answers ready at this time. There is, however, need for a reappraisal of the nature and function of the present system of examinations on entrance as they relate to the first two years of college.
Appendix V

Recommended Changes in the College Year Calendar

In connection with Plan B in particular; but also with Plan A, the committee feels the need for a thorough overhauling of the calendar for the College year. Examination of the calendar with a view toward improvement is no novelty. The committee's recommendations, however, aim at a time-framework for the year's work which logically follows from our earlier suggestions with regard to curriculum and examinations. Our recommendations:

1. Elimination of the present "lame-duck" period between Christmas recess and the term examination period. Instead, an earlier beginning in September with the break at Christmas time coming toward mid-December, with a longer period of vacation than at present, extending well into January. Thanksgiving recess to correspond, if possible, with the major football game in order to minimize interruptions.

2. A second period of consecutive work to begin no earlier than mid-January and to extend into April. There should follow a break of at least two to three weeks of vacation (that is, a substantially longer period than at present).

3. A relatively short "Spring term" of residence and classes lasting a month to five weeks which would extend through the entire month of May. This would be devoted to either a) extension, or b) recapitulation of material covered since September and would provide a period of review and evaluation before the yearly examination period in June.

Comment:

The need for a solid session with as few interruptions as possible in the Fall term seems obvious. The most logical break seems to be at Christmas rather than in January. Another solid session in the Winter lasting until April gives the equivalent (or nearly so) of the present "Spring term." A reasonably longer vacation between the two sessions at Christmas time would be advantageous to the Faculty (for meetings, research, preparation) and might also help to concentrate the social aspirations of the students to the great benefit of the fall term. A break of at least two to three weeks in the Spring would make for a more equitable end of the year. The final short Spring session could be used advantageously by both faculty and students in tying the entire year's work together in a more effective fashion than is at present possible. In the case of serious examinations the utility of such a period can hardly be overestimated.
Summary: (dates suggested only as indications)

Sept. 15  Classes begin (all preliminary registration and examination to take place before this date)

(Thanksgiving recess of five days including major football game)

Dec. 15  Beginning of Christmas vacation

Jan. 15  Beginning of Winter session

Apr. 5-10  Beginning of Spring vacation

Apr. 25-30  Beginning of "short" Spring term

June 1-15  Final examinations with Commencement immediately thereafter