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Preface

My first visit to the campus of Bridgewater State College came in the fall of 1988 as a finalist for the presidency, and I recall vividly that the more I learned about the College, the more deeply impressed I became. The faculty, for example, were an extraordinarily friendly and enthusiastic group, and the many I met during that initial visit spoke with unusual affection and respect for the institution. Similarly, the students and staff were upbeat and positive, obviously proud of their affiliation with Bridgewater and anxious to enumerate all the College’s special qualities and achievements. Since I was no novice to the culture and environment of college and university life — I had by then served as a faculty member and administrator in higher education for more than twenty years — I recognized the exceptional degree to which members of this campus community attached themselves emotionally as well as professionally to Bridgewater.

Dr. Adrian Rondileau was then serving as the acting president of the College, having been asked in August, 1989, by the Board of Trustees to come out of retirement after twenty-four years as Bridgewater’s president, while the search for a permanent successor was in progress. In a cordial meeting with him during my visit as a candidate, and later, after my appointment as president, in a series of extremely helpful discussions with him in the winter and spring of 1989, I discovered the source of Bridgewater’s remarkable sense of stability and optimism.

Longevity of leadership, by itself, offers no guarantee of success. Yet it is clear to me that longevity is only one of the qualities associated with his years at Bridgewater. Through my conversations with Dr. Rondileau I became
familiar with the man and his vision of public higher education, and from many sources familiar with his accomplishments at Bridgewater, came to know that Adrian Rondileau had bestowed upon Bridgewater not only many years of able stewardship but beyond that had infused the campus with a strong sense of confidence in its mission and purpose. Even though he was at the helm throughout an era of tumultuous change in American higher education, he managed to maintain perspective, partnership, and cooperation among all segments of the campus. Even as he led the College in its transition from a distinguished teacher education institution to a multi-purpose liberal arts college, Dr. Rondileau labored diligently to achieve consensus in the community. His personal concern for the well-being of individual faculty, students, administrators, and staff was a hallmark of his presidency. Because he remained committed to that philosophy, the campus community encountered was, in spite of the difficulties it had recently endured, resolutely determined to continue the College’s forward momentum.

By any measure of a college presidency, the quarter century tenure of Adrian Rondileau at Bridgewater State College was remarkably successful. Academically, the number of undergraduate and graduate programs increased significantly, from less than twenty to more than one hundred; the physical plant of the College grew dramatically — a dozen new buildings were erected between 1962 and 1986; enrollment of students quadrupled as the size of the faculty tripled; and Bridgewater’s reputation as a first-class academic institution was widely recognized in the region and throughout the state.

Just as significant as any of these important achievements, and, to him, perhaps an even more meaningful
tribute, was his impact on the thousands of students who passed through Bridgewater during his years as president. When the Class of 1969 dedicated its yearbook to him, it said he was "consistently concerned with the welfare of the student body" because "it is his aim to produce a college community which serves all of its students." The class saluted his dedication to the interests of students, and concluded, "He is the symbol of our College, and we are proud to have him."

That theme mirrors the appreciation, respect, and affection which is unanimously accorded President Emeritus Rondileau by alumni, faculty, staff, and friends of Bridgewater State College. The small, distinguished institution he found when he came here in 1962, was a larger and even more distinguished institution when he retired. By the quality of his leadership, he had strengthened the College intellectually and materially and greatly broadened its educational, cultural, and economic influence on the region and the state. Again, because Adrian Rondileau was tireless in his efforts to promote a sense of community and partnership at Bridgewater, those principles would stand it exceedingly well in the challenges which came after his retirement.

The special vision that he brought to Bridgewater, shaped by years of experience in higher education administration in various parts of the nation and the world, is among the many valuable insights he shares and explains in the memoirs which follow. I am grateful to President Emeritus Rondileau for committing to written form his perspectives on what is certainly one of the most fruitful and interesting chapters in the long history of Bridgewater State College.

Most of all, I am personally very grateful to Adrian Rondileau because he left Bridgewater an academically healthy and spiritually vibrant institution. As the
present administration seeks to continue enhancing the quality of learning, we enjoy the legacy of his commitment to educational excellence and the vision he carried out which built the foundation on which all of our efforts are based. I speak on behalf of all affiliated with Bridgewater, and all who champion the value of a strong public higher education system, when I express my heartfelt thanks to Adrian Rondileau for all of the many services he rendered during his outstanding career.

**Dr. Adrian Tinsley**  
**President**  
**Bridgewater State College**
As a graduate of the Class of 1965, and now as chairman of the Bridgewater State College Foundation, my perspectives of Adrian Rondileau’s tenure as president of the College take root in entirely different circumstances. As a student, I remember him as a strong but caring and extremely competent leader, one who gave our campus community a sense of stability even as the College was growing rapidly. My adult reflections center more directly on the long string of remarkable achievements which occurred during the Rondileau years, including the establishment of the Bridgewater State College Foundation. Consequently, I have come to consider him a great builder, not only of the physical plant and the academic program — which he certainly was — but also as a man who, by his personal example, instilled in the College a clearer sense of its character, mission, and values. This is a legacy of at least equal importance to an educational institution such as Bridgewater.

The Bridgewater Foundation was actually created in the latter years of his presidency. Typically, Adrian Rondileau was looking far into the future as he brought together the various instruments necessary to create this organization and give all the support essential to sustain its functions. Thanks to Dr. Rondileau’s vision, the Foundation was fully operational as a fund-raising arm of the College just when such an entity was most needed to broaden our appeal to private individuals and the business community. I am exceedingly proud that the Foundation has already rendered valuable service to the College in this regard. The opportunity to purchase the property for what is now the Davis Alumni Center, for
example, was made possible by the Foundation acting in cooperation with the Alumni Association. Numerous other activities, ranging from the development of scholarship programs to the creation of the Hall of Black Achievement and the funding of the Bridgewater Fine Arts Series, are Foundation projects, and all trace back in origin to Adrian Rondileau's commitment to Bridgewater State College's future.

My respect for the work of Dr. Rondileau is shared by countless thousands of Bridgewater alumni and other friends of the College. These memoirs help remind us that there were many facets to his presidency and more than a few obstacles to his plans to improve and strengthen the College in all of the ways he eventually did in spite of the challenges. I hope other readers will find, as I did, much hope and encouragement in these pages, for the story of Adrian Rondileau as president is the story of Bridgewater's success as an institution.

David Messaline, '65
Chairman
Bridgewater State College Foundation
Board of Trustees
"Recent events on the national scene, as well as in foreign affairs, have been fast moving and have added to the feeling of uncertainty among young and old to a degree that most of us have not been accustomed to in recent years."

Those words opened the message President Emeritus Adrian Rondileau addressed to my graduating class in the 1981 yearbook. Although a full decade has passed, the durability of his message is clear to all of us. Similarly compelling, and reassuring, is how Dr. Rondileau put this truth in perspective: "But uncertainty, for better or worse, is not a new phenomenon... Uncertainty in our personal lives and, indeed, in the life of this nation and of the world, seems to exist as a very fundamental law of life, and as an experience to keep us at our very best."

A lifetime of perseverance, of hard work and professional achievement, and of unusually keen insight into the human spirit are all reflected in that message. During a career in higher education that reached back into the 1930s and spanned all the way through the 1980s, and which took him not only all over the nation but to far-flung foreign corners as well, Dr. Rondileau had amassed a wealth of experiences, and he shaped each of them into a philosophy that he summarized as follows: have faith in your Creator, have faith in yourself, have faith in your fellow man, and have faith in your country.

Those of us who passed through Bridgewater during his tenure as president saw how he lived those principles. His every action, even during the most tumultuous of years, embodied his conviction that none of life's x
complications and challenges are insurmountable, and the dignity of the individual is paramount. His vision for Bridgewater as a first-rate educational institution was exceedingly broad, but primarily his attention was focused squarely on the needs and interests of the students, faculty, staff, and alumni of the College. Their concerns were always at the top of his agenda.

To be sure, Dr. Rondileau is remembered as a builder of the College — academically, physically, and in terms of its impact on the region. Bridgewater underwent a tremendous period of growth under his leadership — the student body tripled, for example, as did the number of academic programs offered. Simultaneously, the physical plant expanded significantly, from less than a dozen buildings on thirty acres of land to twenty-seven academic and residential buildings on one hundred seventy acres of land. During his tenure, the College earned the respect of civic and business leaders alike as programs were developed to strengthen ties locally, regionally, and throughout the state. Management Science and Aviation Science were among the many new undergraduate majors introduced in the Rondileau years.

Impressive as these achievements are, what he seemed to work hardest at was building consensus among the various constituencies of the College. Truly, as president he cared most about people. Always anxious to listen, and always ready to act, Dr. Rondileau enjoyed a remarkable reputation not only as a great builder of Bridgewater but a wonderful role model for the campus community who helped shape ethics, values, and character.

After twenty-four highly distinguished years as Bridgewater’s President, he bid farewell to Bridgewater at Commencement, 1986. Yet just two short years later he willingly answered the call of the Board of Trustees
to return as acting president. His firm but calm leadership style proved exactly what the College needed to sustain it, and all who love Bridgewater are deeply grateful to him for this extra measure of service at a time of the College's greatest need.

As chairman of the Board of Trustees, and an alumnus, I am exceedingly proud that Dr. Rondileau's memoirs are available for all to peruse and enjoy. They stand as his personal reflection on Bridgewater during many of the College's most exciting and productive years.

Louis M. Ricciardi, '81
Chairman
Bridgewater State College Board of Trustees
Foreword

The appointment of the eighth president of Bridgewater State College in 1962 gave rise to more than the usual amount of rumor and prognostication. The Board of Education had broken tradition and had chosen an educator from outside the Commonwealth. No one questioned the credentials of the appointee but the fact that there were other well qualified applicants from within the state, among them some local favorites, who were not appointed was curious.

"For almost one hundred years Bridgewater was headed by men who were 'on the spot' at the time of their election. Each of the first four men lived in the town, died here, and was buried in nearby Mount Prospect Cemetery." The fifth had been superintendent of schools in Springfield, Massachusetts. Numbers six and seven, John Kelly and Clement Maxwell respectively, had been veteran members of the faculty and the administration prior to their appointment to the presidency.

The incoming president, Dr. Adrian Rondileau, was a New Yorker who had obtained his undergraduate education at City College and had earned his M.A. and Ph. D. degrees at Columbia University, where he was the recipient of noteworthy honors and awards. By happenstance he was a graduate student at Columbia during the hey-dey of prominent scholars, on the faculty there, who were creating great excitement and ferment in education through their teaching, writing, and lecturing. These men and women were influential change agents who had set the direction for much of the reform extant in education. Their lectures and publications were the source of much agitation and disputation within and beyond educational circles. It was inconceiv-
able that any educator engaged in concentrated study under the tutelage of such renowned professors and in such a dynamic setting, could emerge a traditionalist.

Dr. Rondileau’s extensive experiences as a teacher and administrator were also particularly impressive. Among his outstanding accomplishments as a teacher was a role he played in a unique innovative program in the state of Michigan. He had been dean of Liberal Arts at Pace University for four and a half years, and, for an additional four years, dean of Business Administration for the Associated Colleges of Upper New York State. He was coming to Bridgewater from Yankton College in South Dakota, where he had been president for eight years. (Yankton was a private college with major programs in liberal arts and general studies, a conservatory of music, and divisions of teacher education, fine arts, natural science, and humanities).

Dr. Rondileau also had in his background, international and intercultural experience, having served as a special consultant and lecturer for the Brazilian Ministry of Education for three years.

The fact was the Board of Education had appointed an exceptionally well qualified person: a liberally educated scholar, well informed about critical developments in education; an experienced administrator of liberal arts, teacher education, and major professional fields; an educator with intercultural experience; a participant in significant research studies in higher education; an active member of several professional organizations; and, the author of several monographs and books. It is not surprising that a person with such outstanding credentials was the object of much curiosity, of conjecture, and expectancy. Understandably, the campus was rife with anticipation of the challenge of newer, or at least, different ventures in education.
Bridgewater Normal School/State Teachers College enjoyed a proud tradition as one of the first three public institutions in the United States established for the preparation of teachers. (It can be considered to be the oldest state-supported teacher education college in the country, since it still occupies its original site). The College had earned an enviable reputation, not only in Massachusetts, but throughout New England and the nation. Many of its graduates had achieved distinction in allied fields of education.

In 1962 Bridgewater was still the showplace of the Massachusetts state teachers colleges. It had an attractive campus, differing in layout from the standardized architectural plan of several of its sister institutions. It had some physical assets that were almost beyond the fondest hopes of other state colleges in the Commonwealth - a free-standing gymnasium with an olympic-size swimming pool, for one example.

Probably the best known public teachers college in the Commonwealth, with the largest enrollment (at that time) and the one that seemed to enjoy strong fiscal support, Bridgewater State was the most likely institution to spearhead a new direction and the anticipated expansion of the emerging state colleges of Massachusetts. What changes would the new president initiate in the transition from teachers college to a multipurpose institution? Would he launch new majors in liberal arts, in additional professional concentrations such as business administration? Would there be a greater degree of sophisticated research and experimentation in teacher education?

The new president was low-key, earnest, and confident. He envisioned a college community where rights and responsibilities of constituents were respected and promulgated and where all were called upon to make
their common and distinctive contribution to the mission of the College. His first priority seemed to be the building of a college community. “The concept implies that we have a unity of purpose and a community of interest that transcends any competition for influence and power... It assumes that all of the segments of the college community are in a profound sense fellow teachers and fellow learners in the common cause of building a first-rate educational enterprise.”

How successful has this outlander been? A quarter century of history provides convincing testimony. Bridgewater State College is now, “a fully accredited, internationally recognized, multipurpose institution.” Still a leader in teacher education, but now a comprehensive college with several divisions of majors each infused with a solid liberal arts base. Growth in numbers — students, faculty, administration, land, buildings, resources, and professional affiliations — attest to remarkable quantitative change during Dr. Rondileau’s tenure. Equally important has been the maintenance of high academic quality in both existing majors and in new fields such as Communication, Aviation Science, Computer Science, and Management Science. He and his colleagues have enriched the tradition and enhanced the distinctiveness of the institution. On its 150th anniversary, Bridgewater State College is strong and vibrant, poised for the next twenty-five years of growth and service.

DR. JAMES J. HAMMOND
CHANCELLOR EMERITUS
MASSACHUSETTS STATE COLLEGE SYSTEM
Major Steps in the College's Development
1960-1989

Part One
The Three Building Challenges of the 1960s
When I arrived in Bridgewater in September, 1962, the College was beginning to grow so very rapidly that it was terribly urgent to add new buildings in order to accommodate the rapidly increasing number of students and new academic programs. The problem was that in the 1960s and 1970s the budget allocation of the Commonwealth for public colleges and universities was very stringent with respect to yearly operating budgets and especially with respect to capital budgets. Since only one building could be hoped for at a time, the first challenge was to decide which building at any given time was the most urgent and hopefully also the most marketable to the Legislature.

The three most urgent building needs were for a new Campus Center, a new Library, and additional Student Residences.

**The Campus Center**

At that time, the College had never had a Campus Center or a Student Center (or, as it is sometimes known, a Student Union). Commuting students who constitute a large portion of our student body had a room in the basement of the administration building (Boyden Hall) with automatic dispensing machines for sandwiches and soft drinks. The room was terribly crowded at lunch time so that many students were driven, even in the most inclement weather, to eating their lunch on the steps of Boyden Hall.

With the assistance of our local state representative Edward F. Kirby,* we gathered together all of the local state representatives and senators first on the campus and subsequently in Boston. When they became fully

*For many years Edward F. Kirby, popularly known as Ned Kirby, was the local district's state senator.
aware of the problems our students, and their constituents, were facing, they were convinced that a major campus center was desperately needed.

After many discussions and meetings on and off campus, I found myself, in the late fall of 1962, in a Senate Ways and Means Committee meeting in the State House. I was informed by the Committee Chair that there was approximately a million dollars in the capital budget for a Bridgewater State College Union Building, but was requested by him not to press too hard that year for two reasons: (1) because the money was inadequate for the kind of building needed; and (2) because hopefully there would be more funds available at later dates.

With this encouragement, we set up an active joint planning committee of administrators, faculty, and students. We envisioned a Campus Center or Student Union complex three stories high, with a center section for a variety of student purposes and two side sections. The first side section would be primarily for a nine hundred seat cafeteria and a college bookstore; and the other side section for a major auditorium and extensive theatre facilities.

Subsequently, we were offered any one third of the building we wanted; one floor rather than three, or a three-story building, one third of the width we felt was essential. We could not accept the offer because it would not have met our basic needs. Later we were offered any one half of the total complex, and still later, any two-thirds. I still felt it necessary to decline. Finally we were offered the whole building without air conditioning installed, but with the ducts provided for future air conditioning. Although many of my colleagues urged me to hold out for installed air conditioning, I thought it prudent to accept that offer.
It took seven years from the meeting of the Senate Ways and Means Committee for that Campus Center to be completed, but everyone agreed that it was well worth waiting for.

The Campus Center complex, for which we planned so thoroughly and worked so hard, has been visited over the years by scores of administrators from other colleges who were planning to erect new campus center facilities or rehabilitate old ones. Because the building is very spacious and beautiful, personnel from other colleges were understandably interested in its physical structure and its layout. They were equally interested in its varied and extensive activities and programs and very especially in its governance system. The ultimate responsibility for the Campus Center rests with the director of the Campus Center who is directly responsible to the vice president of Student Services. That aspect of the campus center governance is quite standard for such centers. However, there is a Campus Center Board of Governors whose recommendations are very influential in the formulation of Campus Center policies. Over the years the membership of the governing board has consisted of sixteen to eighteen members, including three faculty members, three administrators, an alumnus or alumna, and the rest students. This proportion of students, faculty, and administrators has seemed to satisfy the various constituencies in terms of appropriate balance of input into policies. Certainly the structure and effective functioning of the Board of Governors has been a major factor in its perception by the entire college community as being truly what its name implies, a Campus Center.

The New Library

Just as urgent as having a new Campus Center was the need for a new Maxwell Library.
For many years after Boyden Hall (the Administration Building) was built, the Library was a large room on the second floor of that building. Subsequently when the new Gymnasium was built in 1957, the books were transferred from that single room to the old Gymnasium which was redesigned so that it could serve as a Library. Although the erstwhile Gymnasium (now Library) was more spacious than the room in Boyden Hall, it too became more and more inadequate as enrollment increased rapidly, beginning in the academic year 1962-63.

Fortunately, the legislature recognized the need for a new building and funds were made available. Had there been no special complications, the new Maxwell Library might have been built simultaneously with the new Campus Center. We had received the funds to purchase five private homes situated east of the playing field on which it was planned to build the new Campus Center. All but one of the trustees approved the College’s plans to go forward and build on this property, but one trustee demurred. The reason she took exception to the recommendation was her fear that we would be creating an urban-type campus by having two three-story buildings adjacent to each other. The other trustees did not agree with her, but as a matter of courtesy to a fellow trustee, were reluctant to give final approval without her concurrence. She wished to use the original land as either a lawn or a garden and then take — by eminent domain if necessary — private homes across the street further east. This certainly would have resulted in a three or four year delay in building the badly needed Library.

An even more vital consideration, to take additional private homes would have been a serious breach of faith with the Town of Bridgewater. We had purchased the
original five homes with the clear understanding that the land was to be used for a new Maxwell Library. Furthermore, there is little enthusiasm in any town to have property removed from the tax rolls!

We faced a dilemma! The trustees as a group would not act unless they were unanimous; nor would they act without a recommendation from the president.

After a stalemate of several months, I made the following proposal to the trustees: I suggested that they find and employ the most outstanding consultant on college libraries to come and investigate the situation; and then make a recommendation with respect to the location of the Library with the agreement that both the trustees and I, as president, would honor his recommendation. Furthermore, I made it clear that the choice of the consultant would be entirely at the discretion of the trustees.

The trustees did some appropriate research and came to the conclusion that they had found a consultant as expert and experienced a person in the field of college libraries as could be obtained. Accordingly they contacted the library specialist who agreed to come to the campus, indicating that he would discuss the matter thoroughly with the trustees as well as with administration, faculty and student body — the latter including officers of the governing board of the student body. We reviewed most carefully all of the academic implications as well as the community public relations issues that were involved in the location of the library. As a result of that meeting, faculty, administration, and students reached a consensus, namely, that it would be highly undesirable both academically and in terms of community relations to move from the basic site originally chosen.
Fortunately, the library consultant was convinced in his discussions with representative members of the College community that the basic original site should be utilized. At the end of his week of study and conferences with the trustees and with representative members of the College community, he made the following proposals:

1. That the basic original site be used.
2. That the rear of the Library be set back an additional ten feet from the street.
3. That an attractive plaza with trees, shrubbery, and brick sidewalks be placed between the Campus Center and the Library.

All concerned accepted his recommendations, as we had previously agreed to do. I did discover later, however, that it was the unanimousness of the representatives of the entire College community that persuaded the library consultant not to recommend the alternative site!

3. New Student Residences

As indicated above, the rapid growth in number of students made it urgent to add new student residences as well as the Campus Center and the Library. We urgently needed places for at least six hundred additional students in student residences.* In order to satisfy this need and other building needs, it was important to make

---

*In the late 1960s the Shea-Durgin Residences accommodating six hundred students were built on Great Hill, the highest section of the newly acquired upper campus land. They were named after Dr. Ellen M. Shea, alumna and distinguished dean of students and Professor George Durgin, long-time teacher of mathematics.
a major land acquisition preferably across the tracks in the area that was then known as Great Hill because it towered some 130 feet above the main campus. Such an acquisition would allow space for most of the new buildings from the late 1960s through the 1980s and probably beyond.

Thus, as indicated in Part Two, I sought the purchase of an entire Upper Campus which would be ample both for new student residences and also for a new Campus School, one or more new Academic Buildings, major playing fields and major parking space.
Major Steps in the College's Development
1960-1989

Part Two
Acquisition of the Upper Campus
Early in my years here, it was evident to me that if the College were to be able to expand greatly in number of students, in additional buildings, and new academic programs, it would need considerable additional land. I learned that across the tracks from our campus there was a very large plot of land consisting of approximately forty-five acres, which was owned by a Mr. and Mrs. Perry, who at that time were living on what was called the four-legged tree farm on Summer Street. Mr. Perry, was at that time the head supervisor mechanic at the local Buick dealer where I had bought a Buick. I spoke with Mr. Perry about the College’s wish to buy the land which he and his wife owned. Mr. Perry indicated that they had already been approached by a developer who wanted to buy the land, but that they would rather sell it to the College. He asked me if I was sure that the State would buy it, and quite innocently, I said that I was sure!

As it turned out, it took two years to get the State to appropriate money for that land without which the tremendous subsequent expansion of the College would have been greatly curtailed. I also doubt that the Perrys would have waited for the full two years if I had not earlier become friendly with the Perrys. Subsequent to the purchase of the Perry land, additional adjacent land was purchased to enlarge the Upper Campus.

By the Fall of 1989, the Upper Campus was the site of housing for one thousand students in four major dormitories; student apartments for nearly two hundred students; the large new Campus School, and an adjoining College Academic Building. In addition, there were extensive playing fields and parking facilities.
Major Steps in the College's Development
1960-1989

Part Three
The Philosophy of College Community at Bridgewater State College
Everyone's life and work is powerfully influenced by a philosophy, knowingly or unknowingly. Philosophy may or may not be expressed in words. It is certainly implied by actions and behavior, but sometimes the philosophy in words is not necessarily corroborated by behavior and actions.

From my years of experience both in college teaching and college administration, I came to Bridgewater with a deep conviction that the single most important factor in the life of a college is its basic philosophy. The reason is that basic philosophy influences most powerfully the character of the institution as well as the attitudes and morals of all persons connected with the college, including its faculty, students, and administrators.

My personal conviction is that whatever its diversity of personnel and of academic objectives, a college ought to be a true community with a profound sense of common purpose among all of its students and among all those who work for it in various capacities. Therefore, from my very first days and years at Bridgewater and throughout my tenure, I tried in everything I said and did to foster a sense of college community. This obviously required speaking about college community, but more importantly demonstrating it by actions. It is obviously only a necessary beginning if the president believes it is desirable to be a college community. It was much more important that very soon officers of the Student Government Association, when addressing freshmen, began to speak proudly of Bridgewater as being different because it was a community in which students, including freshmen, were important members.

Obviously no one could be opposed to such a concept but it would be legitimate to ask with all other goals and
complexities of a college, "Why is the concept of college community paramount?"

The answer to that legitimate question, unexpectedly and unhappily, came to our College in the late sixties and early seventies when, along with all other institutions of higher education in America, we went through the several very difficult years of student and faculty unrest. This unrest was in part concomitant with the Vietnam War and certainly exacerbated by it.

The philosophy of college community made a significant difference in the College's ability to cope effectively with the unrest because college community was a generally shared value among most of the members of the College. For instance, when there were differences of opinion and sometimes outright disputes, even the so-called radical students frequently argued for their cause by claiming that their solutions "would lead to a better college community."

Clearly to have the philosophy of college community a strong pervasive influence, it must be widely understood, and must be implemented in a myriad of ways. The following two specific examples are illustrative:

(1) Example one is a three-page Position Paper on Rights, Freedoms and Accountability,* issued in 1969 at the height of the nation-wide student unrest in which all actions as well as rights and freedoms are weighed and judged by the desired characteristics of a sound and strong college community.

(2) Example two is a summary I made on September 4, 1980, Basic Management Philosophy of Bridgewater State College.** I trust that no one will be misled by an

*Appendix A

**Appendix B
apparent tour de force of stating the Management Philosophy in ten concepts, all of which begin with the letter C. The really important thing is that each and every one of the ten management concepts is also an integral part of a vital philosophy of college community.

In sum, the concept of community was a basic philosophy rather than a pleasant public relations phrase.
Major Steps in the College's Development
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Part Four
The Validity of College Community Tested by Strong Radical Movement in the late 1960s and in the early 1970s
In the 1960s and the 1970s, American higher education was exposed to an unprecedented period of unrest, radicalism, and sometimes violence. From coast to coast colleges and universities — public and private, large and small — were all affected. The temper and atmosphere of those years is captured in a few brief sentences written about Wesleyan University's 1970 commencement the first year Colin Campbell was president: "Half-carnival, half-protest, the ceremony was ablaze with color as students marched onto Andrus Field wearing clown costumes, Elizabethan finery, bathrobes-anything but academic gowns. Striking employees from Yale imported a full-blown demonstration, ringing the field and chanting protests against then-Yale President Kingman Brewster, who was the speaker and received an honorary degree that day. What was a nice conservative middle-class lawyer like Colin Campbell doing in a place like this?"

For several years one of the special targets of the radical student leaders was institutions in the Boston-Cambridge area. Along with Harvard, Boston University, and Northeastern University, the Massachusetts State Colleges were prime targets of the movement.

The central force in the movement was the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society). "The Port Huron Statement, drafted by (Tom) Hayden and ratified by the SDS National Convention in 1962, introduced participatory democracy. ‘We are people of this generation, bred in at least modest comfort, housed now in universities, looking uncomfortably to the world we inherit.’ The hope for a better world expressed in this sixty-three

page document, included in Miller’s book as an appendix, has been forgotten, its reputation tarnished by the violence it inspired.”

“As a freshman at Pamona, in Clairemont, California, Miller quickly fell in with the radical crowd, many of whom were already members of SDS. ‘My sense of growing outrage over the Vietnam War and my interest in some form of experimentation in a more democratic form of politics developed side by side with my interest in rock and roll — the feeling that the Beatles were creating a really new kind of popular music — and also side by side with experimentation with drugs and the counterculture,’ says the forty-year-old author.”

The SDS established centers in many of the Massachusetts colleges and universities, both public and private. I was very surprised that one was not established on the Bridgewater State College Campus since we had a number of radical students who had some strong disagreements with the administration, including a student strike to protest the non-rehiring of a faculty member. Many months after the period of greatest turmoil, both throughout the State and on the Bridgewater Campus, two of the radical student leaders on campus were talking to me on another matter. Suddenly one of them said, “Do you know why we do not have a SDS chapter on Campus?” I indicated I did not know why. He said, “We would not allow it to come here because even though we disagree about some things on Campus and would like to make changes, we love this College and we are convinced the SDS does not care what happens to this College.”

I had never anticipated that the philosophy of college community would be so severely tested and validated even among anti-establishment students!
Major Steps in the College's Development
1960-1989

Part Five
Major Academic-Related and Building-Related Decisions 1960-1989
Twelve Major Academic-Related Decisions

The following were among the great turning points during the past three decades in the life at the College with respect to its academic nature and curricula.

1. The state legislature's 1960 decision to authorize the four-year state colleges (including Bridgewater) to cease being single-purpose teacher education institutions and to become multi-purpose liberal arts colleges.

2. Bridgewater's decision to become an outstandingly strong liberal arts college. To achieve this, strength was required in the five major divisions of the College (existing in 1962 and for many years subsequently) namely the Division of Social Sciences, the Division of Behavioral Sciences, the Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, the Division of Professional and Special Education, and the Division of Humanities and the Creative Arts. To achieve balanced strength in each of the academic divisions, a divisional dean under the vice president of Academic Affairs was appointed with special responsibilities for coordinating and strengthening the departments within the division. This buttressing of academic departmental strength with academic divisional strength helped the College to develop strong majors.*

3. Bridgewater's decision to become an outstandingly strong comprehensive college (A comprehensive

*For example (1) in the Division of Behavioral Sciences, a new strong major was created in Sociology and Anthropology; and (2) in the Division of Humanities and Creative Arts, new strong majors were created first in speech and drama, then in art, and most recently in music.
college is nationally defined as an institution of higher education consisting of a liberal arts college offering two or more professional programs).

In the decade of the 1970s the following important Professional Programs were added to the curriculum offerings:

- Social Work
- Computer Science
- Aviation Science
  (with concentrations offered in Flight Training and in Airport Management)

At the beginning of the decade of the 1980s, based on the strength of existing curricula both liberal arts and professional, we were ready to enter the large and complex field of Management Science. Management Science is offered with the following six concentrations: Marketing, Transportation, Information Systems Management, Finance and Accounting, Energy and Environmental Resources Management, and General Management.

4. Bridgewater's decision that all of these new professional programs would have a very strong liberal arts component as well as strong professional courses also applied to the long-standing professional education (teacher education) curriculum.

5. Bridgewater's decision to undertake and implement two major revisions of general education requirements thus helping to insure the strength and balance of both liberal arts curricula and professional curricula.

6. Bridgewater's decision to encourage faculty research and as one important means to that end, to
build a strong grants program. In this connection, the College has from time to time published a list of faculty publications and research.

7. Bridgewater's decision to help its students build broad national and international perspectives. Among the steps in this direction are: (1) strong multi-disciplinary courses in American studies and in Canadian studies; (2) encouraging the presence of foreign students and a strong International Club; (3) setting up student and faculty exchange programs with China, Germany, England and Canada*; (4) building a strong foreign languages program offering Chinese and Russian as well as German and Romance Languages.

8. Bridgewater's decision to have strong student support programs along with strong academic programs and excellent teaching. Among such essential support services are the following:

(1) health services, (2) cultural programs, (3) academic counseling, (4) personal counseling, (5) student clubs and other student organizations, (6) athletic programs, and (7) career counseling and placement.

9. Bridgewater's decision to establish the Bridgewater State College Foundation to supplement the limited state-appropriated resources of the College. One recent major result was the Davis Alumni Center which houses the personnel of the Bridgewater State College Foundation and accommodates individual alumni and alumni groups.

10. Bridgewater's decision to work closely with the College's Alumni Association which can contribute so greatly to the College's reputation and effectiveness.

*Separate Canadian exchange programs in Quebec, Arcadia, and Nova Scotia.
11. Bridgewater's decision to build support for the College by establishing positive relationships (1) with the communities of the region and chambers of commerce in the area; (2) with other colleges, public and private within southeastern Massachusetts as well as with the Board of Regents; (3) with local representatives and senators, with the Governor's Office, and with the state legislature.

12. Bridgewater's decision to have managed growth. New strong programs were added gradually while maintaining the high quality of existing programs. The College grew steadily but not precipitously. Otherwise high quality could not have been achieved as the College grew from a few hundred full-time day students to over five thousand; from thirty-six acres to one hundred seventy acres; and from a handful of academic programs to several dozen diverse academic programs, with corresponding growth in the number of faculty and buildings.

Four Major Building-Related Decisions

With respect to land and buildings, there were the following turning points during the past three decades at the College.

1. Bridgewater's decision to wait three additional years for the Campus Center (formerly called the Student Union) until it was possible to get funding adequate to the large and expanding needs of the College. The three-floor, three-section Campus Center has been vital in the life of the College since it was built eighteen years ago. If inadequate funding had been accepted and a much less adequate center had been built
earlier, it would have had adversely affected the quality of life in the College for decades.

2. Bridgewater’s decision not to seek to take additional land for the new Maxwell Library, but to locate it on already purchased land adjacent to the Campus Center. The taking of additional land would not only have delayed the Library for several critical years, but would have been catastrophic in terms of college relations with the Bridgewater community. It would have been viewed as bad faith on the part of the College, since it had previously purchased five homes with the express purpose of locating the Library on that land.

3. Bridgewater’s decision to acquire the Great Hill property across the railroad tracks from the main campus. When I talked to the owners of the property, there were developers who wished to buy it for commercial use. Fortunately the owners were persuaded to wait for the State’s very slow process of purchasing the land. This forty-five acre purchase became the heart of the upper campus where in the 1960s, student dormitories and student apartments were built. In subsequent years the Upper Campus became the site of the following additional major facilities: (1) the Campus Elementary School; (2) an Academic Classroom and Office Building (see below); (3) very extensive playing fields; (4) the largest parking lot on the campus; (5) two large new student residences (1989).

4. Bridgewater’s decision to continue to seek a Campus School despite the fact that virtually all official sources indicated that there would be no such school built on the Bridgewater Campus at least in the twentieth century! Related to that decision was the development of a compromise which gave us both a splendid
new Campus School and the use of some of the proposed Campus School funding to build an Academic Building which was greatly needed, and in fact indispensable to the later growth of the College.*

The words of Marion Stoddart, who was honored by the United Nations Environment Programme for her persistence in achieving the clean up of the Nashua River, are relevant to all college objectives that are difficult to achieve... 

"It is that if you care enough about something you can make a difference; one person can do the work of a thousand. And to be successful, you don't need to be very smart—you only need to be committed and persistent and to keep your focus on what you aim to do. If you are not successful in reaching your goal by one route, try another."

*In the past three decades each new major College building has involved at least six to eight years of complicated planning and effort. In the case of the new Campus Laboratory School and the concomitant three-story Burrill Avenue Academic Building, it took over a decade-and-a-half of extraordinarily involved planning and negotiations to receive state funding for the buildings.
Appendix A

*Position Paper on Rights, Freedoms and Accountability

Dr. Adrian Rondileau, President
Bridgewater State College

1. The campus either has a deep sense of community or is a fragmented chaos.

2. Freedom is indivisible in the campus community.

3. No element of the campus community can be expended in terms of its freedom and rights without endangering the freedom and rights of other elements of the campus community — neither students, nor faculty, nor staff, nor administrators.

4. In a system of colleges under one board of trustees, a maximum of individual campus autonomy is essential for a sense of local freedom and a sense of local involvement in decision making.

5. Important decisions on the local campus — such as reappointments and discipline — must win consent and campus-wide confidence by cooperation in decision making among the major segments — faculty, students, and administrators — of the campus community.

6. So-called freedom for one segment of the campus community that denies and frustrates the rights of others in the community is anarchy.

7. Everyone in the campus community and everyone in society has a stake in academic freedom, academic due process, and the opportunity for genuine dialogue.

8. Clearly destructive of everyone's freedom is any kind of coercion, threat, use of force, whether by occupation of buildings or by an other violence.

9. More subtly, but just as certainly destructive of the campus community, is any grouping of two or more segments of the campus community against other segments, such as

*Written by President Emeritus Rondileau in 1969
faculty and trustees against students, or any other coalition of segments against any one or more other segments.

10. What happens on campus is everybody's business ultimately. Specifically concerned in the last analysis, are parents, alumni, legislators, and the general public who support both public and private institutions morally and fiscally.

11. There are two basic threats to campus freedom today: the first, a fantastic amount of moral and intellectual arrogance in which, both in the campus community and in society generally, some persons are assuming that they have unlimited rights to commit any violence or other attacks on the freedom of others. Their justification is the alleged failure of the so-called Establishment to correct all the wrongs of American society and of the entire planet — such as alleged violence, alleged imperialism and alleged hypocrisy. This is all too easy buck-passing. The second basic threat is argumentation by personal attack, such as a vicious name-calling attack on any member of the faculty, student body, or administration who does not agree with those who assert they have the answers.

12. Invoking the shortcomings of the rest of society does not justify the abridgment of democratic processes on the campus — even under the umbrella of so-called “academic freedom,” “academic sanctuary,” “academic tenure,” or via pronouncements from prestigious ivy-league institutions, or dicta from individuals who use their unquestioned expertness in other special fields to lend authority to their views on politics, economics, sociology, and other areas, in which they have no more special competence than other citizens.

13. The freedom of the various members of the campus community — students, faculty, administrators, staff members and trustees — must reckon with the freedoms of the other members of society who are also subject to frustrations and confusion due to the complexities of the problems confronting the nation and the world.

14. Unrest on Campus is NOT the result of a single simple cause: it includes genuine idealism and legitimate anxiety — shared by much of American society, about a
generally unpopular war, alleged draft unfairness, and the threat of nuclear disaster. It also reflects alienation by bigness, impersonalism, and bureaucratic inertia in adjusting to individual needs in a time of rapid and constant change. Campus unrest also results from, among other things:

1) deliberate revolutionary activity which seizes upon any and all pretexts, grievances and alleged shortcomings; and plays upon the mood of cynicism and distrust of authority;

2) widespread romantic oversimplification of the difficulty of improving institutions and international relations;

3) a lack of appreciation of the great strengths of American society — in terms of the many facets of freedom and other fundamental societal criteria — in comparison with such societies as those of Cuba, Red China, and Soviet Russia.

15. The campus community cannot be politicized without destroying its essential characteristics — and specifically its inherent rights and freedoms.

16. We of the campus community must address ourselves to our common purposes — the cooperative achievement of educational excellence, and the free pursuit of the truth, however unpopular. Only thus can we hope to maximize the rights and freedoms of all. Only thus can we measure up to the great expectations of society and of the campus community itself.
Appendix B

*Basic Management Philosophy of Bridgewater State College*

1. COMMUNITY
   (A. Build Campus sense of belonging to a family).
   (B. Build Campus sense of belonging to a system).
2. COMMUNICATION
   (Inform all concerned fully and early).
3. COOPERATION
   (Be sure that personnel cooperate rather than build private empires).
4. COORDINATION
   (Make sure appropriate coordination takes place among individuals, offices, departments, and areas).
5. COUNSEL
   (Seek it on all matters of consequence. This also helps the objective of meaningful participation).
6. CREDIBILITY
   (Must develop it).
   (Promises must be kept. Bear in mind wishful thinking).
7. CONCERN
   (Show it for individual student or colleague).
8. CONFRONTATION
   (Avoid it if at all possible).
9. CREATIVITY
   (Encourage it).
10. CONTROL
    (Maintain quality of personnel, quality of programs, effectiveness of administration, budgetary and all other fiscal matters, and management organization and procedures).

Adrian Rondileau, President
Bridgewater State College
September 4, 1980

*Written by President Emeritus Rondileau in 1980.*
Appendix C

*Early Experiences and Influences

Over the year many colleagues and students have expressed some curiosity about the kind of background and circumstances that leads anyone into a lifetime career in college administration. In this Appendix, I refer briefly to certain of my early experiences which I believe were important in leading me first into college teaching and then into college administration.

I was born in the New York City borough of Manhattan in the Women's Hospital on 110th Street and Amsterdam Avenue just opposite the Cathedral of Saint John the Divine, which like so many of the great cathedrals of Europe, has been under continual construction for over a century. That general location was prophetic since I lived for the first twenty-three years of my life in that borough. Also my birthplace was within blocks of Columbia University where I did all of my graduate work and where I met Martha Denison*, to whom I was married in the summer of 1936.

In that city at that time, a youngster's world tended to be bounded not only by the one of the five boroughs in which he lived, but also to a great extent by the local neighborhood. Thus, any good Manhattanite in the early decades of this century knew that Manhattan was the center of the universe and that the west began with the Hudson River, which led to a strange country called New Jersey!

Apropos of the neighborhood, as a middle schooler I moved from 99th Street between Columbus and Amsterdam Avenue to 111th Street and Morningside Avenue, the latter address only two-and-a-half blocks from where I was born — and a block from where Lou Gehrig of Yankee baseball fame lived at that time. Subsequently, we moved a third time to 93rd Street between Columbus and Amsterdam Avenue. These might seem to be very minor moves, but they did involve three quite different neighborhoods, both economically and ethnically.

Fortunately there were some circumstances which helped a
great deal to broaden my geographic and intellectual horizons.
As a child I learned French from my grandparents. I also had
cousins who lived in that foreign country of New Jersey,
whom we visited several times a year. Furthermore, they were
of Italian background and, like some French cousins, followed
the old European tradition of being extremely strict with their
children. In the family of my Italian relatives there were two
grown up daughters in their twenties and early thirties, when I
was in my pre-teens and early teens. They were both teachers
in the New Jersey public schools, but were as accountable in
every way to their parents as if they had been teenagers or
even small children. To the best of my knowledge, neither one
ever married although both of them were intelligent, attractive,
and personable. Apparently there were no swains willing to
confront the double barrier of marrying school teachers who in
the bargain had somewhat fearsome and threatening parents
as well as a huge, protective brother.

I also remember when I was very young — perhaps four or
five years old — staying with some cousins of German
background and I remember them teaching me the song “auf
Weidersehen.” Perhaps because of those early experiences and
because I loved to hear the Schubert lieder songs, I have
always felt that I should understand spoken German, which
unfortunately, I do not.

The common thread in these three European backgrounds
was what I, as a thoroughly Americanized boy, thought was an
excessive domination of the children in general, and the girls
in particular, by their parents and perhaps grandparents too.
But some would point out that there are also swings in the
pendulum among generations from parent-dominated families
to children-dominated families — the phenomenon sometimes
spoken of as “spoiled children.”

My high school work at the Townsend Harris Hall, at that
time the preparatory school* of City College of the City
University of New York, was very demanding as was my later
undergraduate and graduate work. Nevertheless, I found time

*The buildings which were adjacent to the College were
taken over for the greatly expended needs of the College
in the 1940s.
for baseball, handball, and running.

One factor that compensated for the inevitable narrowness of vision of a person confined to one community was that from earliest childhood I loved to read and had a wide-ranging interest in almost anything I could read about in books. Reading introduced me to other people and places, to the arts and sciences, and to the limitless possibilities of what one may experience and what one may become.

Some undoubtedly thought I read too much in my younger years. I frequently read and studied while I ate and on my way back home from high school and college. I read in streetcars, in trains, and sometimes while walking. I would never have guessed then that the days of freedom to read whatever I chose would begin to disappear when I got in college administration. This was especially true in my last thirty-five years as a college president. In the presidency one has to read a vast amount of material. However, the great bulk of it is related to the profession and the requirements of the position.

Another circumstance broadened my perspective in the years after completion of my graduate courses. My profession afforded me the opportunity to live in very diverse communities! Persons with exclusively large city backgrounds usually have a different outlook than persons with exclusively small town backgrounds. Consequently, a person who has lived a great deal in both large and small places is more likely to feel at home with persons from any type of community. I had the good fortune to have my personal living experiences divided between urban life (e.g. New York City, Kalamazoo, Michigan and Rio de Janeiro); and small communities (e.g. Mount Pleasant, Michigan; Plattsburg, New York; Yankton, South Dakota; and Bridgewater, Massachusetts). Such varied living background is helpful not only in working with colleagues, but also in relationships with college students and with other citizens of the region.

Another fortuitous factor in broadening my horizons was the opportunity to live and work professionally in Brazil for three years (1943-1946). Not only did this establish a bond with other people who have had similar experiences, but it also
helped me to understand the problems and outlook of foreign students and of other foreigners who came to America. The Brazilian experience also helped in establishing extensive relationships with colleges in other countries and with foreign students both at Yankton College and at Bridgewater State College.

For whatever reasons and circumstances, I early developed a wide range of interests ranging from philosophy, literature, music, foreign languages and science to business and economics. When in the last four decades of my career as academic dean and as president I interviewed candidates for faculty positions in a great variety of fields, that diversity of interests made it much easier for me to find common ground with the interviewees*. Faculty candidates would normally assume that their peers on the faculty would be interested and knowledgeable in their discipline. They would not necessarily assume the same about administrators. Certainly most faculty candidates considered it a plus if the president was genuinely interested in, and reasonably knowledgeable about a candidate’s own disciplinary area.

*Most critical of all, such discussions were invaluable in helping to judge whether or not the candidate had a primary interest in and commitment to teaching, a cardinal qualification in an undergraduate institution in which excellence of teaching is its most important reason for being. There is no necessary conflict in commitment to excellence in teaching and commitment to research. Relevant research can certainly enhance teaching and a great deal of excellent research has been and is being conducted at Bridgewater State College.