



BULLARD MEMORIAL WINDOW
 ERECTED IN THE GENERAL LIBRARY, ROGERS BUILDING
 BY THE CLASS OF 1887
 JUNE 4, 1906

The Technology Review

VOL. VIII.

JULY, 1906

No. 3.

THE BULLARD MEMORIAL WINDOW.

A new feature was added to the physical aspect of the Institute upon Commencement Day in the memorial window given by the Class of '87 as a Memorial to the late Frederic Field Bullard. The gift was, both in its purpose and in its embodiment, a unique contribution. It is the first time any class has cared to take definite steps toward perpetuating the memory of one of its members, and it is also (with the exception of the restorations of the frieze in Huntington Hall and the drinking fountain in the hallway of Rogers) among the first attempts to minister to the somewhat starved æsthetic needs of the Technology environment.

That Bullard richly deserved this tribute of love and admiration goes, of course, without saying; and it is well that this piece of color and symbolism should stand for the education of that true "Tech" spirit which is to come. Bullard identified himself with the so-called spirit of the Institute in many ways, and, at a time when it was most needed, infused life into the solidarity of the undergraduate body. His work at the Tech Union is not yet forgotten, and, working as the coadjutor of President Pritchett, he built up the "Kommers" spirit which made that organization a success. The Tech Song Book was originated and edited by Bullard, and to it he gave many of his best compositions, including the "Stein Song," upon which his popular favor was based. Bullard's heroic work at the great Tech Reunion of 1904 is not yet forgotten, and it achieved special

emphasis from his death almost as soon as that work was over. No Tech student or graduate has ever had better claims to a public recognition of his worth to his Alma Mater.

The window, while simple, adequately typifies Bullard's phases of work as a student in the chemistry course, as the leader of the Tech Union, and as a musician. For a fitting eulogy the committee from his class chose the words once used by Kipling in his tribute to Wolcott Balestier,—“Simplicity and Gentleness and Honor and Clean Mirth.” The window was designed and executed in the old manner by Harry B. Goodhue, of Cambridge, a personal friend of Bullard's, and who contributed, as his own share in honoring his friend's memory, far more work than was actually paid for.

In looking for a location for the window, the old Biological Laboratory, now the General Library, seemed to be best fitted, as being a central and general meeting-place for the students. The windows, topped by lunettes, are admirably adapted to such decoration, and the hint once given will doubtless be followed by other classes until this room becomes the natural memorial hall wherein may be erected other such offerings.

It was, indeed, with something of this in mind that the committee decided upon this form of memorial; for it has seemed to many that the grim and severe scientific aspect of the Technology might well be brightened and be made beautiful by the addition of some such color and interest. The Tech's stern discipline and its chill social atmosphere have begun to give way to less harsh ideals, and it is to be hoped that the Bullard window may have some such effect upon the material, as his life did upon the spiritual, needs of the Institute.

ALUMNI REPRESENTATION IN COLLEGE GOVERNMENT

A STUDY OF METHODS

The recent election by the Corporation of the first "term members," from nominees chosen by letter ballot of the alumni, completed the inauguration of alumni representation in the government of the Institute. In accepting the privilege of nominating nearly a third of the members of the Corporation, the alumni have assumed new and grave responsibilities. Most obvious of these is that of insuring that their nominees shall be invariably fit; and this is scarcely to be accomplished, permanently and with certainty, unless these representatives are chosen under a well-considered plan. For whatever assistance it may afford in judging of the plan adopted for the Institute, this study of alumni representation in the government of American colleges is here presented.

The data for this study were compiled during the latter half of 1905 by the Technology League for the information of the several bodies then studying plans of alumni representation in the government of the Institute. College publications, and correspondence and interviews with officers of the colleges and with representative alumni, furnished most of the information. An excellent article on "Alumni Representation in College Government," by Samuel H. Ranck, published in *Education* for October, 1901, giving the results of a study of this subject made in 1900 for the alumni of Franklin and Marshall College, and Mr. Ranck's personal correspondence on the subject, which he generously loaned, were freely used. The institutions studied, seventy-two besides the Institute, are intended to be fairly representative of American colleges, universities, and technological schools. They include colleges for each sex and for both sexes, old schools and young, and are in nearly equal numbers under denominational, non-sec-

tarian, and political (*i.e.*, city or State) control. In the accompanying tables is given a digest of the information obtained, for each college reporting any measure of alumni participation in its government.

Some participation of alumni is almost universal in American college government to-day. Only 7 out of 73 colleges are without it. Of these, 3 are under State control and 2 are private foundations established since 1890. This participation is often that of individuals chosen, not primarily as representatives of the alumni, and not as the result of any action by the alumni body, but as men conspicuously fit and devoted to the school. In one-third of the colleges reporting, the alumni participate in the government only in this informal way. (Colleges 43 to 66 in the tables.) Of these 24 colleges, 14 are under city or State control, two-thirds of all the colleges under political control being in this group. Whether under political or private control, the number of alumni on the governing boards of these colleges is often large, averaging for the entire group 35 per cent. of the membership of these governing bodies; and at Columbia University (No. 45), University of Iowa (50), University of Michigan (52), New York University (56), Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (59), University of Virginia (61), and University of Wisconsin (64), alumni * constitute from one-half to nearly all of the trustees. This, however, is but the participation of individuals, not alumni representation, and does little to conserve the alumni interest, unlike that formal representation by representatives chosen by the alumni themselves, with which this inquiry is chiefly concerned.

Formal alumni representation has achieved its present wide adoption during the past forty years. First put into operation at Harvard College in 1866, it is to-day typical of the government of American colleges. Of the 73 colleges investigated, the alumni are now formally represented in the government of 42; and other colleges anticipate such representation when their alumni shall have become more numerous and more mature. Of the city and

* The word "alumnus" is used throughout in the broad sense of one who has been a student, not in the limited sense of a graduate.

State colleges, few have established alumni representation, since, in general, the incentives to its establishment are less and the difficulties of establishment are greater than in colleges not under political control. Of the colleges under private control, three-fourths have established some form of alumni representation.

This representation takes one of two general forms, according as the alumni representatives are members of the board of trustees or of a separate body. The former plan is the more usual, representation being on the board of trustees in 35 out of 41 colleges. (Colleges 1 to 27, 34 to 39, 41 and 42.) Except in a single college (13), these alumni trustees have the same powers and duties as other trustees. They have, in addition, the very important function of keeping the alumni authoritatively informed of the condition of their college, its aims, its problems, and its needs. At Rutgers this function is made an official duty, the alumni trustees being required to report in writing to the annual meeting of the Alumni Association.

The second plan, that of representation upon a separate body, is followed in six colleges. Of these Bowdoin College (29), Harvard University (32), and Tufts College (33) have boards of overseers, bodies co-ordinate with the trustees. The powers and duties of these boards of overseers are not uniform, and are not always well defined. In general, however, these are examining and reviewing bodies, scrutinizing the internal work of the college through their visiting committees, and exercising a veto over all important appointments and certain other acts of the trustees, though they may not originate business except by recommendation. At Harvard, where alumni representation has been longest established and where it is eminently successful from every point of view, practically all important acts of the President and Fellows require the approval of the Overseers. Representatives in the remaining colleges of this group have no such direct responsibility. At the University of Chicago (30) the representatives elect from the faculty a small minority of the members of the two bodies which direct the internal work of the school. At Franklin and Marshall (31) and at Bryn Mawr (40) representation is upon a purely advisory

body. In the former this arrangement was the choice of the alumni, who felt that in this way their influence would be greater than if they nominated a few members of the Trustees. In both cases these advisory bodies discuss college problems with the President of the college. They have considered chiefly educational and social questions, and many important changes in college policy have originated in these conferences. In addition to its Conference Committee of Alumnæ, Bryn Mawr is about to establish alumnæ representation on the Board of Trustees. This tendency sooner or later to give alumni representatives full responsibility is indicated by the fact that there are to-day but four out of forty colleges where these representatives do not vote as overseers or as trustees.

The choice between representation on the board of trustees, or the creation of a board of overseers or of an alumni advisory body, is largely a question of adaptation to the conditions peculiar to each case. A purely advisory body will probably seldom be adopted as other than a temporary expedient. Where the board of trustees is small, efficient, and permanent in its membership, the establishment of a co-ordinate alumni body, such as the Board of Overseers of Harvard, would seem the ideal plan. By this means the small board of trustees is not diminished in efficiency by increase in numbers, the alumni representatives have greater freedom of discussion, being unhampered by much of the routine business which the trustees must discharge, and important actions of the trustees are subject to review by an entirely independent body representing a great variety of professional and business interests and points of view. If, however, the board of trustees is large, as is the Corporation of the Institute, it must, for rapid and efficient work, delegate the administrative detail to a small prudential or executive committee. The board of trustees itself then becomes a reviewing and confirming body, of which the alumni representatives may well be members; and the addition of a responsible board of overseers would make the government needlessly complicated and cumbersome, since every important action would have to receive the successive approval of three bodies,—the executive

committee, the trustees, and the overseers. Again, the terms of the college charter and the desire to avoid the necessity of amending it may largely affect the choice. Thus at the Institute, whereas representation on the Corporation was established by an amendment to the by-laws of that body, a board of overseers, unless with very limited powers, could probably not have been established under the existing charter.

In number the alumni representatives constitute a minority of the members of boards of trustees, but comprise the entire active membership of boards of overseers and of purely advisory bodies. The few exceptions are found where representatives are chosen for life (4, 21, 29). At the Institute 28 per cent. of the members of the Corporation will be alumni representatives. In but one-fourth of the colleges having short term alumni trustees is the proportion as great or greater.

The term of office of alumni representatives is usually three to six years. Compared with election for life, this short term has many advantages. The short term permits of bringing to the service of the college many more of the strongest of her sons. By the wider distribution of representatives which this greater number makes possible, many more of the alumni may be kept in touch with the college through a member of the government personally known to them. The short term makes representatives responsible to the alumni who elect them, in that they need not be returned unless they have served the college well. This makes them more truly alumni representatives, and furnishes an incentive for the alumni to watch their representatives' work. Finally, and not the least important, the short term involves regular and frequent balloting, itself an effective agency for keeping the alumni interest keen. In thirty-three out of forty colleges the representatives are chosen for short terms. Of the seven in which representatives are chosen for life, one reports that a large number of alumni participate in the voting, while six either do not report the number or report it to be very small. In two of these latter the plans of representation are now undergoing revision because of this lack of alumni interest.

Habitual re-election of representatives may, in part, neutralize the advantages of the short term; and in many colleges the tendency to such re-election is strong. To prevent the indefinite return of a willing candidate, without his formal rejection by the alumni or the trustees, many colleges make a representative ineligible for immediate re-election after two or three successive terms. At the Institute a representative may not be re-elected for at least one year after the expiration of his last term.

The alumni choice is usually effective as an election, whether it be actually an election or technically a nomination, only a single candidate being offered for each vacancy, with the understanding that the trustees will elect this candidate. Less frequently multiple candidates are offered, and the trustees may or may not agree to fill the vacancy from these candidates. The tendency, however, is strongly in favor of direct election by the alumni, or, if this is impracticable without change of charter, of requiring the alumni to present but one candidate for each vacancy. Thus, out of 35 colleges in which the alumni representatives are voting members of the overseers or of the trustees, the alumni ballot "nominates" multiple candidates in 8, single candidates in 10, and elects outright in 17. Considering nomination of a single candidate as equivalent to election, we have "nomination" in 8 colleges, and "election" in 27.

Where the alumni ballot merely nominates multiple candidates from among whom the trustees choose, it is always uncertain whether the first choice of the alumni will be confirmed. The knowledge that their choice might be in a measure nullified has in some cases seriously diminished the interest of the alumni and their participation in the voting. Of the colleges where this uncertainty exists, but six have had representation long enough for the taking of a second alumni vote. In two of the six, the vote continues large after many years. One reports a persistent decline in the number voting from 66 per cent. to 20 per cent. in the past five years, and in three the vote is very small.

In methods of conducting the alumni ballot, the greatest diversity prevails. While this is especially true of the methods of making

the preliminary nomination, these methods can, with few exceptions, be classified under two heads: nomination by the alumni at large and nomination by committee. Nomination by the alumni at large is the method most widely used. Usually, this is by a preliminary ballot, on which each elector suggests one or more candidates. Of the candidates suggested in this way, in some cases a prescribed number of those receiving the largest preliminary vote, in other cases all those receiving a prescribed number of votes, are placed on the final ballot.

Nomination by the alumni at large has given good results where the alumni organizations are alert and the mass of the alumni well informed. On this preliminary ballot the vote is, however, always scattering. Thus, at Yale, for a single vacancy as many as a thousand names have often been suggested in this way, from three to twelve of which have received the twenty-five votes necessary to place them on the final ballot. Elsewhere, not infrequently, only a single candidate or set of candidates has been nominated. In exceptional cases, no candidate has received the requisite number of votes (usually ten to twenty-five) and the nomination has failed. Bowdoin College (29) and Stevens Institute of Technology (41) have guarded against this contingency by requiring a committee to make the nominations, if nomination at large fails.

There are other disadvantages of nomination at large besides its uncertainty. It establishes no organization for investigating the fitness of candidates, whose choice is likely to be determined more by their personal popularity or their conspicuous position in public life than by any just appreciation of their probable usefulness as trustees. It provides no mechanism for informing the electors of the qualifications of the several candidates. As a consequence, the elector, knowing personally few or none of them, must often vote in the dark. It furnishes no means of regulating the geographical distribution of representatives, one or two active local organizations being able, in some instances, to monopolize the representation. As the preliminary vote is scattering, it permits a small clique, often as few as a dozen men, to secure the nomination of any one they choose.