RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

We have, in Lee Hall and you, a new administration with new promise. Questions of tenure under OEE guidlines are a major and troublesome concern of this faculty. Mixed as my own feelings are with respect to the advantages and disadvantages of a faculty union, I would hate to see a decision unfavorable to Marion Marzynski serve as a catalyst to that end.

I have always felt and still do, that we constitute a community small and integral enough to work out our own problems equitably and in the best interest of education without recourse to outside arbitration and civil authority. I sincerely hope my feelings are not without justification.

Sincefely,

Hardu

Hardu Keck
Assistant Professor of Design

50 Summit Avenue
Providence, Rhode Island 02906
Telephone: /401/ 272-2235

Marcus M. Marzynski
/"Marz"/
November 22, 1976

Jack Stewart, Provost
Rhode Island School of Design
Providence, Rhode Island

Dear Mr. Stewart :

As you know I received from Tom Sgouros a copy of his recommendation for a non-renewal of my contract. To provide you with all necessary facts I shall comment on his following statement:

> "Mr. Marzynski is either unwilling or unable to function in a team situation. He is either unwilling or unable to support a policy or course of action which is not his own."

This represent to me Mr. Sgouros' feeling about my person rather that a factual description of the situation in the film department. The facts tell that after the decision about the development of the film department was made in March 1976 I took the following initiatives in support of Mr. Sgouros' course of action:

1.
On March 23, 1976 Peter O'Neill and I wrote a proposal for the integration of film and video resources to bring the most effective and economical tools for undergraduate education especially on the beginning level. (This proposal as well as another proposal/statement made in this matter by Bob Jungels was never the subject of any discussion initiated by the Department HEad or the the Division Chairman).
2.
On June 21, 1976 I assured Dr. Lee Hall that "I will devote all my energy to make the most effective contribution to the program that both my supervisors consider the best present alternative for film at RISD".
3.
In May 1976 under the departmental discussion about the 1976/77 curriculum I strongly supported the suggestion of me taking the junior class in the second semester in the process of re-orienting my teaching toward undergraduates.
4.
On September 15, 1976 I made an offer to take the Super8 class for beginners in the first semester as a result of Paul Larkin's tkaking this offering away from Chester Michalik. The offer was rejected. In the conversation with Tom Sgouros I repeated this offer for the second semester.
5.
In September 1976 I was active and helpful in designing a new Film-Video-Film course by Bob Jungels and Chester Michalik and offered unlimited cooperation in conducting this new kind of Instruction.

2.
Jack Stewart

6.
I was active and helpful in Peter O'Neill's new design for the junior class this semester which functions now as the most effective instruction on this level we've achieved.

7.
To strenghten the input of this years graduate program on the undergraduates I came with the suggestion of making a RISD Centennial Film. This project is under way and has the potential for a substantial enrichment of film experience for many film undergraduates on all levels as well as non-film majors who will participate in my winterseesion Art for Film.

8.
I recently created an internship program with WJAR-TV which will bring to all seniors and juniors a tremendous exposure to TV media as an extra-curriculum activity starting January 7, 1977.

9.
I am working with Bob Jungels and Peter O'Neill on a comprehensive long run concept for a photography/film/video curriculum which would create a solid interdiscilinary foundation in those areas.

In addition to those activities I am working very hard with my seniors on their projects which seem to reflect higher quality this year as compared to past years. I am looking forward to teaching the juniors next semester, and I remind you that my original assignment at RISD has been to work with advanced undergraduates.

As you can see I am spending my time on many positive and affirmative actions which fully follow the adopted policy for the film department. My belief that the graduate program would bring a great stimulation to the whole area of moving images does not change the facts : I am willing and able to function in a team situation and I am willing and able to support a policy or course of action which is not my own.

I believe that I am working very hard in joining everybody's efforts in strenghtening undergraduate instruction.

Sincerely,

Marian Marzynski

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

November 29, 1976
From: Marian M. Marzynski

RISD film graduates employment*

BFA '74
David LePere: not involved in film
Daniel Friedman: after receiving MFA from NYU in '76, making films in N.Y.
Carol Millican: after receiving MFA from NYU in '76 employed by a film company N.Y.
David Barey: filmmaker/director of 'Pittsburgh Film-Makers, Inc.'
Scott Dornblaser: audio-visual director in a big hospital in Pennsylvania

MFA '74
Ken Druse: producer/director for educational television in NY and Conn.
Sue Jensen : no information
Howard Gladstone: active director/cameraman in New York City
Kathleen Dowdey : active producer/director in Washington D.C. and NYC.

BFA '75
Jean DeSegonzac: presently news cameraman for a tv station in Columbus, Ohio
Tom Payne: RISD graduate student
Edward Bastille : RISD graduate student, WJAR-TV free-lance news cameraman
Eric Edwards: working for a tv station in Portland Oregon
Robert McKean : American Film Institutes Center for the Advanced Film Study
Gus VanSant: assistant director to Ken Shapiro at the Paramount, Hollywood
Matt Hintlian : graduate student in filmmaking at NYU

MFA '75
Brian Dowley: associated with Harvard University's film production
Phil Lebowitz: producer/director for the cable tv station in Conn.
Scott Sorensen: Filmmaker-in-Residence for the state of Rhode Island

BFA '76
Roger Brown: employed by a film company in Detroit
Tim Behl: recovering after a serious illnesss
Roger Gordy: looking for job in Boston
Fred Rosenberg: employed by a New York City's film company
David Govoni: part-time filmmaking teaching at RISD
Gregg Patnales: looking for a job in Detroit

MFA '76
Loren Hammer: working for a film company in Los Angeles
Tom Joslin: acting head of the film department at Hampshire College, Mass.

*since the creation of the graduate film program

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

Faculty Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, December 8, 1976 4:30 p.m. College Building Room 412

The minutes of the November 10, 1976 meeting were approved as distributed. Mr. Hoffman, chairman, made the following comments with regard to those minutes:

1. The "Mug Book" retention motion was brought to the attention of Mr. Lederhos. It will continue to be published.

2. The conflict referred to by Mr. Washburn regarding the use of Room 412 for faculty meetings has been resolved. It was agreed that faculty meetings would continue to be held monthly on Wednesdays in Room 412 at 4:30 p.m. and that the instructor would be asked to adjust his class accordingly on that day.

REPORT OF THE NOVEMBER 16 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Mr. Keck reported to the faculty that there were two major items of concern to the faculty at that meeting:

1. The resolution of the October 13 faculty meeting and what became of it.

2. A request that comprehensive minutes of the Board of Trustees meetings be made available to the faculty trustees and other members of the Board soon after each meeting. (Current practice has been to distribute minutes at the subsequent meeting, i.e. about six months later. The minutes of the May 18 meeting as used in my report of October 18 were a lightly edited draft of the secretary's verbatim transcript.) Chairman Ewing at the November 18 meeting interpreted the request to mean a courtroom style stenographic record and questioned whether such recording would inhibit the proceedings of the meetings. After discussion, Mr. Hoffman moved that a transcript of the proceedings, as kept by the secretary, be made available to all trustees on request, shortly after each meeting. This motion, however, failed to pass. An amended motion by Mr. Hoffman to distribute a draft copy of edited minutes within two weeks after each meeting was approved.

Mr. Keck continued his report by stating that the faculty resolution came to the attention of the Board through Mr. Ewing, who added that although the faculty did not ask the trustees for any specific action on the nine resolutions which had been passed, the concern would be taken into consideration. The trustees highly favored open communication with segments of the School.

In response to a question from the floor regarding the status of the nine resolutions, Mr. Keck responded that they would become part of the faculty handbook but was of the opinion that the resolutions were not absolutely "instoned." Merlin Szosz then described the process of how the handbook was being developed as a joint effort between the handbook committee, which is composed in part of faculty members, and the Board of Trustees who will make the final decision.

It was further reported by Mr. Keck and Mr. Hoffman that the letter endorsed by the faculty (Mr. Hoffman's letter of October 27, 1976 to Mr. Ewing) was not presented to the trustees, but that the trustees had all been sent copies with a covering explanation of the faculty's resolution passed on October 13. Mr. Keck concluded his report by stating that the only other matters discussed were the standard reports of the standing committees. To further clarify the attitude of the trustees regarding communication and the handbook policy, Mr. Keck read selections from the minutes of the Board of Trustees meeting of November 16, 1976 as received today, December 8.

In response to questions concerning promotions for next year, Mr. Stewart, provost, replied that all such promotions were in abeyance until criteria are established for making promotions. He then assured the faculty that this matter was being worked on and that he is urging that it be put into effect as soon as possible.

Mr. Hoffman then recommended that those with questions or objections concerning such policy should address personal letters expressing their opinions to Merlin Szosz. He further commented that some of the nine resolutions had been radically amended and that 50 copies of the minutes of the trustees' May 18 meeting with pages containing these revisions had been distributed at the October 13 faculty meeting.

MOTION CONCERNING A UNION REFERENDUM

Since Bob Jungels was not present, it was moved and seconded unanimously that Items 3 and 4 be switched.

The chairman called Marian Marzynski to present his motion to the faculty

Mr. Marzynski then presented the following motion:

Considering that a faculty union can possibly improve the interaction between teachers and administration in their joined efforts of bringing better education to Rhode Island School of Design, be it

MOVED: "the faculty wishes to hold a referendum by secret ballot, with the ballots sent to all faculty members, part time and full time, putting the question: "Are you in favor of or against establishing a faculty union (of one form or another) at the Rhode Island School of Design?"

If the above motion is passed, be it

MOVED: "the faculty chairman is instructed to distribute such ballots before the end of the first semester; the deadline for ballots to be counted will be Monday, January 17; and a report on balloting is to be made by the chairman at the next meeting, January 26."

Mr. Marzynski noted that the following elements needed clarification:

1. How part-time and full-time faculty would be involved in the voting.

2. What the referendum meant--that it was an opinion poll and not a legal decision.

Mr. Hoffman responded that the ballots would be marked to indicate either full-time

or part-time status and would be secret. Consequently, the opinion of part-time faculty towards a union would be designated. The motion was seconded and discussed.

It was noted by Mr. Szosz and Mr. Chihuly that the term "union" can imply either having a local union chapter or creating a union bargaining unit for the faculty, which would be stronger.

Other points of consideration that were raised included the fact that much time would be involved, the question of what form of union would be desired, and the question of how many persons would be ready to join and pay dues. Mr. Sullivan and others then raised objection to the word "referendum" in the motion because the word meant soliciting an opinion on an issue which has already had legislative action.

Mr. Marzynski further elaborated on the motion by stating that it is clearly an emotional issue, and that the faculty would, as a result, have a feeling of community with the administration since they would be working as partners. He also stressed that the character of the School is a matter of spirit as well as organization and that there were visible signs of making the School an "educational factory," a charge Mr. Stewart denied vehemently.

It was then MOVED and VOTED that the word "referendum" in Mr. Marzynski's motion (in the sentence "the faculty wishes to hold a referendum...") be stricken and the words "an opinion poll" be substituted.

Paper ballots were then distributed and the faculty instructed to vote on the amended motion:

"the faculty wishes to hold an opinion poll by secret ballot, with the ballots sent to all faculty members, part time and full time, putting the question: 'Are you in favor of or against establishing a faculty union (of one form or another) at the Rhode Island School of Design?"

If the above motion is passed, be it

MOVED: "the faculty chairman is instructed to distribute such ballots before the end of the first semester; the deadline for ballots to be counted will be Monday, January 17; and a report on balloting is to be made by the chairman at the next meeting, January 26."

The ballots were then completed and collected and Mr. George Sullivan was asked by the chairman to count them. Mr. Marzynski questioned the use of paper ballots and said he would have preferred a voice vote. The chairman said that balloting would provide an indisputable count in tabulating the votes. He pointed out that on this motion only full-time faculty members had been allowed to vote. This was in answer to Mr. Stewart's question whether the rules of the faculty meeting must be suspended in allowing part-time faculty to vote. The chairman pointed out that only in the opinion poll, not on this motion at the meeting, is the opinion of part-time faculty being solicited.

MOTION CONCERNING FILLING OFFICE OF ASSISTANT PROVOST

The chairman then called Bob Jungels to present his motion to the faculty.

Mr. Jungels apologized for being late and presented the following motion:

"the faculty urges the president to redefine the position of assistant provost so that the assistant provost shall be elected by the faculty from among its own members."

The motion was seconded and discussion followed. In response to a question regarding the word "redefine," Mr. Jungels responded that the motion could not be that direct and that only the president had the power to "define." It was then noted that in the organization of the School in matters that went before the trustees, one problem was important: any representative of the faculty acting in a position as an elected power is a representative of the faculty.

In response to a question regarding the faculty status of the proposed candidate, Mr. Stewart stated that he believed that the candidate should have such status and proceeded to define the position as a considerable five-day-a-week task, which would relieve the provost's office of the day-to-day problems. Mr. Stewart then questioned the motion as violating the EEO law in not conducting a search and stressed that persons outside the College could not be discriminated against. In response to another question regarding persons under consideration within the College, Mr. Stewart responded that he has reviewed some candidates and that others were under consideration, but the position was not yet filled and he did not have any present faculty members among the candidates, though some had been considered. Furthermore, final approval for such an appointment rests with the provost. Mr. Stewart then informed the faculty that an acting person was being sought since Merlin Szosz would be leaving within two weeks. Mr. Stewart left the meeting at approximately 6 p.m.

Mr. Hoffman then commented that at the present time the provost is proceeding as instructed in trying to fill the position and that the position of assistant provost is an appointment which the provost is authorized to make. The faculty itself cannot redefine this office, and the acting provost would have to be appointed under the existing conditions.

Mr. Dwyer then moved that the motion be amended to read:

"That the faculty would like to define the position of assistant provost in such a way that the assistant provost should be elected by the faculty from its own members."

The motion was seconded; voted on, and passed: 34 in favor and 1 opposed.

The chairman then announced the results of the vote by ballot of the motion presented in Item 4. The motion was passed: 35 in favor and 5 opposed.

It was then moved by Mr. Fowle and seconded unanimously that the provost should be invited to attend the next meeting.

Since there were no further announcements or other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

y

December 12, 1976

Mr. Jack Stewart
Provost
Rhode Island School of Design
Providence, R.I.

Dear Mr. Stewart:

I am writing you to put on record my thoughts concerning Marion Marzynski and the RISD Film Department. I have three points to make: One, Marion is a strong teacher with wide professional experience. He is able to translate this experience in such a way that students can make use of it. He brings to them energy, interest, and ability that enables them to concentrate and work at the highest level of their ability. Marion is not simply a good teacher but has a sound educational philosophy. He realizes that what is important in film education is not teaching students to operate equipment - equipment that changes constantly, but to help them grasp the ideas of film making: The ability to organize, to organize their concepts into meaningful aural-visual sequences, and to organize the practical elements (time, people, etc.) so as to achieve the necessary idea-images on film. By utilizing the workshop structure, Marion allows a student to work on film projects important to them so that they learn the principles of film making in the best possible way, making their own films. They also learn the necessary technical basis of film making in a real-work situation rather than by doing exercises. By crewing for each other they work at every level of film making and experience the areas of responsibility in film work. The workshop, or work lab, is not only the best way to teach film making; it is the best way to work with RISD students. However, it takes a strong, energetic, talented teacher who is able to give his attention to many simultaneously ongoing projects. Marion does this most effectively.

Two, Academic Freedom.

Having a sense of the educational needs of a viable film program, seeing the levels necessary so that students would be enriched by the activities within the department, not wanting to see such a curriculum weakened, Marion, as every teacher, had a right and duty to fight for all aspects of such a program. To fight for educational effectiveness is no more disloyal to a school than to oppose an immoral action by the government is unpatriotic. Marion is arguing for a film program that gives students an education worthy of their time, trust, and tuition. Hardly a cause for dismissal. Academic Freedom is a principle essential to honest education and one that a faculty must fight to preserve.

Three. The decisions that have culminated in the recommendation for Marion's removal seem, inadvertently or by design, aimed at ending a viable film program at RISD. On the grounds that a craft-technician oriented film program- a type of education more suited to the Cleveland Institute of Technology or the R.I. School of Photography- could not be afforded by RISD, plans that would continue and solidify the work started by Marion and Peter O'Neil have been aborted and we are where we are now. The future of film and video at RISD now seem to be at stake, not merely their merging but their very existance. It is not a question of whether RISD can afford film and video, it cannot afford them if it is going to continue to claim it offers a twentieth century education to its students. However a curriculum that is appropriate to a design-art school must be basis of a film-video program at RISD. One appropriate to a technical school will fail here as will one imitating the USC-NYU curriculum. At the undergraduate level those schools offer little experience to their

students. RISD through its workshop method of teaching-through-doing offers the best method of teaching film and video. It is a method that requires strong dedicated teachers, however; this makes it imperative that for the sake of the school we keep Marion Marzynski here.

Sincerely,

Robert Jungels

50 Summit Avenue
Providence, Rhode Island 02906
Telephone: /401/ 272-2235

Marcus M. Marzynski
/"Marz"/

December 13, 1976

Dr. Lee Hall, President
Rhode Island School of Design
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Dear Dr. Hall :

I am writing this letter two days before the deadline of your decision regarding my contract with the Rhode Island School of Design.

On November 30 I asked Mr. Jack Stewart for a meeting prior to his recommendation to you, but it now appears that he did not view such a meeting possible.

I have met with Mr. Stewart once after our conversation in mid-summer at which time I presented to him my concerns about the operation of the film department and particularly the decision to phase out the graduate program. At that time Mr. Stewart agreed that the proceduresfor such a decision were unfortunate and undescored the lack of good communication within our Institution. He assured me that a series of meetings would be held to discuss film and video curricula and that I would be invited to attend those meetings. I suggested to Mr. Stewart that since the Instruction Committee was not involved in this decision, as it rightly should have, it would be most appropriate to bring these matters to that Committee's attention.

As I waited for these matters to run their proper course, I received instead from Mr. Sgouros a copy of his recommendation for a non-renewal of my contract. In the enclosed copy of my repley to Mr. Stewart subsequent to Mr. Sgouros' recommendation, I pointed out that what Mr. Sgouros characterized as my unwillingness for team work reflects as a personal feeling contrary to the facts.

In light of this, particularly the by-passing of the Instruction Committee in a matter which clearly falls within its purview, the deliberations within the Committee on Faculty Appointments involving my contract were premature and predjudicial, concerning themselves, as they did, with opinion without my own voice in the matter. I was furthermore amazed to learn that the former acting Head of the Film Department, Chester Michalik, sat in on these deliberations and excercised a vote, when it was common knowledge that he had in the past recommended an unfavorable decision on my contract, a decision which was harshly criticised at the time by both faculty and students.

./.

I am confident that on this basis you will agree with me that Mr.Sgouros' recommendation for a non-renewal of my contract is ill advised. I sincerely hope that your own sense of academic freedom and professional intuition will render a decision which will be favorable to me and one which demonstrates to all at the Rhode Island School of Design your concerns for the rights of its faculty in matters of academic integrity as they are expressed in our own Handbook:

> " The right of inquiry for the pursuit of truth is regarded by the Board of Trustees, the Administration, and the Faculty to be esential to education. Rhode Island School of Design has a long tradition of such inquiry, and its members are encouraged to pursue this right to express their beliefs independently of the popularity or unpopularity of their conclusions,..."

Very truly yours,

Marian Marzynski
Associate Professor

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

December 13, 1976

Mr. Marian Marzynski
Assistant Professor, Film Studies
Rhode Island School of Design
Providence, Rhode Island

Dear Mr. Marzynski:

I regret to inform you that the Board of Trustees, acting upon recommendation from your colleagues, the Committee on Faculty Appointments, and Provost Stewart, instructed me not to offer you a renewal of your contract in the Department of Film, Rhode Island School of Design.

We are grateful to you for your contributions to the students and curriculum of the College and wish you good fortune in your career.

Yours cordially,

Lee Hall
President

LH:MW

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

December 14, 1976

Mr. Dan Friedman
18 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10010

Dear Mr. Friedman:

Thank you for your letter of November 14 addressed to the Rhode Island School of Design administration.

I am interested in your comments and am taking the liberty of passing them on to Mr. Jack Stewart, our Provost.

Yours cordially,

Lee Hall
President

LH:MW

CC: J. Stewart

43 Great Jones St., 5th Fl.
New York, N.Y. 10012
December 20, 1976

United States Department of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service
20 West Broadway
New York, N.y. 10007

To Whom It May Concern:

I have known Marian Marzynski since 1972, and am familiar with his work on the screen as well as in the classroom. He is a very talented film director, producer, and editor, and has made an immense contribution to film education at the Rhode Island School of Design. He brings to this country a rich understanding of the medium and an extraordinary enthusiasm. His teaching innovations generated an unprecedented level of film activity and encouraged students to help each other in the collective process of evaluation and film production. Marian's unique abilities have made an unquestionable stamp on the work of his students and on the advancement of cinema in this country.

Sincerely,

Howard Gladstone

Howard Gladstone
Filmmaker, Cameraman for
Cecropia Films

The Film Society of Lincoln Center, Inc. 1865 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10023 Phone: 765-5100 Cable: Lincenarts

December 20, 1976

Immigration and Naturalization Service
20 West Broadway
New York NY 10007

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in support of Mr. Marian Marzynski's application for permanent residence. I have known Mr. Marzynski personally for a number of years and am familiar with his international reputation as a filmmaker. His outstanding credits include a 35mm film entitled "Minute Waltz" which we showed at the New York Film Festival in 1967. I have also been pleased to be able to cooperate with Mr. Marzynski in his excellent film education work at the Rhode Island School of Design over the past several years.

Mr. Marzynski comes from an exceptional generation of Polish filmmakers and as such I am confident in his filmmaking ability and know that he will make a considerable artistic contribution in this country as well.

Very truly yours,

Suzanne Charity

Suzanne Charity
Film Coordinator
New York Film Festival

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

12/21/76

United States Dept. of Justice
Immigration and Naturalization Service
20 West Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10007

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to encourage the permanent residency request by Mr. Marian Marzynski, who I've known for five years. I have worked very closely with Mr. Marzynski in film production in New York and in film teaching in Providence, and found him to be a brilliant collaborator. He is a talented and inspiring film professional, who makes strong and rewarding impressions on those with whom he works. He brings a dimension of international and historic awareness to his work because of his experience. He is clearly making a contribution to documentary film culture in this country.

yours truly,

Peter O'Neill

Peter O'Neill
Filmmaker/Film Teacher
R.I. School of Design
2 College Street
Providence, RI 02906

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

January 5, 1977

Dr. Lee Hall, President
Rhode Island School of Design

Dr. Hall:

Since the spring of 1976 we have been following the events leading to the recent decision not to renew Marian Marzynski's contract in the Film Studies Department.

The following aspects of Marian's case are particularly alarming:

--that a faculty member holding critical opinions about the development of curriculum in the field of his recognized expertise does not find within the college structure room for debate with those who oppose his ideas as well as appropriate academic review;
--that when his division chairman, solely on the basis on this unresolved controversy, recommends a non-renewal of the faculty member's contract, the chief educational officer of the college submits this recommendation directly to the CFA without first involving the instruction Committee in an academic review of matters pertinant to the argument;
--that all letters and appeals from faculty, alumni and students concerning the controversy are being ignored and the decision is being made solely on the division chairman's allegation that the faculty member "is either unwilling or unable to function in a team situation."

By ending the controversy over the film curriculum in this way, the administration has demonstrated a disregard for the faculty's right " to express their beliefs independently of the popularity or unpopularity of their conclusions", as the definition of academic freedom provides in the 1974 draft of the Rhode Island School of Design Faculty Handbook.

Sincerely,

Dale Chihuly
Assistant Professor

Robert Jungels
Associate Professor

Hardy Keck
Assistant Professor

Arthur Wood
Associate Professor

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

January 5, 1977

Mr. Dan Friedman
18 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10010

Dear Mr. Friedman:

Mr. Marzynski has been notified that his contract will not be renewed, and he has subsequently notified me that he wishes to exercise his appeal privileges regarding this decision.

This procedure will get under way just as soon as is practicable. Because of the sensitive nature of any appeal process and the implication that new heretofore unconsidered information is going to be presented, it would be highly inappropriate for me to discuss the matter with you.

Sincerely,

Jack Stewart
Provost

JS:d

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

January 10, 1977

Dear

On December 15, 1976, President Lee Hall notified Marian Marzynski that the Board of Trustees does not intend to renew his contract with the Rhode Island School of Design.

We asked Marian to provide us with all pertinent material in his possession and came to the conclusion that his case constitutes a dangerous violation of a faculty member's academic freedom.

We are forwarding the crucial material to you and asking you to join us in fighting for a reversal of this decision by signing the following petition to the Board of Trustees"

> " The undersigned faculty members of the Rhode Island School of Design urge the Board of Trustees to reverse its decision not to renew Associate Professor Marian Marzynski's contract in the Film Studies Department. After studying the pertinent material, we feel the procedure followed by the administration disregarded due process and constitutes a threat to all faculty academic freedom."

The petition will be available for the signatures in your divisional offices starting Monday, January 17, 1977.

Sincerely yours,

Hardu Keck
Hardu Keck

Alice Marcoux
Alice Marcoux

Dale CHihuly
Dale CHihuly

Peter O'Neill
Peter O'Neill

Friedrich St.Florian

Robert Jungels
Robert Jungels

Albert Beaver
Albert Beaver

Art Wood
Art Wood

James Carpenter

Mahler Ryder
Mahler Ryder

Constantine Karalis

David Brisson
David Brisson

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

January 15, 1977

Jack Stewart, Provost
Rhode Island School of Design

Dear Mr. Stewart:

I would like to put on record our last communications concerning the procedure of my appeal from the decision not to renew my contract.

I asked you on January 3, 1977 for a hearing before the CFA and you scheduled it tentatively for January 26. On January 13, I called your office and heard from you that the Faculty Handbook does not provide for a faculty member the option to appear before the CFA and that the proper way for me is to start the grievance procedure. Then I brought to your office the book with following passage:

> "After a final decision not to renew a faculty member's contract is reached, he has the right to request the Committee on Faculty Appointment to reconsider his case. At this review, the President, the Division Chairman and the Department Head will be present."

Your answer was: I need more consultation. Next day, on January 14, you told me that after consulting the attorney your interpretation of said passage is that when a faculty member requests a reconsideration of his case by the CFA, the Committee has the right to either accept or reject such a request. Than you said that the CFA actually had already rejected my request on the January 12 meeting, although you didn't want to mention it to me before consulting the attorney. Asked if the rejection was by a vote, you said that it was a unanimous opinion by CFA members and that - if I wish so - you can bring my request again before the Committee for a formal vote.

Let me first say that I object to your interpretation of the Faculty Handbook regarding a faculty member's right to have his case reconsidered before the CFA. It is evident from both wording and context of the passage on page 18, 1974 edition, that a reconsideration of the case in the presence of all those involved in the decision making process, constitutes a faculty member's privilege to be heard. If "the right to request" was not meant as such a privilege, it wouldn't be worth mentioning or it would be suplemented by a statement about the Committee's prerogative to reject the request.

Secondly, we have President Rantoul's memorandum from April 22, 1975 /enclosed/, in which he clearly directs to CFA faculty members for reconsideration of their cases and makes a clear distinction between this procedure and the grievance procedure:

> "The purpose of the Problem Clearance Committee is to provide a specific forum of faculty who have not been involved in a prior discussion of a case. Their recommendation is made to the President, who determines the final decision. The basis of this, is for faculty to exhaust every means of settling a problem within the faculty, and use the Problem Clearance Committee as a last resort, if in the opinion of that faculty member is the problem is still unsettled".

In Spring 1975 Niels-Bruun had his appeal before both the CFA and the Problem Clearance Committee on that basis.

./.

The faculty handbook is a code of professional ethics and procedures and was not written by lawyers. As such it gives both administration and faculty equal rights for interpretations. It is clear however, that your interpretation cannot rule the CFA operations unless that Committee itself will accept it. Therefore I request that you ask the Committee for Faculty Appointment for a vote on the interpretation of the handbook's passage about faculty members rights to have their cases reconsidered before CFA. I believe that the Committee's opinion in this matter will serve the cause of all faculty, not only my case.

Sincerely,

Marian Marzynski
Associate Professor

cc:
Bayard Ewing, Chairman of the Board of Trustees
Lee Hall, President
Committee on Faculty Appointment members
Fenno Hoffman, Faculty Chairman

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

11 January 1977

Marian M. Marzynski
Film Studies
RISD
Providence, RI

Dear Marian,

If someone asked me directly what my personal feelings would be on the question of hiring or firing you, my response would be to recommend your renewal based on what I know and the opinion I have of you.

On the other hand, if asked my position on the decision made by Tom Sgouros in regard to non-renewal of your contract, I would have to support his decision assuming that he made that decision with all due respect and fairness to you, and with a greater knowledge of the specifics of the case.

Your feeling that the ultimate decision on your case was questionable in its origin needs further study; and since there seems to be some confusion and considerable disagreement involved, I support the re-opening of your case — through the grievance committee!

However, I was not willing, as requested, to sign the letter urging faculty support of the petition requesting that the Provost's recommendation for non-renewal of your contract be reversed. In principle I dislike signing petitions, for they polarize opinion - and cases such as these are hardly ever so simple. Furthermore, the true meaning of my signature attached to that letter could easily be misinterpreted, especially by those in the polarized field having a case against Tom Sgouros.

I hope this clarifies my position sufficiently. I will do what I can to support you, but in my own way.

Best regards,

Tom

Thomas Ockerse

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

January 17, 1977

Mr. Bayard Ewing, Chairman
Board of Trustees
Rhode Island School of Design

The undersigned faculty members of the Rhode Island School of Design urge the Board of Trustees to reverse its decision not to renew Associate Professor Marian Marzynski's contract in the Film Studies Department.

After studying the pertinent material, we feel the procedure followed by the administration disregarded due process and constitutes a threat to all faculty academic freedom.

Morton Fink, Liberal Arts

Hardu Keck, Freshman Foundation

Mahler Ryder, Illustration

Peter O'Neill, Film Studies

Robert Jungels, TV Studies

James Carpenter, Freshman Foundation

David Brisson, Freshman Foundation

Constantine Karalis, Architecture

Alice Marcoux, Textile Design

Dale Chihuly, Glass

Arthur Wood, Printmaking

Lucien Pompili, Ceramics

Arnold Prince, Sculpture

Tonia Aminoff, Liberal Arts

Louis Mueller, Winter Session

Preston McClannahan, Graphic Design

Russel Daly, Sculpture

Kathy Kelm, Textile Design

Louisa Chase, Painting

Linda Bowab, Apparel Design

Lorraine Howes, Appazel Design

Tom Cormley, Printmaking

Maria Tulokas, Textile Design

Friedrich St. Florian, Architecture

Hans VanDijk, Graphic Design

Edward Dwyer, Liberal Arts

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

January 17, 1977

Mr. Bayard Ewing, Chairman
Board of Trustees
Rhode Island School of Design

The undersigned faculty members of the Rhode Island School of Design urge the Board of Trustees to reverse its decision not to renew Associate Professor Marian Marzynski's contract in the Film Studies Department.

After studying the pertinent material, we feel the procedure followed by the administration disregarded due process and constitutes a threat to all faculty academic freedom.

William Newkirk, Freshman Foundation

Deborah Wharton, Fresmen Foundation

Norman Schulman, Ceramics

Richard Lebowitz, Photography

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

January 17, 1977

Mr. Bayard Ewing, Chairman
Board of Trustees
Rhode Island School of Design

The undersigned faculty members of the Rhode Island School of Design urge the Board of Trustees to reverse its decision not to renew Associate Professor Marian Marzynski's contract in the Film Studies Department.

After studying the pertinent material, we feel the procedure followed by the administration disregarded due process and constitutes a threat to all faculty academic freedom.

Arthur Zwerk-Bronner, Architecture

John Behringer, Archtecture

Zane Anderson, Architecture

Deh, Teeds e

ABEDON, STANZLER, BIENER, SKOLNIK AND LIPSEY
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
220 SOUTH MAIN STREET
PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND 02903

AREA CODE 401
861-5700

M. LOUIS ABEDON
MILTON STANZLER
ALVIN N. BIENER
RICHARD A. SKOLNIK
HOWARD I. LIPSEY

ALTON W. WILEY
RICHARD A. SOREN
JORDAN STANZLER
MORRIS J. LEVIN
WILLIAM RENZULLI

January 19, 1977

Rhode Island School of Design
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY APPOINTMENTS
Providence, Rhode Island

RE: MARIAN MARZYNSKI

Gentlemen:

Please be advised that this office represents the above-named, MARIAN MARZYNSKI, who, by letter dated December 13, 1976 was advised by President Hall that he was not going to be offered a renewal of his contract in the Department of Film.

Pursuant to the Faculty Handbook (October-1974 edition), request is hereby made, by Mr. Marzynski, for the Committee on Faculty Appointments to reconsider his case; whereat such consideration, the President, Division Chairman and Department Head, as well as Mr. Marzynski will be present. I await your advice.

Very truly yours,

/s/

Richard A. Skolnik

ras/hb

cc: Marian Marzynski

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

To Bruce Helander *From* R. P. Larkin *Date* January 19, 1976

Subject - Summer Session Program

Dear Bruce,

A recent incident within the film department has forced me, as department head, to reevaluate my earlier endorsement of the proposed Marzynski/O'Neill Summer Film Program. I am not aware of how committed you are at this time to the inclusion of the offering in your total program and have no desire to disrupt your emerging plans if they are far advanced. However, if there is still the opportunity I would wish to withdraw my endorsement.

The withdrawal is based not on any weakness of the proposed course which as presented appears to be a strong and innovative idea. Rather it is based on some doubts as to the ability of one of the co-instructors to represent the department in a responsible manner. Please let me have your reaction at your earliest convenience.

RPL:bh

RPL

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

January 25, 1977

Dr. Lee Hall, President
Rhode Island School of Design

Dear Dr. Hall:

In recent months a feeling of concern has been growing upon us. It seems as though the educational priorities of this institution are shifting. Various instances will illustrate this fact, but one in particular glares out at us: The removal of Marian Marzynski from our academic community. When we first learned of these events, we tried to use our lines of communication to the administration but to no avail. At the Student Board meeting of December 6, 1976, we met with Jack Stewart. After an hour and one half of discussion about Marian's case, our impression of him as a teacher, and his abilities and merits to this community, we were shocked to have Mr. Stewart respond that his decision had already been made and though he would consider what he heard, it would not seem likely that he would change his mind.

When we returned from our winter recess, we learned that not only had Marzynski not been rehired, but the major reasons seemed to be purely political rather than educational... We simply feel cut down by this turn of events and implore you to rehire Marian Marzynski, for he is a teacher who is essential to the vitality of our school as well as the future of our film department.

School is a place of higher learning, not a battleground for the practicing of power politics. If a conflict in personalities explodes, a creative teacher cannot be the victim of it. It appears to us that the quality of education here at RISD is being dimmed by internal inertia. This inertia is created by the forces of administrative conformity which are constantly rooting out new blood and ideas. Dr. Hall, you yourself quoted William Whitehead as saying, "...the intellect does not work best in a vacuum," but such a vacuum is being created here by your own administrators. The lines of communication are down and we no longer feel confident that our voice is being respected. We are tired of being shortchanged of our basic rights to receive the high quality of education that we are paying for at the expense of the dehuminizing institutionalization that this school is being subjected to at present.

At this point we no longer feel that your administration is making a constructive effort in improving the educational environment. Instead, we feel that RISD is going downhill. Only your immediate action to this situation may restore some of our confidence in your administration's ability to do what is best for RISD and undo the damage that has been created. Please consider this a matter of utmost urgency.

Respectfully submitted,
THE STUDENT BOARD

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND 02903, TELEPHONE 401 331-3507

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

January 26, 1977

Richard A. Skolnik, Esq.
Abedon, Stanzler, Biener, Skolnik and Lipsey
Attorneys at Law
220 South Main Street
Providence, RI 02903

Dear Sir:

As the Chairperson of the Committee on Faculty Appointment of the Rhode Island School of Design, I have delivered copies of your letter of January 19, 1977, in which you advise us that your office is representing Professor Marian Marzynski, to each member of the committee at our regular Wednesday morning meeting today.

The reconsideration of Professor Marzynski's case has been proceeding in the normal order of business with the committee. Today they set a date for his appearance before the committee: March 2, at 11 a.m. This meeting will take place in the office of the President in the Woods-Gerry House. The President, the Chairperson of the Division of Design and the Head of the Film Department will attend this meeting.

Kindly advise me if you, or anyone from your office, plan to accompany Professor Marzynski to this meeting.

Yours very truly,

Jack Stewart

Jack Stewart
Provost

JS/kam

cc: Marian Marzynski
Lee Hall
James Jackson, Esq.

RISD students listen at last night's rally, left. Above, with hand to face, in white jacket, filmmaker Marian Marzynski, who has been fired; above left, with beard, RISD instructor and cartoonist Art Wood.
—Journal-Bulletin photos by WILLIAM K. DABY

JAN 26 '77

500 RISD students rally in support of filmmaker; provost being relieved

By LORRAINE HOPKINS
Journal-Bulletin Staff Writer

PROVIDENCE — Over 500 Rhode Island School of Design students rallied last night, hoping to reverse the firing of RISD filmmaker Marian Marzynski. Massing at the RISD auditorium, they began circulating petitions for the renewal of his contract, and to express no confidence in Provost Jack Stewart.

RISD is dropping Marzynski after five years because he is "either unwilling or unable to function in a team situation," according to his division chief, Thomas Sgouros.

RISD faculty and students are being notified this morning that Provost Stewart has been relieved of his duties as the college's academic chief after only six months on the job. The decision was made by President Lee Hall Monday, prior to last night's rally, but announcement was held being held off until this morning.

Stewart was recruited last summer from New York University, and as of Monday was assigned to "major administrative projects for the duration of this academic year. This will prevent Mr. Stewart's daily dispatch of duties related to the office of provost," according to the memo being issued by Hall.

Bruce Helander, director of the RISD summer sessions, is being named acting associate provost "and will handle the routine related to the office of provost."

At last night's rally, students jammed the aisles and stairwells at the auditorium. Neither Hall nor any high-ranking administrators attended, although the crowd included about a dozen faculty.

Student speakers led by Reinie Pukinskis, acting chairman of the Student Board, hailed Marzynski and condemned "the vacuum created" by poor administration. Marzynski himself said, "It's not a simple story of good guys and bad guys and the sheriff who didn't come to town," and along with a couple of others, he got a standing ovation. So did Art Wood, a silk screen instructor whose caustic comic strips, which appear regularly in the RISD student newspaper, were flashed on a movie screen to open the rally.

Veteran faculty at the meeting called it a remarkable turnout especially since it is wintersession, when great numbers of the 1,350 member student body are off campus.

There is widespread disaffection among students on the RISD campus. "They had such high expectations of the new administration," said one administrator dean. Lee Hall, a painter and art historian, arrived in the summer of 1975 following an administration in which the president, Talbot Rantoul, had been a businessman, and his chief academic officer, Dean Donald Lay, had been a private school headmaster — neither one with an arts background.

Marzynski has a sizable student following, and the students expected the new administration to act on their feelings about him. Marzynski co-produced the controversial films *To Live in Providence* and *Block Island*, both financed by the Rhode Island Committee for the Humanities.

Hall's shelving of Provost Stewart followed a quick buildup of resentment against him by both students and faculty, having to do with personal style and with the times. Hall, who was hired by trustees more as an analyst and planner than an artist, is insisting on rapid adoption of policies relating to faculty governance, like accountability of time, as well as cutting costs.

Under Hall, Stewart's job was to hold the faculty together while their pay was frozen, promotions were frozen, and policies that make them apprehensive, like accountability of time, were being adopted by trustees.

with Taunting
While Rome Burns.
... 6,488. Handle $588,321.

Foxboro entries

Thursday, Dec. 9

FIRST—$1,000; Pace; Clmg.; 1 Mi.; ($2,500)

7 Schem Ann ..... Handy 3-1
8 Simmac Frank ..... Jo. Hogan 7-2
1 Hal Sirada ..... Marshall 7-2
5 Pontic A ..... Smith 10-1
6 Brass ..... J. Beckwith 6-1
3 Veloc N ..... Green III 8-1
4 Big High Roller ..... Quinn 12-1
9 Mazie C ..... No driver 10-1
Also eligible — Jefferson Star.

SECOND—$1,200; Pace; Clmg.; 1 Mi.; ($3,000)

7 Gay Logen ..... Leblanc 5-2
6 Icelus ..... Kamal 9-2
9 Sluggy D ..... Handy 7-2
1 Ads Senator ..... Sutherland Jr. 6-1
4 Storm Land ..... J. Hogan 3-1
2 Joe Ray ..... R. Andersen 8-1
3 Knightly ..... No driver 10-1
5 Royal Eleanor ..... O'Donnell 12-1
Also eligible — Keystone Irish Quinn, Piper Princess.

THIRD—$1,000; Pace; Clmg.; 1 Mi.; ($2,500)

8 Sarah Viking ..... W. Beckwith 3-1
2 Gay Dan ..... Lancaster 5-2
1 T. J's Penny ..... Powers 6-2
6 Sauc Me ..... Jo. Hogan 7-2
3 Sold And Able ..... Guidette 8-1
5 Nibble Frost N ..... Mattison 8-1
7 Oslo Meadow ..... Gibson 10-1
4 Ricky Duane ..... Bullock 12-1
Also eligible — Miles End, Loch Chu.

quick completion ...
book. Since then, she sa...
book has become a year's work.

Writing that first book not only brought recognition and some stability to a life which saw her hold 20 jobs in two years, but it also brought bad reviews from her own family.

some ex...
who can right...
Charles Dickens' ima...
whiskey ads, the public ...
sion biography, the musical ex
cesses of "Oliver" and the inter-...

DEC 7

RISD faculty to vote on union

PROVIDENCE — Faculty at Rhode Island School of Design yesterday voted to hold a straw vote on whether to organize a union. The vote will be conducted by secret paper ballots, which are to be counted by Jan. 17. The vote was authorized, 35 to 5, at a regular monthly faculty meeting at the College Building.

The action is in response to a number of moves by the new administration of President Lee Hall, including efforts to codify college policy on a wide range of personnel practices like tenure.

RISD has been struggling to adopt a faculty policy handbook for nearly a dozen years, and Hall, who took office 18 months ago, has been assisting in its completion. Last May trustees adopted a policy on tenure as follows: "Rhode Island School of Design does not have tenure in the usual sense, but in lieu of assurance of full-time employment to the age of 65, RISD may offer five-year contracts without prejudice to existing policy on tenure."

The issue of accountability of faculty time — both in the classroom and in their professional life as designers and artists — has also aroused the faculty.

RISD's faculty four years ago voted, 2 to 1, against affiliation with the American Federation of Teachers after union organizing efforts on campus. The upcoming straw vote will test present sentiment and does not involve actual union affiliation.

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

MEMORANDUM

To Jack Stewart *From* Thomas Ockerse *Date* 1 February 1977

Subject CFA – C.Michalek as a CFA member in regard to the Marzynski case.

I only recently realized that Chester Michalek is a member of the CFA. Not that I have any quarrel with this membership, but under the circumstances in regard to the Marzynski case, and in all fairness to Marian, I was rather surprised that Chester had not been disqualified (voluntarily or upon request by the committee) to evaluate the Marzynski case as a CFA member. It seems to me that his presence and input can only prejudice the judgement of this particular case, which can only be considered unfair toward Marian.

It is my personal opinion that such situations should always be avoided, in the best interest for all concerned; and, with all due respect to Chester Michalek, I feel it to be my duty to recommend that he be replaced as a member of the CFA when the case of Marian Marzynski is being reviewed.

Respectfully,

Thomas Ockerse

cc. M.Marzynski

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

TWO COLLEGE STREET PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND 02903 TELEPHONE 401-331-3511

March 10, 1977

Professor Marian M. Marzynski
50 Summit Avenue
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Dear Professor Marzynski:

The Committee on Faculty Appointment reconsidered their earlier recommendation not to offer you another contract to teach at Rhode Island School of Design. As you know, I had concurred with their recommendation and, with support from the Board of Trustees, had informed you that your employment at Rhode Island School of Design would terminate with the completion of your present contract.

The Committee on Faculty Appointment, after full consideration of your discussion on March 2, voted again to recommend that you not be offered another contract for teaching. Again, I concurred with their recommendation and, upon approval again by the Board of Trustees, am writing to inform you that your employment at Rhode Island School of Design will terminate at the end of your current contract.

Yours cordially,

Lee Hall
President

LH/mk

cc: Thomas Sgouros
Bruce Helander
Jack Stewart

CONTENT

page:

1 Three-years contract notification from March 14, 1974
2 Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor
3 Proposal for the undergraduate film program
- Professional evaluation by John Kelly, Brown University
5 Course description for 1976/77
6 Professional evaluation by Robert W. Corrigan, University of Wisconsin
7 Memorandum to Thomas Sgouros about the "Wax Cracle" and this incident in his office on May 28, 1976
8 Letter to Lee Hall by Art Wood about the film program
9 Letter from Lee Hall responding to the memo sent to Thomas Sgouros
10 Letter from Bayard Ewing responding the the memo sent to Thomas Sgouros
11 Letter from Bayard Ewing to Art Wood
13 Teaching program for 1976/77 Seniors and Graduate Students
14 RISD Centennial Film Project
15 Peter O'Neill's letter to Paul Larkin about David Govoni's appointment
16 Memorandum to Paul Larkin about David Govoni's appointment
17 Paul Larkin's response to this memorandum
18 Memorandom to Jack Stewart about the situation within the film department
19 To Paul Larkin more about David Govoni's appointment
20 Paul Larkin's response
21 Memorandum to Paul Larkin about 1976/77 program and the Centennial Film
22 Winter Session 1977 proposal
23 Letter to Paul Larkin about the differences of opinions
36 Letter to WJAR-TV about internships program
37 Thomas Sgouros' recommendation for the non-renewal of the contract
39 Dan Friedman's /alumni/ letter to the RISD administration
43 Letter to Jack Stewart about the CFA vote on my contract's renewal
44 Hardu Keck's letter to Jack Stewart
46 Letter to Jack Stewart about my contract's renewal
48 Memorandum to Jack Stewart asking for the Instruction Committee's opinion
49 Robert Jungels's letter to Jack Stewart
51 Letter to Lee Hall about my contract's renewal
53 Lee Hall's notification about the non-renewal
55 Professional evaluation by Howard Gladstone, alumni, filmmaker
56 Professional evaluation by Susanne Charity, New York Film Festival
57 Professional evaluation by Peter O'Neill
58 Letter to Dan Friedman from Jack Stewart
59 Letter to Lee Hall by Dale Chihuly,Hardu Keck,Bob Jungels and Art Wood
60 Letter to faculty members by 12 teachers
61 Letter to Jack Stewart about the Faculty Handbook's interpretation
64 Attorney's letter in this matter
65 Student Board's letter to Lee Hall
66 Professional evaluation by J.L.Anderson, WGBH, Boston
67 Letter to the Attorney from Jack Stewart
68 Letter to Jack Stewart from Thomas Ockerse about Chester Michalik and the CFA
69 Lee Hall's second notification about the non-renewal of my contract
70 Petition by faculty members to the Board of Trustees asking to reverse the decision about non-renewal

A petition by 751 students asking the Board of Trustees to reverse its decision is out of this set of documents

D R A F T MM

RESOLUTION

We, the Faculty of Rhode Island School of Design urge the Board of Trustees to recognize as a matter of highest importance for the well being of this institution, the existence of the following disagreements, disatisfactions and disaffiliations between us and President Lee Hall:

1. her poor judgment, that the quality of education at the Rhode Island School of Design will be improved by imposing on the faculty the accountability of their outside professional activities;

2. her poor judgment, that educational benefit can be drawn from defining the job of a division's chairperson as a management position rather than an educational leader elected by the co-teahcers as the one who intimately understands academic goals set by the division's members;

3. her mismanagement of this institution's academic affairs by a wrong selection of a candidate for the position of Provost and her further support of his performance despite the evidence of both students and faculty's disatisfaction and non-confidence;

4. her refusal to accept our demand to define the position of the Associate Provost as elected among faculty by a faculty at large;

5. her covering of evident violations of procedures and fairness for employees brought to her attention by the Faculty's Problem Clearance Committee in Marian Marzynski's case by maintaining her decision to not renew his contract;

6. her total failure in providing us with information pertinent to understanding the institution's financial problems, and communicating with us as a group on ideas and management concepts under way, as well solicitaing our advise on the matters related to our professional knowledge and experience.

In May 1972 The Faculty Conference introduced several resolutions, never adopted by the administration, for the improvement of our institution by establishing faculty's elective leadership of college academic affairs. Since then we have unsuccesfully tried to build a partnership with this corporation's management and to be recognized as a self-governed professional body without the necessity of an adversary type labor relations.

This institution's financial dilemmas were always of our deep concern, although we were always and still are kept uninformed of the financial problems at the institution. We wish to participate in the process of making the school's operation more efficient and effective in the only way we can: by 'selling' the quality education. But sine 1972 the quality has been declining and our moral as a group is low as never before. It is a result of a dramatic gap in understaning of the mechanisms of necessary changes for which the administration brings a management model antagonistic to the very spirit which has made this school's reputation.

In spite of being the major force for the possible success of this institution of learning and in spite of having a total sense of an unrestricted commitment to this unique community of artists, designers, architects, scholars and students 'under one roof', we feel now that we are viewed by the administration as a group of under-loaded and overpaid workers. The new President introduced to us an unprecedented style of PR communications, confusing memorandums, hearing about our own affairs from the newspapers, being called on the TV screen 'a sparkling faculty' and in the house the one which 'cannot get their act together' which has left us confused and leaderless.

We admit the failure of our recent actions by the committees on Faculty Governance and on Handbook which did not produce their final conclusions after lengthy frustrations of working under an unhealthy climate of the lack of confidence and confused messages from the President. The enclosed documents speak to this regard.

This school can rebuild its reputation only under a management sensitive to both students and faculty needs, challenging our creativity, commited to the concept of faculty self-governance, than setting the highest standards for our performance.

Enclosed are the following documents:

Faculty resolution in regards to changes in by-laws concerning Deans and Provost
Faculty deliberations on the nine guidelines for the Board of Trustees
Faculty resolution on vinyl siding
Fenno Hoffman's letter to Bayard Ewing
Faculty resolution on the definition of the Associate Provost position
Faculty resolution on the re-making the Problem Clearance Committee
Faculty resolution on charges to the Committee on Faculty Governance
Faculty resolution about Professional Activities
Faculty resolution about disclosure of the Problem Clearance recommendation in Marian Marzynski's case
Fenno Hoffman's memo about Professional Outside Activities
Baruch Kirschenbaum's memo about Professional Outside Activities
George Sullivan's memo about Professional Outside Activities
The Committee on Faculty Governance report
Fenno Hoffman's report on the Committee on Faculty Governance Operations
Jack Stewart's final report to Lee Hall
Lee Hall's answer to Jack Stewart's final report
1972 Faculty Conference resolutions in regards to Elective Educational Leadership

D R A F T

evaluation of performance

DIRK BACH

We the Faculty of Rhode Island School of Design unanimously and vigorously register our serious disagreement, disaffection and disaffiliation with the current practices, policies and attitudes generated by President Lee Hall and imposed on us.

1. She has ignored Faculty requests to elect or appoint someone from the ranks of the Faculty to serve as Associate Provost.

2. She has repudiated conscientious advice and generous counsel given by Division Chairmen concerning the academic structure of the School of Design and persists in implementing her own format for the College.

3. She has arrogantly regarded the Faculty as employees who are underworked and overpaid and who, as a group, "cannot get their act together." This stereotype has saturated all administrative levels of the institution in spite of the situation of Faculty solidarity, collective progress and productive evolution which does exist in the College; she merely does not like our "act."

4. She has attempted to curtail creative engagement in our professions as artists, architects and designers by proposing to enlarge our contractual responsibilities to the school calendar or to change our academic status from full-time to adjunct, while her professional reputation as a painter and educational leader increases with her reliance on the prestige of the School of Deisgn to support her credentials.

she has
she has
she has
she has

Le Letter

HOW TO KICK RISD INTO THE XXTH CENTURY?

Sometimes I really hate to be kicked in the XXth Century especially when I walk through the East Side and see vinyl siding on old houses.

It was a rainy day when RISD students had signs reading "quality education?????" in their hands, when RISD celebrated its Centennial this spring.

RISD was once a trade and craft school, now we want mastery of hands and illumination of minds to follow one another. The school must realize that in this way it enters a field of "wild flowers", the world of creative processes. The most efficient management cannot assume the completition of such a mission. Only leadership with managerial skills at all levels of academic structure can stimulate and challenge the participants, teachers and students, and protect "quality education".

The problem at RISD, is that this school has not discovered leadership yet, and is now as far away from this discovery as ever.

Dr. Lee Hall's arrival on the campus was the result of previous managerial failure and she is certainly a first class manager. Her brightness is unquestionable and she certainly has a vision for this school. But after being President for two years she still keeps it a secret.

Her ex-provost brought his vision under the horroristic title "How to pull RISD, kicking and screaming into the 20th century", a report to the Trustees. He wanted to replace RISD's provincial, self-protective and nostalgic faculty, including almost all painters and almost all sculptors, by teachers who supposedly better belong to the 20th century, whatever that means. Faculty and most students feel that their President basically agrees with the Provost's report.

Dr. Hall has the recent support of the Trustees, despite faculty and students dissatisfaction, on the basis of her promise that by settling firm policies and procedures for the institution she can start to rebuild the so called RISD reputation.

But policies and procedures can not describe the spirit of this school which is declining: and who will have the authority of knowing what is fair and what is unfair to put into those policies and procedures. I have a strong feeling of the insensitivity of the President's approach and insensitivity of her promise.

Whenever you start talking about school, everything amounts to teachers. Who they are, how good they are, and how much they will cost. A teacher in a school dealing with a creative process, like a coach, acts upon the challenges of the game, coming from students on one side and coming in the form of open discussion created by leadership, from other teachers and administration on the other. Because the second stimulation does not exist, the first is weak.

Ex-provost, a XX Century "buyer" of educational quality said that RISD is eccentric and the RISD "experience" is an albatross. That is not an insult, it is a wrong professional judgement. The truth about RISD is that it is a school of dedicated teachers once in a while doing wrong things because they are totally confused by all levels of their management as to what is wrong and what is right, not in the sense of procedures/they need those too/, but in the sense of content. Approach them with heart and open mind; cut down the mushroom of middle management, let students evaluate teachers, teachers argue about education without fear of employment and elect their leaders on the basis of ideas not power alignments, then you will find out that some of them won't stand the heat, others will stay to build a better school with a balanced budget.

Money is not such a devil in education, as many think. You can get a lot of free energy from teachers if you know how to challenge their creative egos. But certain losses like "provincial" dedication are impossible to replace over a decade, the same thing happens after a fire in your home.

Marian M. Marzynski
Associate Professor
Department of Film Studies

RHODE ISLAND SCHOOL OF DESIGN

Providence, Rhode Island 02903

CRIFF KING CHAN, V
617 447-0400/432
to file
after 2nd

TO: Lee Hall, President and
the Board of Trustees of Rhode Island School of Design
FROM: Jack Stewart, Provost
DATE: April 5, 1977

In response to your request of March 22, 1977, I address an analysis of my experiences as Provost to you and the Board of Trustees, (Appendix I). Included are my recommendations; presented while still under contract as the Provost and in accordance with Section 4-B of the By-Laws of the Rhode Island School of Design as of November 18, 1975, and I request that the President and the Board of Trustees act positively on them.

How to pull RISD, kicking and screaming, into the 20th century: The President and the Board of Trustees should give full support to the Provost in efforts to implement reorganization plans that have gained prior support and approval of the President and of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees.

The office of Provost should not be subjected to secret criticism directly to the President or members of the Board of Trustees from faculty or administrators who, under the By-Laws (Section 4-B), are charged with reporting to the Provost. Such practices corrupt the orderly administrative procedures of the college and undermine the authority of the Provost.

If this institution is governable, the person charged with governing the college, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, must be given the full support and complete confidence of the President and of the Board of Trustees.

Until, and unless, the President and the Board of Trustees are willing to place this kind of confidence in the Provost, which includes supporting the Provost when attacked by the faculty and/or the student body, then you can forget about that office. You might just as well let the division chairpersons continue to run the college.

This is one of the most important criticisms I offer as a result of my experience at RISD. The practice of administrators who report to the Provost going around that office directly to the President and to members of the Board really must be stopped, regardless of the close friendships that have existed for many years between certain faculty members and members of the Board of Trustees. It is a naive practice fraught with unpredictable consequences that can do nothing but weaken any efforts to administrate the college in an orderly and creative manner.

In my case, I was never even given an opportunity to defend myself or my position against the attacks made upon me behind my back by the division chairpersons. While I was out of town the President met with them to hear their attack on me without giving me any forewarning or opportunity to meet with all parties concerned to rebut their complaints. The circumstances under which I learned of the events that had transpired are described in my letter of January 28, 1977, directed to the President and the Executive Committee of the Board. As many of you know, I learned of the extent of the bad news from the 7 a.m. radio news on January 26.

Until the morning of January 24th, 1977, I had received praise and letters of support for my policies, plans, and performance. I have learned now that Professor Sgouros wrote a letter to the President urging her to fire me, claiming that I had lost the confidence of the faculty by walking out in the face of Manzella's insults at the faculty meeting of December 8. Sgouros told me he wrote the letter the day after the faculty meeting. The President told me she would have done the same thing under the circumstances, so why did she sit for six weeks on this letter without mentioning it to me? Then, why is Professor Sgouros considered an accurate barometer of faculty opinion? Just what kind of confidence have I been privileged to share with the President and the Executive Committee of the Board in my efforts to carry out an extremely problematical task?

Do the President and the Executive Committee have so little real authority in the administration of the college that division chairpersons in collusion can dictate to them who will survive as the chief policy maker of the college and abort those organization policies that have received the approval and promised support of the President and the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees? This year your actions have indicated that this is precisely the sad state of affairs at RISD.

Assessment of the Division Chairpersons

I believe the division chairpersons attacked me because they became convinced that I would succeed in reorganizing the college if I stayed in office, and not one of them wants anything to change other than a cosmetic reorganization, and only this in the hope that superficial changes may lay the whole question to rest.

Professor Manzella knew that I was going to, sooner or later, move the whole MFA program out from under him and leave him as only the head of the MAE-MAT program, and form a graduate council of the three chairpersons of the major divisions to run the MFA program. He had personal reasons to try to get me removed because I have recommended that his $3,000. stipend for administrating the Saturday program (an amount that doesn't even show up on the college budget for 1976-77 but is paid directly by the business office in some arrangement between Manzella and the Business Office) be eliminated and the Saturday program be placed under the Extension School. This is just one example of my effort to scrape away the vast accumulation of shoddy practice barnacles that are encumbering the hull of the good ship RISD.

Before December I proposed a reorganization of the Film Program to Sgouros which recommended greatly reducing the use of film and shifting as much as possible to instruction with video. It is less costly and most film educational goals at the undergraduate level can be achieved in this medium. He seemed to resent my efforts to change anything in his division and this resentment became fully expressed by him when I told him I would not approve an amount in his 1977-78 budget request to replace Marzynski's salary. I explained to him that the graduate film program had been phased out and that included the salary of the instructor of this program. I recommended approximately $393,000. for the salary budget of the Design Division, rejecting his request for $406,000. My recommendation did include about $2,000. as a margin against the loss of the Marzynski salary.

Professor Sgouros' administrative abilities are the most limited of any

of the division chairpersons. He is either incapable of making decisions or unwilling to, in either case, the Design Division has been without leadership from a single source this year. This has led to confusion, difficulty in relating Design Division instruction and related activities to the overall college goals, departmental isolation, and in the case of film, chaos in his division.

He was offered a great opportunity to publicly display the accomplishments of his division for the promotional good of the college. The Providence Journal generously turned over up to 16 pages of the Rhode Islander to the Rhode Island School of Design to do with what they wished. Sgouros was placed in charge of that Centennial graphic production at a meeting in the office of the Providence Journal on October 6, 1976. The seven or eight pages of photographs, with no indication of what they pertain to, is the last minute effort that Sgouros came up with. The results speak more loudly than any criticism I could make of this embarrassing display of ineptitude.

Professor Sgouros is now in a state of embattlement because of his poor administrative abilities. The departments in his division are being run like independent franchises. As an example of this department autonomy, Professor Beaver has negotiated a private arrangement with Brown students to take photography in his department and pay their fees right into the photography budget. This money never appears in the college budget.

Sgouros has acquired such a bad reputation with the students that they are refusing to enroll in his classes. Nothing about his performance, either as an administrator or as a teacher, has been conducive to quality education at RISD.

Barry Kirschenbaum seems to have a reflex action of resistance to suggestions that it might be good for our students, the Division of Liberal Arts, and for the college to make much greater use of our option to send students to Brown for their liberal arts special studies courses. I told him I thought most of our special studies could be more qualitatively supplied by Brown and that I would like us to move toward abolishing our special studies department, except for those tenured and long time faculty members in this department, so that this portion of the liberal arts budget could be used to improve our art and architectural history courses. He objected to this plan and was uncooperative in exploring the potential. He exhibits the worst characteristics of departmental protectivism.

Gil Franklin is the most difficult of the division administrators to deal with. He seems very cooperative in face to face discussions and then proceeds to do everything in his power, which is apparently considerable, to see that nothing changes. His division is without doubt the worst in the college. Professor Franklin seems to be constitutionally dedicated to maintaining the status quo at RISD. This has contributed to the faculty stagnation in his division. I would venture to say that until my arrival, one of the most secure jobs in the world was a full time faculty position in Gil Franklin's division. Dale Chihuly is the only exciting and highly qualified faculty member that has been brought into that division in years until I brought Tom Gormley into printmaking this year.

The Fine Arts Division has the most inefficient student-faculty ratio of any of the divisions. The two major components of the Fine Arts Division, painting

and sculpture, are among the weakest programs in the college. When students march under signs questioning the quality of education at RISD, they must have painting and sculpture high on their list of complaints.

These two programs are overloaded with tired faculty members either unqualified to teach in a first rate art college in the 1970's or so lacking in interest and enthusiasm that they are ineffective teachers. Many of them became conceptually lost about fifteen or twenty years ago and have just settled into the security of a full time faculty appointment at RISD with little pretense of maintaining the kind of professional commitment the college claims to expect of its faculty. Those few professionally respectable faculty members in painting and sculpture are mostly adjuncts.

The majority of the faculty, and all of the division chairpersons, seem determined to maintain the status quo. I've had the question put to me at a faculty meeting: "What's so wrong at RISD?" Any faculty member who can't give many answers to that question is blinded by their own self-interest or too naive to be in education. For those members of the Board of Trustees who have that question on their tongues, please read on, I am giving you the answers.

There's a nostalgia in the faculty symptomized by their reverence for the "RISD experience," a term which seems to me to be synonymous with provincialism. The problems of this college go very far back and have become so woven into the fabric of the faculty that real improvement is decades away, if ever, unless strong corrective measures are taken soon by the administration.

RISD has a small core of excellent faculty. They are the real hope of re-establishing quality education and the nucleus upon which a good adminis-

tration can rebuild.

Recommendation for the Office of Provost

The Board of Trustees should build into the office certain safeguards to insure that the Board will at least be strongly induced to support the Provost through the initial, and inevitable, crises. These safeguards can only be in the form of a contractual commitment on the part of the President and the Board of Trustees.

I make the following recommendations to the President and the Board of Trustees:

The Office of Provost must not be viewed as a front line of defense for the President.

The Provost should be offered a three year contract with one year's severence pay. The contract should be a full time faculty position with the rank of full professor. The year's severence pay may be pay for instructional services if the Provost is not renewed in that office at the end of the three year contract.

The Provost should chair the faculty meetings in the absence of the President who should be the nominal chairperson of the faculty. The present office of chairperson of the faculty should be changed to the executive secretary of the faculty, be elected by the faculty, and charged with preparing agenda and bringing all matters of faculty concern to the attention of the administration and seeing that these matters receive the attention of the faculty and the administration at faculty meetings.

This is the minimum security the office of Provost should have to afford the kind of freedom of action that will be needed in this office if any improvement in the condition of the college is to be achieved.

The office of Associate Provost should be changed to that of Dean of the Faculty. This position should be filled by someone elected from the faculty or selected from the outside by a faculty search committee, subject to the approval of the Provost in either case. This position should be designed to require only three days on campus and ten months a year so that it will be easier to get a good person for the post. The Dean of the Fauclty should chair the faculty meetings in the absence of the Provost and the President. In any event, the Dean of the Faculty should chair at least one faculty meeting per semester.

The position of Executive Secretary to the Provost should be redefined as the Administrative Assistant to the Provost.

The part time secretarial position now in the Provost's office should become a full time executive secretarial position.

These changes will put the very crippled Office of Provost back in operation, and with the right people in these key positions it will function as the nerve center of the college.

Reorganization of the Division Administrators

Now for the next essential stage, and this ranks only slightly below placing complete confidence in the Provost in order of importance:

Change the titles of all chairpersons of the three major divisions, Fine Arts, Design and Architecture, to Associate Dean of the Division.

Remove Gil Franklin from his position as Chairperson of the Fine Arts Division. There is money in the budget for a head of the Sculpture Department. Make Franklin the head of Sculpture and use the money allotted for that position, plus money from some of the Fine Arts Division contracts that were not renewed, to hire an Associate Dean of this division from the outside.

Remove Tom Sgouros from his position as Chairperson of the Design Division and get a first rate person to be the Associate Dean of Design.

Derek Bradford should become the Associate Dean of the Architectural Studies Division. I think he is one of the most accomplished and reliable in place administrators in the college.

Make Gregor Goethals the Chairperson of the Division of Liberal Studies. I understand her reluctance to take on any more responsibility, but I feel she has been at the college long enough to have incurred a certain debt of responsibility to the college when it really needs her, and believe me, the Division of Liberal Arts really needs her to replace Kirschenbaum. She may wish to also continue as head of the art history program, which I would encourage. I suggest that the Art History Department be renamed the Art and Architecture History Program.

The Special Studies Department should be abolished and those tenured and long term members of that department should come directly under the Chairperson of the division. Most of the special studies courses now in the curriculum should be supplied by Brown. We have a very good arrangement with them whereby our students may take courses there at only $40.00 per course. Brown has been making a much greater use of this exchange arrangement than we have. It will produce an upgrading of our special studies courses and will free money to improve our art and architecture history program.

Freshman Foundation should be limited to a program faculty of instructors in 2-D and 3-D Design. All drawing instructors in Freshman Foundation should be reassigned to divisions of their respective disciplines and drawing instruction in the Foundation Program should be given by instructors from the three major divisions in coordination with the Foundation curriculum and under

the direction of the Chairperson of the Foundation Program.

My recommendation is that John Udvardy remain as the Chairperson of this redesigned Foundation Program.

The Chairperson of the Foundation Program should report, along with the chief administrators of all divisions, directly to the Provost.

The Graduate Studies Program and the MAE-MAT Programs should be separated. All studio graduate programs, MFA, should be administrated by a Graduate Studies Council, composed of the three Associate Deans and the Dean of the Faculty.

The MAE-MAT Program should become an independent program under the direction of a Head of the program, not a chairperson. There should be no stipend for this position. It is a program of only 30 students who do most of their work off campus. I think the administrative work involved should not be more than that of the heads of other departments and programs. The program head of MAE-MAT should report to the Provost.

I recommend that at an early date the MAE-MAT Program be evaluated thoroughly by an outside, independent, evaluating body. I have reason to seriously question the quality of the degrees we offer in these two programs.

Faculty Development

The most serious problem facing RISD today is the poor quality of its faculty in certain programs, particularly in the Fine Arts Division. No college can long remain highly reputable unless it has an effective system of rejuvenating its faculty.

The greatest strength of the college now lies in its student body and this strength has been maintained through an excellent and uncompromised admission system still working from a large applicant pool. But a declining reputation, increasing tuition, and a declining national college age applicant pool will erode this strength very quickly.

This year the number of applications is down 10 to 11%, and it is not yet known what the yield will be. All colleges will be facing a drop in applications from now until the early 1990's. The birth rate in the United States peaked in 1957 and began to decline rapidly a few years later. The national applicant pool is now in its first or second year of decline. If RISD has to face this demographic decline encumbered by a declining reputation, which its faculty is contributing to, the consequences seem dire indeed.

Through my chairmanship of the Committee on Faculty Appointment I have made significant achievements in the area of faculty development. Do not permit these achievements to be nipped in the bud. I urge you to insist that the tough stance that I have established regarding contract evaluations be maintained. The college must continue to demand the right to seek and consider more accomplished people from outside whenever a contract is up for renewal, particularly in considering a faculty member for a first five year contract.

I have written the criteria for the guidelines on faculty contract renewal and promotion. It was voted approval by the CFA and submitted to the ad hoc committee on the Faculty Handbook. It has been adopted by this committee with slight modification and is being proposed for formal adoption.

I set a standard of impartial consideration of past performance as an indicator of future accomplishments for the good of the college. I challenged this committee on their responsibility to consider the recommendations of Department Heads and Division Chairpersons as only part of their data and that information from all quarters of the college community should be sought in every evaluation. I established a precedent by presenting to the committee a request from a delegation of students to appear before the CFA, and received an affirmative vote. This is the first time a student delegation has been invited to appear before the CFA regarding their deliberations on faculty contract renewals.

In certain instances I reversed CFA recommendations for contract renewal after a very thorough study and investigation of all aspects of the case under consideration. All of my recommendations for contract renewal or non-renewal were thoroughly documented and so soundly based on the AAUP guidelines for faculty appointment that they will sustain any appeal attacks on them. They will be very valuable contributions to your next Provost as a model for faculty appointment recommendations.

I recommend that if at all possible, the present make-up of the CFA be retained through next year. They work well together and have acquired an attitude of college wide faculty development responsibility as opposed to the initial attitude that many of them held that their responsibility was college wide faculty protectiveness.

Program Development

Program development and faculty development are so interdependent that it is an artificial device to discuss these subjects under separate headings.

For many years Professor Callahan and Professor Siskind brought national acclaim to the college. RISD gained the reputation of having one of the best photography departments in the country. Whenever any program in a small college gains a national reputation the effect is very positive on the entire college. The fact that some of the programs at RISD were moribund was concealed by the force of the reputation of the Photography Department supported by the generally good reputations of the Graphic Design Department, Glass Blowing, Jewelry and architecture programs.

I believe the reputation of any college of art can never achieve its greatest potential without at least respectable programs in painting and sculpture. Whether we like it or not, the reputations of art schools rest more sensitively on the quality of these two programs than on any other programs with the exception of architecture.

Painting and sculpture are the most neglected areas of education at RISD, and the consequences of a continuation of this neglect are predictable.

My most useful advice to the Board of Trustees, though I realize it is unfortunately impossible, is to remove everyone in the Painting Department except Richard Merkin, and remove everyone in the Sculpture Department except Dale Chihuly. I firmly believe that it would not be difficult to replace this faculty with better teachers of a professional standing that a school of RISD's aspirations should have.

Now, acknowledging the impossibility of such an ideal in faculty development, I make the following more realistic recommendation to you:

The first step to take in turning the decline of the reputation of the college

around is to remove Roland Belhumeur from the head of the painting program. He is a weak administrator out of contact with what is happening in art today and with those who are making it happen. He is professionally arrested in the backwaters of confusion that engulfed so many painters in the late fifties and early sixties. His influence on the painting program is stagnation, which in the long run means retardation. As the Provost, I recommend his removal under the terms of Section 4-B of the By-Laws of RISD. My recommendation is to combine painting, drawing, and printmaking into one adminsitrative unit and place Tom Gormley over it. I brought Mr. Gormley to RISD in September and he has proven to be one of the most creative and professionally accomplished instructors on the faculty. The review of the Faculty Show in the Weekend section of the Providence Journal on March 5 singled his work out as the most imaginative in the show. He has a vast range of contacts in the art world, has a proven record as an administrator, and has been a representative on the committee to the Endowment for the Arts.

Under very difficult circumstances and continuing procrastination from Franklin and Belhumeur, even in the face of my recommendation that Mr. Gormley be given a full time contract, he has as an adjunct taught a full time schedule this year, including Wintersession. He has willingly participated in jurying student work outside the printmaking program. I believe inquiry among the printmaking majors will confirm that in one year he turned the printmaking program around from a protesting delegation of students in my office in late September to one of the best programs in the college now. This is what sound faculty development can accomplish relatively quickly.

My recommendations for the Sculpture Department were included in my recommendation to remove Gil Franklin from the chairmanship of the Fine Arts Division. My recommendation for the head of sculpture is Dale Chihuly, but unfortunately,

he does not wish to continue in that position, therefore, I recommend that Franklin be made the head of a reorganized Department of Sculpture, including under the authority of one head the programs in sculpture, ceramics, glass, metal and jewelry.

I recommend combining Apparel Design and Textile Design into one admistrative unit. They will be housed together in the ASB next year and for this and educational and professional reasons I believe one head would be more effective in administrating these two programs. I recommend that the head of these programs automatically rotate every two years alternately from the faculty of each of the two programs.

This new Apparel Design Program and Textile Design Program should be transferred to the Design Division.

Graphic Design and Illustration, including Film Animation, should also be combined into one administrative unit under one head, but continue to exist as separate degree programs. I recommend Tom Ockerse to head this unit.

Photography, film, and video should be combined into one administrative unit under one head. I recommend Bert Beaver to head this unit. One criterion for new film instructors should be that they understand, and are experienced in, the extent to which film disciplines may be successfully taught through the video medium. Video is the cinema medium of the future and now that the college has the film faculty weeded out, don't make the mistake of filling those positions with romantic dedicated film makers. Film is a commercial business, and it will go in the future the way the economics dictate. The cinema size TV screen is already a reality and the cost of video tape is a fraction of film. It is extremely important that careful planning with an eye decades ahead be made in rebuilding the Film-Video Program.

Architecture and interior architecture should be combined into one administrative unit under one head - Warren Luther. I have heard considerable criticism of Chick Fink as the head of Interior Architecture and it is my conclusion that he has the weakest program in the Architecture Division. It would be much better managed in any case in conjunction with the Architecture Department. Numbers of students in a program is not a reason to resist combining two or more programs under one administrative head. Counselling should be distributed among all the faculty in a program anyway, and this is the only area that numbers of students might increase the work load of an administrator.

Landscape Architecture and Industrial Design should remain separate programs under separate heads. If a program in urban planning is introduced in the future I think it should properly, and most efficiently, be combined with Landscape Architecture for administrative purposes, under one head for the two programs.

The Administrative Council

From these program heads, eight in all, together with the three Associate Deans of the major divisions, the two chairpersons (Foundation and Liberal Arts) ,and the head of the MAE-MAT program, the Dean of the Faculty and the Provost, an administrative council of sixteen members could be composed. One student representative from each degree granting educational division should be invited to the council meetings, including one from Freshman Foundation and one each from the MFA program and the MAE-MAT Program. These student representatives should have deliberatiye and voting privileges on the council.

Student Life

I strongly recommend that Caroline Davies be removed from her position as Dean of Students. She has been a failure in that office. One of the most important charges of the Dean of Students is to monitor, and maintain if at all

possible, student good will and contentment. She has totally failed on both charges. She is unqualified for her position and whenever the demands of the office become pressing she has neither the experience or training to cope with them. She was totally ineffective in diffusing student protests that were being planned in her office right under her nose. Failing that, she did not even carry out her responsibility of alerting the Provost to the seriousness of the developing situation, nor did she take any action, or propose any plan that would have possibly blunted the extent of the protest. These are all actions that a college might reasonably expect to be taken by a fully qualified Dean of Students. I recommend that she be removed from her office and that Associate Dean of Students Newman be made Acting Dean of Students until such time that a fully qualified person may be found for this important position.

The office of Dean of the Third World should be changed to Director of the Third World Program. The director of this program should report to the Dean of Students but work closely, cooperatively, and under the Director of Admissions. The Director of the Third World should have included in the description for this position the charge that recruitment of Blacks and Puerto Ricans should not be confined to financial aid candidates but that 50% of the time spent in recruitment should be concentrated on middle and upper middle class Blacks and Puerto Ricans who would be able to pay tuition.

Housing

Mr. Gordon Allen has my recommendations for a more equitable assignment of dormitory space and has researched this problem well.

RISD's Relationship With Other Colleges of Art

The college's reputation with the East Coast Colleges of Art and those col-

leges of art who are members of NASA has plummeted. If RISD had its house in order and was delivering quality education, as it claims to do, and as its high tuition implies, it would not matter so much what the administrators of the other colleges of art thought, but with our students marching in the streets under banners proclaiming "quality education????" we need friends outside the walls. Instead RISD is making enemies all over America. We have been excluded from the NASA protfolio days where much recruiting is nailed down by other colleges, of which we used to enjoy the benefits.

Senior administrative officials from colleges who are members of NASA meet annually; whom do you suppose they took over the coals this year? - Yes, RISD, and it will continue next year and on until it is very damaging. The President includes in her reasons for withdrawing from NASA that Yale is not a member. So what? RISD is not Yale and never will be. Such equations are presumptions and unrealistic. Yale is not in a competitive situation with other colleges of art; RISD is, and the competition will increase sharply within the next few years. To incur the enmity of all these schools is wrong because there's absolutely nothing to be gained by remaining aloof.

As far as the NASA evaluation is concerned, I think this college needs it very badly. It is the most professionally oriented evaluation a college can get today. I think a NASA evaluation would confirm the criticisms that I have made of the education being offered by RISD, would put these criticisms in a usable order, and give the administration the kind of outside affirmation that would be useful in making the changes that are essential to the health of the institution. This is a much more professional and faculty acceptable way of evaluating the educational tone of a college than the lone

educational consultant brought in by the President to play a kind of hide and seek delaying action with the faculty.

All the outside consultants are correctly perceived by the faculty as an alternative to taking any action, which of course, they welcome. There have been so many studies done on RISD that it has become a euphemism for "if we study it we won't have to do it." There were studies done in 1971 and 1974. Architecture of course has had its separate required evaluations at regular intervals and seems to be the only division in the college that doesn't either conveniently lose these evaluations or just file them away and forget them. One advantage of a NASA evaluation is that the organization has the leverage to follow up on whether its recommendations have been acted upon.

The previous evaluations of the Fine Arts Division both made essentially the same recommendations, not fundamentally different from those recommendations I have made: Simplify the departmental structure, reduce their number, concentrate divisional decision making in the hands of the division administrators, improve student-faculty advisory and consultation services, and increase faculty and student fluidity between programs.

There is nothing revolutionary about anything I have recommended. I have been guided by what is generally practiced in small colleges of this nature and my recommendations are based on sound educational management principles. The Rhode Island School of Design is so out of step with the general practices of small colleges of art that it can be described as nothing more than eccentric. The President, who has a wide knowledge of the practices and conditions of other small colleges of art will, I believe, confirm my description of RISD as eccentric. Let none of you think that this is in any way an advantage to the college. I think the "RISD experience" is an albatross.

Elliot Barowitz headed the outside committee to evaluate the Fine Arts Division in 1974. The first draft of his evaluation was rejected by Dean Lay on the advice of the Fine Arts Division on the grounds that it was so critical of the division that it must be a very biased report and therefore, Mr. Barowitz was requested to write a new, more "realistic" report which could be more helpful to the division. I have not been able to locate that first draft, but a second, watered down report was submitted, with the request that a follow up report be sent to the committee within a year describing any changes that were made in response to suggestions in the report. Not only was this request ignored by the Fine Arts Division, Mr. Barowitz never heard a word from RISD again until I contacted him in December, 1976.

Alternative advice

In the event the President and the Board of Trustees choose not to act on my advice that the best chance a new provost will have will be to take office with at least Franklin, Sgouros, and Kirschenbaum out of office, then I tell you quite frankly, in all fairness to the next candidate for the position, you should tell the candidate that the situation is such at RISD that close consultation with, and cooperation with, Franklin and Sgouros will be necessary to hope to survive in the job. That on paper the division chairpersons report to the provost, but it has been the practice in the past for any division chairperson to report directly to the president without the knowledge of the provost and, in the case of Franklin and Sgouros, they have a direct line to members of the Executive Committee of the Board and have in the past used that friendship, unbeknownst to the provost, to undermine the credibility of the provost. If the Board of Trustees leaves Franklin and Sgouros in position as chairpersons of their respective divisions, they should do so with a willingness to face the reality that their failure to act on my advice is Board of

Trustee approval of their position as the real power in the college. To bring a new provost into such a situation without a fair warning of the actual power alignments would lead to other crises of leadership and failure in that office. As long as these two are chairpersons of divisions, with the build-up of power and influence they have with important members of the Executive Committee of the Board, it is unrealistic to dream that any provost is going to be able to implement the changes that are clearly indicated as necessary for the health of the college. You give yourselves the choice of harmony between a new provost (who takes your warnings wisely) and the divisional chairpersons, as the school continues its gentle decline into the second ranks, or awakening to the crisis the school is in, acting positively on my advice by July 1, 1977, and bringing in a new provost who will at least have an even chance from the outset.

I would have been less than honest if, after learning the conditions at RISD, I would not have moved to reorganize the college. The basic problems that I have described to you are obvious to anyone experienced in art education who is not blinded by their own investment in the status quo at RISD (which doesn't leave many with 20-20 vision around here).

I was led to believe I would receive the support of the President and the Board of Trustees in the implementation of my reorganization proposal, which was reviewed by the President and the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees and approved by them. The essence of my plan was delivered to the full Board of Trustees at their meeting in November, 1976. You have all received copies of that interim report from the Provost.

However, at the first concerted resistance to my actions by the Division Chairpersons, resistance which I had predicted to the President and which was expected by the Executive Committee of the Board, I was relieved of my duties, effectively ending any possibility of reorganization and denying me the support I had been assured of by the President and the Vice-Chairman of the Board of Trustees in writing. (See Appendix II & III), and the verbal support of the Executive Committee of the Board. I refer you to paragraph three of President Hall's letter to me dated 10/4/76:

> If cooperation does not come about as a result of persuasion however, I am fully prepared to take a strong administrative stance regarding the proposed changes and regarding your authority to exercise them.

And on page two of the same memo, last paragraph:

> I shall be very pleased if you can accomplish the changes suggested by the beginning of the next academic year.

I believe you will all agree that any reasonably intelligent person would take such unqualified statements of support and encouragement for action within the year on an approved plan as the policy of the Rhode Island School of Design and assume that the full support of the President and the Board of Trustees would be forthcoming when the inevitable crisis came and that they would stand by their written word. As you know now, this didn't happen.

The Union

My word of recommendation to the Board of Trustees is that faculty unionization is not the worst thing that can happen to this college. In fact it is not nearly as bad as the threat of unionization being used by the division chairpersons to intimidate the Executive Committee into acquiescing to their

demands. My advice to you is let 'em unionize. The administration will have a much cleaner management relationship with the faculty and you will get that union threat monkey off your back once and for all.

If it comes to a union organization in the faculty, my recommendation is that you try to get the faculty to accept the AAUP as their bargaining agent. This organization is the most professionally oriented of the various college faculty bargaining agents.

Adjunct Faculty

Resist all attempts to have adjunct faculty included in union membership. There are many grounds and precedents for resisting this and someone should research this now so that if the faculty unionizes you will be prepared to limit it to full time faculty.

The present ratio of full time to adjunct faculty is very bad and inhibits attempts to bring in fresh and exciting instructors for short periods. I suggest that the college begin now to develop an FTE balance between full time and part time faculty. This will mean the ultimate reduction of the full time faculty to around 75, even with a student enrollment reaching 1500. This will be a full time faculty to student ratio of one to twenty. The ratio would be reduced by the increased number of adjuncts. I believe this college must achieve an FTE ratio of one to fifteen if it is going to remain healthy and be able to survive in the rough, highly competitive years that lie ahead, and somehow, the faculty must be made to realize this.

Conclusion

These are my recommendations to you ladies and gentlemen. They have been seriously studied by me and are precisely the recommendations I would have requested approval of if I were continuing as the Provost of the College.

Now, for the good of the future of the college, I reiterate my request that you use your authority under the terms of the By-Laws of the Rhode Island School of Design and approve these recommendations which I make under the terms of Section 4-B of those By-Laws.

Very Sincerely,

Jack Stewart

Jack Stewart, Provost and Vice-president for Academic Affairs