

The article that follows originally appeared as Chapter 2 in Torry D. Dickinson's *Community and the World: Participating in Social Change*. The article appears on the Community Studies Department Website with the permission of Nova Science publishers, Inc. With the exception of short passages for purposes of review or comment, it may not be reproduced without the permission of the publisher. We gratefully acknowledge the generosity of the publisher in permitting us to reproduce this chapter for the benefit of our students and others interested in the Community Studies Program at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

William H. Friedland and Michael E. Rotkin

# **COMMUNITY AND THE WORLD: PARTICIPATING IN SOCIAL CHANGE**

**TORRY D. DICKINSON  
EDITOR**

ISBN 1-59033-633-X

Copyright @ 2003 by Nova Science Publishers, Inc.  
400 Oser Ave, Suite 1600  
Hauppauge, New York 11788-3619  
Tele. 631-231-7269 Fax 631-231-8175  
e-mail: [Novascience@earthlink.net](mailto:Novascience@earthlink.net)  
Web Site: <http://www.novapublishers.com>

## **Chapter 2**

# **ACADEMIC ACTIVISTS: COMMUNITY STUDIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ.\***

**William H. Friedland and Michael Rotkin**

## **ABSTRACT**

Community Studies, created in 1969, is an innovative undergraduate major educating social change activists at the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC). This undergraduate program has flourished for over three decades, producing over 1,000 community activists, making contributions to community organizations around the world, and creating a model for engaged academic research at the undergraduate level now being emulated in other institutions of higher learning.

This paper describes the program's intellectual antecedents, the social context within which it was formed, how it was institutionalized within the University, curriculum development and evolution, the central role of experiential field study, senior projects and theses students have produced, and some of the experiences of alumni. The program is described in detail so that those interested in creating similar programs will understand the model and assess its appropriateness for their own academic contexts.

## **THEORY AND TRADITIONS**

Community Studies (henceforth "CS") as a formal academic program and department was created in 1969. Its antecedents rest in the student rebellion, the civil rights movement, and the anti-Vietnam war movement of the 1960s, although its theoretical antecedents are even older. With the passage of almost four decades since the first major manifestation of student activism in Berkeley in 1964 (Lipset and Wolin 1965), there is often a tendency to forget the social turmoil of the period 1964-1972, when movement after movement appeared

---

\*We are grateful for comments by our colleagues John Borrego and Deborah Woo, which have helped clarify some aspects of this paper. The authors are solely responsible for its contents and the paper is not a

---

on the American scene. From the student rebellion (Becker 1970; Bell and Kristol 1969; Horowitz and Friedland 1970; Wallerstein and Starr 1971) which most directly influenced the formation of CS, to movements for civil rights, antiwar movements against the Vietnam war, race and ethnicity-based movements of Blacks and Chicanos, the farmworker movement, the rise of feminism - all of which played a role in stimulating the effort that was embodied in CS, the program was conceived and stimulated with a powerful orientation toward social change.

Part of the background of its formation also rested in the ferment taking place in U.S. universities. While most universities maintained their well-established ways, new programs were beginning to be shaped exploring innovations to make their pedagogy more effective. In the founding document of Hampshire College, for example, its authors wrote:

Hampshire College is the World... The academic program is intended to utilize field experience actively in connection with course work, to allow students time out either before or during college for extended leaves, and to use the "interim" midyear break for off-campus work and study projects (Patterson and Longworth 1966).

The first year of CS operations saw the culmination of the student rebellion in May 1970 with the killing of four students at Kent State University (Gordon 1990; Michener 1971; Bills 1982) and two students at Jackson State College in Mississippi (New York Times, May 15, 1970: 1). The turmoil of this period had not been witnessed in the United States since the labor uprisings of the mid-1930s.

The CS idea was born in a period of considerable spontaneous activism best characterized by the slogan at the beginning of the rebellion in 1964-65: "Don't just stand there, do something!" This spontaneous slogan provided an explanation for what became much mindless activism. While not all American universities joined in the struggle, student movements erupted on campuses such as Berkeley, Madison (Wisconsin), Stanford, Cornell, Columbia, and elsewhere. Students searched for ways to make their activism effective, accelerating the growth of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), that, in turn, sought participation in local utilitarian actions. Among these was an approach that led to a focus on the complicity of universities in the war effort.<sup>1</sup> If nothing else came out of the student rebellion, the separation of profit-making institutes from ownership by universities was one concrete result of the student uprising.,

As the rebellion expanded and grew, students and faculty members were energized and hundreds of experiments were initiated; some students sought a more immediate confrontation with the authority structures of the American university system since President Lyndon Johnson and Congress seemed too distant except for the largest demonstrations.

---

formal representation of the Department of Community Studies at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

<sup>1</sup> University complicity with the war effort took many forms ranging from facilitating interviews by CIA recruiters to faculty conducting research on chemical warfare and counter-insurgency. As the need for troops in Vietnam increased, student exemptions from the draft became subject to examinations, which were held on university campuses. This "conveniencing" of students by holding exams on campus brought home to many the links of universities to an increasingly unpopular war. At many universities, the long established Reserve Officers Training Corps programs came under attack as students demanded their removal from campuses. As the war progressed, students attacked university research entities that had

Often, on many campuses, the traditional doctrine of *in loco parentis*, by which college faculties and administrations acted in place of parents in disciplining student behavior, came under challenge; within a few years, the doctrine was abandoned or significantly modified at many universities.

Almost as rapidly as students began their confrontation with campus administrators, students turned to the outside world. Upset by the abstract academicism of their professors and demanding relevance in their studies, many students turned to the "real world" by translating off-campus activity into field study, i.e., remaining enrolled but obtaining academic credit for the activity beyond the campus. Field study had been, in the social sciences, a well-established practice by anthropologists and sociologists but had been utilized almost exclusively at the graduate level. With the new activism, field study proliferated for undergraduates.

Field study, often referred to at the time as "internships," had a long-established history in many professional schools such as social welfare, business, and nursing. Such internships — periods in which students would confront "real" problems in the "real" world — were also found in a few liberal arts colleges such as Antioch and Oberlin, both of which were well known in academic circles but field study had not extended beyond small elite colleges. Liberal arts programs such as Antioch's had no explicit academic component; students were expected to learn from their off-campus field study but were never institutionally required to come to grips with their field experiences intellectually. The experience was purely internal to each student and the lessons gained were implicit rather than explicit. Nor was the Antioch model focused on social change.

There had also been earlier experiences with field study models but these exposed students to functioning institutions, preparing them for post-university employment. Business, architecture, and engineering schools had encouraged students to take internships to learn practical aspects of daily employment. Some apprenticeships had an explicit academic component, with students required to analyze their experience by writing papers or developing case studies; but just as frequently, experiences were individualized, each student being expected to somehow gain from the exposure to the "real world" without requiring academic reflection that could be examined and critiqued by faculty and community members to assess benefits to potential users of student findings.

During the 1930s, small numbers of students who became radicalized found outlets for political expression in socialist and communist youth groups. for such students the university became a distraction and they left the campus completely. Engaging in radical political activity (especially off-campus activity) while remaining within the university was still to be invented. This was to be a product of the 1960s.

As the 1960s activism became more widespread, field study with a social change focus emerged. In one sense, this innovation was well rooted in the university's Baconian tradition that the world had forms of order — that the systematic application of science and reason could transform what seemed like unformed chaos into order (Busch 2000). Baconian applications had characterized the natural sciences and, with some delay, the social sciences. Bringing together confrontations with the "real world" while seeking social change seemed a reasonable way for the university to operate. It was, of course, not this simple. While field

---

been established at Stanford, Cornell, and the University of California. The connections of U.S. universities to the government and the war, in other words, came under increased challenges.

study had been accepted in anthropology and sociology, it had been accepted only at the graduate level and was considered feasible only after long and intensive preparation.

Now, however, with students on hundreds of campuses seeking relevance off campus but wanting to maintain a relationship with the university, field study emerged as a viable solution. Many faculties had to struggle with its acceptance but field study metastasized nationally. Although it had traditions in John Dewey's educational pragmatism — his notion of learning by doing — 1960's university field study emerged more out of practical experimentation than a conscious search for intellectual antecedents. Similarly, although Paolo Freire in Brazil had developed a theory using everyday life activity for literacy instruction (Freire 1975), his work was discovered in the U.S. only after field study had spread.

What made the CS program unique or near unique were its features: First, the curriculum of the major was centered on the idea of a six-month full-time field study which, second, had to be accomplished within a social change context. Third, the field study had explicit academic objectives, including the production of a senior thesis reflecting the student's learning during the field period.

By the mid-1960s a plethora of field study experiments were getting under way. Some permitted students to go off campus either for credit or without; some offered students transcript notations so that they would have "something to show" for community work. Frequently, with no explicit academic demands (i.e., intellectually processing the field experience in some tangible way such as an analytic paper), some programs required an academic component. But experience was idiosyncratic; students might write papers and submit them to faculty members but with no extension beyond one-on-one interaction.<sup>2</sup> Other programs encouraged students to do field study by providing service to an organization. Again, there might or might not be an academic component; experiences were either individualized or took place in the context of service provision. With the exception of some social welfare schools, few programs had an explicit social change orientation. What was missing were field study programs with an explicit social change orientation and institutionalized academic requirements. This was the program that developed at the University of California, Santa Cruz, taking the form of a distinct department (at that time called a "Board of Studies" at UCSC) with its own faculty and curriculum. Having our own faculty FTE (full-time equivalents) turned out to be crucial to the long-range survival of the program.

Community Studies had its most immediate origin in the Cornell Migrant Labor Program, a year-long course focused on understanding migrant agricultural labor in upstate New York.<sup>3</sup> The Cornell program involved recruiting undergraduates for a preparation for field study semester, largely following traditional sociology and anthropology field preparation; inserting students into migrant labor camps as agricultural workers for a summer of field activity; and

---

<sup>2</sup> This identifies an issue of concern to the Community Studies faculty at the beginning that has never been resolved satisfactorily: the problem of accumulation of individual efforts by students in some way. Once each student completed her or his field study and thesis, activity with respect to the community or organization in which the student had worked, in effect, died. Faculty struggled to develop a limited number of projects where a succession of students would provide continuity and student contributions would begin to accumulate. We were not successful in these endeavors and it has remained a source of frustration for faculty to the present.

<sup>3</sup> The authors of this paper were the developer and instructor of the program (Friedland) and a student participant (Rotkin).

---

conducting a post-field seminar in which the students wrote analytic papers. Students were "serviced" in the field by having their field notes taped and transcribed for them; these became the basis for the post-field analyses.<sup>4</sup>

During the 1967-8 academic year, Friedland was on sabbatical at Stanford and met faculty members from UC Santa Cruz, which had opened in 1965. UCSC students were among the earliest to move off campus into "real life" activities, but UCSC faculty were concerned about some of the exotic experiments such as raft-floating down the Mississippi (recapturing Huckleberry Finn) and redwood hugging. The worry was that the potential for experiential learning was being dissipated in uncontrolled experimentation. Friedland was invited to talk about the Cornell project, which engaged the interest of several UCSC faculty members.

Around the same time, the University of California Regents, disturbed by the urban insurrections of the 1960s, had funded an "Urban Crisis" initiative that called on campuses to create academic programs to respond to the crisis. This provided initiatory funding for new faculty recruitment and program development. Friedland was recruited to initiate CS in 1969.

While CS followed the Cornell model in establishing an integrated program of preparation, field study, analysis, its format was different. At Cornell, all students worked on migrant agricultural labor. At UCSC, students would determine their individual locus of field study. They would engage in preparation and analysis together but there would be no attempt (at least until later) to cluster students around a single area. An important aspect of the UCSC program was that each student would prepare a senior thesis out of the field experience.

One salient emphasis guided students in selecting field study sites: they were strongly encouraged to select field situations with a social change component, to find situations where change was an explicit aspect of the organization or community to which they went. For example, rather than placing students in standard schools, they were encouraged to experiment with new programs aimed at minorities or alternative educational projects. No explicit ideological commitments were made, so an occasional student would stray into CS with a conservative view of social change; such variations were acceptable to the faculty but there is little doubt that students overwhelmingly selected field locations geared at progressive social change.

In many respects, CS fitted very well with the land-grant origins of the University of California although, in the late 1960s, it was regarded as a "radical" experiment. Land-grant universities, originating in the Morrill Act of 1862, had evolved a tradition of providing instruction, research, and the extension of learning to constituent populations. CS followed this pattern, providing teaching and analysis, research (through the production of tangible products), and extension through the utilization of students by external constituencies. CS students would explicitly be oriented to working with constituencies that had traditionally been underserved by the University of California, i.e., minority communities and groups, poverty programs, social experiments.

One early issue had to be resolved: we quickly learned that turning largely inexperienced students loose to form new organizations was doubly perilous. First, students often had little idea of the complexities and difficulties of initiating new social forms. Very often their enthusiasm outran their capabilities. Secondly, when students formed a new organization, if it

---

<sup>4</sup> A book, *Migrant: Agricultural Workers in America's Northeast*, was drawn from student field notes and writings (Friedland and Nelkin 1971).

---

was successful, students would be confronted by unsatisfactory options. Often such organizations depended for continuity on the originating student remaining with the organization, thereby subverting return to the university and completion of the degree. Accordingly, students were encouraged to find existing organizations and communities within which they could work. Existing organizations, already rooted in their communities, served to mediate between the students' idealism and the complexity and often conservative views of the communities being served.

## INSTITUTIONALIZATION

The University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) opened in 1965 so that the campus began its fifth year with the initiation of CS as a major for undergraduates. One of three new University of California campuses — Irvine and San Diego being the other two — Santa Cruz immediately established a reputation for being explicitly oriented to undergraduate education and for academic innovation. Its founding philosophy, in the words of U.C. President Clark Kerr, was to "make the campus seem small as it grows larger" (UCSC Academic Plan 1965: 3) by emphasizing the importance of its colleges and de-emphasizing traditional departmentalism. From its opening, the campus became a magnet for the best, most innovative and experimental — and in some cases, kooky — high school graduates in California.<sup>5</sup>

Although the campus had been founded with the idea that faculty members would be fellows of a college, they were also attached to Boards of Study (departments). Faculty in the humanities and the social sciences were housed in the colleges; natural scientists were allocated offices in the colleges but also had laboratories in a central cluster of science buildings where most tended to spend much of their time. Although it seemed to come as a surprise, disciplinary attachments were starting an inevitable evolution in which departmentalism would become hegemonic. Still, in 1969, colleges were vibrant parts of the Santa Cruz experiment. Into this unfolding drama came CS, the first interdisciplinary department.

Departmental affiliation, however, was the prevailing organizational principle since, in their college roles, physicists hardly knew how to talk to sociologists, and vice versa. In contrast, CS was aggressively interdisciplinary, the first of the campus' interdisciplinary programs. A distinctive complication was added to faculty affiliation because of CS's interdisciplinary character. In other departments, faculty had two organizational affiliations,

---

<sup>5</sup> Indicative of the kinds of energies that students would bring to UCSC was a class created on the spur of the moment as the 1969 academic year opened. A community controversy had developed over the location of a proposed freeway that would come close to the downtown shopping district of Santa Cruz. The City Council favored the proposed freeway location which would eliminate approximately 400 housing units, mostly occupied by retired low-income seniors whose cause was taken up by a right-wing populist woman Council member. The California Transportation Commission was unable to effect a compromise between the Council and the seniors but left the hearing record open for 30 days for additional information. A Freeway study was organized by CS. Twenty-eight students were recruited to a hastily organized class, taught research and interview design, population sampling, interviewing and data processing. The students recruited additional students for various activities. One thousand face-to-face interviews were conducted with a random sample of the Santa Cruz population, data processed on a counter-sorter and analyzed, a report written and delivered to CalTrans within 28 days. The results showed only a small minority of the citizenry supporting the City Council's position. CalTrans shelved the freeway project.

department and college. With no experience in interdisciplinary departments, CS policy required each faculty member to have a traditional disciplinary and college affiliation. This originated because the new department was staffed in part by faculty already in disciplinary departments (politics, sociology, etc.). Begun with the best of intentions, triple organizational affiliation rapidly became unviable, with CS faculty carrying the burden of operating in three demanding organizational environments as the campus shaped itself. Some departments were amenable to joint appointments of faculty with CS; others boggled at the idea and refused. With CS attempting to recruit sociologists, political scientists, historians, fiction writers with anthropological training, community organizers trained as architects, and historians, it became increasingly difficult to find departments willing to share an FTE with CS and, slowly, new faculty increasingly had a single departmental affiliation with CS only.

Highly motivated, UCSC students demanded entry into the decision-making processes of the university. CS students also wanted access to decision-making with the faculty. Initially students demanded equivalent representation with the faculty. After some debate, the faculty proposed that the students could have as many members as they wanted except equivalence. Once students decided to have one member more than the faculty, the issue dissolved. The faculty view was that it didn't matter how many members the students had; it was up to the faculty to convince the students if there was a disagreement. CS faculty accepted student participation in all aspects of running the program although, following university policy, only faculty could formally vote on personnel matters. In practice, decisions in the early years were usually based on consensus. Over the next decade, faculty and students began the institutionalization process, which was largely centered on the evolution of the curriculum, a topic discussed below.

Having initiated an academic program explicitly focused on involving students in social change activities, the faculty was acutely aware of the need to be sensitive to the administrative environment, including the Social Sciences Division, other departments on campus, the campus administration, the University as a whole, and the State of California. Not all of these external entities had to be accorded equal recognition and time, but we could not take their support for granted.

The UCSC faculty was composed of a small number of senior professors with well-established reputations and a much larger number of newly minted PhDs who, on the whole, had been classically trained in their respective disciplines but who had been recruited because of their interest in pedagogic innovation. Few, however, whether senior or junior, had any grasp as to what CS was or how its curriculum worked. Social science departments such as sociology and anthropology understood CS's mission but departments elsewhere were often puzzled by the idea of institutionalizing academic credit as part of a curriculum, especially since some considered the field experience simply as "trouble making." When some students, doing field study with the United Farm Workers union, found themselves on boycott picket lines in front of a California supermarket chain, its chief executive and a major provider of funds to one of the UCSC colleges protested to the UCSC chancellor. The chancellor defended the program on academic grounds: students chose their own field study sites and were expected to act responsibly within the organization with which they did their field study. The University's responsibility, through CS, was simply to ensure that the students were experiencing a university-level education. The chancellor diplomatically rejected the complaint.

This nevertheless served as a warning: the department could not afford to be solely wrapped up in its own work. To let other departments know about CS, it was essential that the CS faculty be active in campus affairs. This was not a problem for a campus still shaping itself, and our faculty actively sought involvement in standard campus committees involving budget, planning, personnel decisions, academic freedom, affirmative action, etc. Connections were made to other departments and CS became legitimated.

The early years through the 1970s were not easy, as cycles of boom and bust normal to California's economy visited cyclical financial crises on the University. When fiscal crises developed, established disciplinary departments looked hungrily at the CS faculty FTEs. Several such crises had deans thinking about the "consolidation" of CS into other departments (especially sociology) as a way of "streamlining."

Part of the vulnerability of CS arose from the effects of California's changing economy on the "market" of student choices of their major. In the early years, with the economy booming and with the pick of California's high school graduates, UCSC had the luxury of all kinds of experimentation. Students flocked into CS seeking outlets for their individual desire for relevance, anxious to pursue areas of interest they saw as their post-university future. As the economy tumbled into crisis in the later 1970s, students moved into a more conservative mood. Economics, for example, which languished for students during the activism period, now became a popular major. CS, in contrast, with students seeking employment in "trouble making" occupations after graduation, found the number of majors dropping. Deans of the social sciences inevitably reminded us that we were near the bottom of the social science division as far as student loading (the number of students majoring in CS and the ratio of students to faculty) was concerned. Over the years and through the financial cycles, the state of the economy has manifested itself in increases and decreases of students majoring in CS.

The relationship of universities to the larger society has been an issue since the first universities were formed in medieval Europe. Ranging from town-gown conflict over student behavior and norms to explicit concerns about preparing students for post-university employment and involvement, universities have responded to financial incentives, legislative interventions, and social pressures with a wide range of programs and activities. Beginning in the 1990s, some universities began to pay greater attention to explicit social missions by encouraging student activity in public service. Since public involvement by students is integral to the CS curriculum and the department continues to encourage field study in communities and organizations traditionally underserved by the university, in a period that also celebrates diversity, the department has emerged as a favorite with campus administrators.

While most of CS's public service activities became manifest in the field study through student placements, the consequences organizationally for many communities were profound. In the Santa Cruz area, CS students, through their field placements, were responsible for providing the basis for many community organizations such as Senior Legal Services, child care and after school programs, AIDS projects, domestic violence prevention groups, an immigration project, tutoring programs, drug and alcohol programs, neighborhood organizing projects, political advocacy and civil rights groups, to mention only a few.

## EVOLUTION OF THE CURRICULUM

From the outset in 1969, the CS program had a basic curriculum for students to complete the major. Students took an initial Preparation for Field Study course, undertook a six-month (two academic quarters) internship, returned to campus to take an Analysis of Field Study course, and completed the program with a senior thesis or project.

The preparation course was intended to introduce students to field methodology as well as to raise ethical issues likely to be confronted. The primary methodology, still fundamental to the program, was participant-observation, a method in which students attempt to maintain critical perspective while committing themselves to their organization and immersing themselves in the group's daily work. The preparation course originally included an eight hour-a-week "part-time" placement with a local community group which served both as a "laboratory" for experientially based assignments in understanding social organization, taking field notes, learning how to conduct interviews, and as an introduction to issues students would likely be confronting during their internships.

For the first decade, the preparation course was actually composed of two courses for credit, one for classroom work and one for part-time field study. The course was co-taught by two faculty to insure an interdisciplinary approach and encourage students to develop an approach to field study based on diverse perspectives from the faculty.

Because of student complaints that the two-course preparation requirement made it difficult to take a sufficient number of theory and elective courses, the preparation course was reduced to a single course and the part-time field study was reduced from eight to six hours a week. Later, because of limited faculty resources and the need to teach substantive courses, co-teaching of the preparation course was abandoned.

Initially, the only requirements for the full-time internship or field study (the terms have always been used interchangeably) were that students work with an existing community organization (not on their own), and that the organization not be located on a college campus. Full-time internships were initially mostly with organizations located in the communities close to campus, although from the beginning, one student went to Ireland to work with an intentional community serving people with mental health problems and another went to San Francisco to work with its Zen Center.

The analysis class following their return to campus was always intended to help students put their experience in the field into a wider theoretical and political context. When the program was small, the course was a combined analysis and thesis-writing course co-taught by two faculty. Later, the two courses were divided into a separate Analysis of Field Study course followed by a Thesis Writing course and the courses are no longer team-taught.

Over time, the curriculum has seen a number of changes. Most interestingly, students have consistently argued for and won faculty approval for required courses to provide more theory and background related to the kinds of fieldwork they undertake.

Fairly early, a requirement was added for a theory course taught by CS faculty. Initially, the course was offered as an introduction to social theory rooted in Marxist and neo-Marxist approaches and integrated with feminist and anti-racist concerns. While generally well received, outside reviewers of the program suggested that it had too limited a perspective. The department then experimented with a new course offering "conservative, liberal, and radical" theoretical approaches to social change. This approach was not well-received and a third

approach was tried involving each of the faculty coming to the class to explain his or her approach to theory and practice, usually organized around a field study that the faculty member had conducted previously. Again, students complained that the course seemed "disjointed," "too busy," and that many of the lectures appeared unrelated to particular students' interests.

Finally, the department adopted its current approach to theoretical preparation. This involves a series of "theory and practice" seminars. Each faculty member offers a seminar related to his or her research area, teaching students relevant theory and examples of practical organizations and work. With the support of the program's field study coordinator, faculty are increasingly developing working lists of organizations they recommend to students as sites for full-time field studies. Students can either select from these lists or work with the field coordinator to develop placements related to the theory and practice seminar they have selected.

Theory and practice seminars offered by the program vary slightly from year to year and have included:

- Labor Movements and Immigration
- Health Activism
- Economic Justice
- Race, Gender, Work and Family
- Schooling, Inequality, and Social Change
- Resistance and Social Movements
- Sexual Politics
- Social Documentation
- Asian Americans and Social Change
- Youth Societies and Schooling
- Arts and Social Change
- Global Capitalism and Community Restructuring

This approach has been successful both with students and faculty. Faculty members feel that students who join the major are interested in their areas of work, and students feel their theoretical preparation is focused on areas where they will be doing field studies. Faculty attempt to be flexible and broad in how they define the topics of theory and practice seminars; however, the program only has a limited number of faculty and the foci of the seminars do not cover every conceivable student interest. Consequently, there have been students who might have majored who cannot find an appropriate theory and practice seminar and must choose other majors. Nonetheless, the theory and practice seminars are popular with students and the courses are responsible for the increase in the number of students enrolling in the major, now the fastest growing major at UCSC.

Although there was a negative impact, in increased faculty time, of having each faculty member teach a theory and practice seminar, the new format represented a welcome change. It had the consequence, however, of the faculty withdrawing from sponsoring field studies. The field study coordinator, also a lecturer in the program, now sponsors these seminars. Previously, faculty followed students through the entire curriculum; now they lose contact while on field study. This decrease in the direct supervision of field studies by faculty is

---

creating some feeling of disconnect and alienation from the heart of the undergraduate program. Addressing this problem is currently the focus of faculty discussion.

In addition to the theory course, and to meet consistent student demand for better theoretical preparation, the program added a requirement for three upper-division elective courses which must be related to each individual student's field study. One of these electives must be taken in the CS Department, but the other two can be taken from any campus program. Students, for example, take courses in general social theory, such as a course in Marxism or urban economic issues; courses providing background on the geographical context for their organization, for example, courses on Latin American history or politics; social movements; or courses related to issues they will confront in field study, for example, courses in health care systems or adolescent development.

### **SPECIAL CURRICULA AND THE PROBLEM OF "ACCUMULATION"**

The department continually sought to resolve the problem of "accumulation," i.e., overcoming the individual student's project "dying" when they left the field. Two experiments were notable, even if neither survived. The first was the "Second Curriculum," modeled after the Cornell Migrant Labor Program, which allowed a faculty member to plan a curriculum around a clearly defined research project. Students took group independent studies and courses with the faculty member with the expectation that senior theses would be part of the larger research endeavor. In practice, the faculty who undertook second curriculum projects found that they were unable to attract sufficient numbers of students to justify the faculty member being released from other teaching obligations.

A second more successful curricular innovation was the "Extended University" in which the curriculum was adapted to offer a BA program to community workers of a Model Cities Program in Fresno, California, and social service agency employees in San Jose. In place of the field studies of the on-campus students, Extended University students were given special preparation to make their employment locations into field study sites. New faculty were hired to teach in Fresno and San Jose and teaching exchanges were arranged to provide these students a reasonable range of course alternatives.

Ninety percent of those admitted to the Extended University successfully received Bachelor's degrees. The program was successful in getting older students, mostly people of color who had dropped out of college, to think critically about their community employment. Students were encouraged to focus on ways to empower their clients and involve community residents in the planning process for city redevelopment or as activists in structuring of social service delivery plans. Students loved the program and most learned how to navigate through the many contradictions of being simultaneously an employee and a social change activist.

Despite the success of the Extended University program, it was terminated after four years because California Governor Jerry Brown found it "inconsistent with the educational mission of the University of California to educate the *best students in the state*" [emphasis added], i.e. high school graduates in the top 12% of their class. The decision to close the Extended University may have been the result of a lost "turf battle" between the University and the State University system which had branches in Fresno and San Jose, but the real reason may never be known.

## FIELD STUDY

The full-time six-month field study has always been the heart of the CS program. In exit surveys completed by graduating seniors and in an alumni survey conducted after fifteen years of the program's existence, students uniformly reported that full-time field study was what they liked most and was of lasting importance in shaping their lives.

With guidance from a faculty advisor (usually the faculty teaching the student's theory and practice seminar) and the program's field study coordinator, students select a field study based on their academic and social change interests. A major task is to direct students toward placements in which they can observe and participate in social change processes and distinguish them from other forms of social service. Although the CS program is a form of "service learning," it is distinguished from most service or experiential learning programs by its emphasis on social change. CS encourages students to locate their placements in organizations explicitly committed to social change or open to students exploring social change with or within their organizations. While many students select social service organizations whose central mission is to provide services to low-income or underserved ethnic populations, preparation and feedback students receive on their field notes push them to focus on social change opportunities.

"Social change" versus "social service" has been the subject of continual discussion and debate since the founding of the department. Faculty always recognized that service to the sponsoring organization or community was an integral part of the student's field study. At the same time, the faculty was committed to the perspective that no student should treat the field study simply as an opportunity to provide service. Students, we believe, should consciously be alert to issues, challenges, and opportunities for change aimed at making their sponsoring organization more democratic, participative, and reducing hierarchy and its privileges. Change orientations have to be introduced with great care since students are essentially "visitors" until they might become actual participants. The service-vs.-change tension is continuing and can only be resolved by each individual student during the field period.

This is, of course, not an even or uniformly successful process. Many students take positions in cutting-edge social change organizations and welcome the opportunity to become activists in the social change process. Others have views along a continuum that, at its other end, see any form of service as a form of social change — or as is sometimes stated: "If I just help one person solve one personal problem, I will have made a difference." Few students leave the program, however, without an appreciation for the distinction between the kinds of social services that reinforce existing social arrangements and activities which organize communities and/or empower their members to take more active control of the institutions affecting their lives.

CS students work for a variety of types of organizations including community-based, non-profits (or NGOs in the international context), governmental agencies, unions, political parties, alternative schools, and occasionally for-profit groups. Non-profit agencies include community health centers in inner cities or on Native American reservations, HIV/AIDS projects, drug and alcohol rehab programs serving adolescents, battered women's shelters and domestic violence education projects, family planning agencies, affirmative action advocacy groups, international development groups like Oxfam America, groups producing film and video documentaries, and community access television and radio stations.

---

Educational placements may include community schools, after-school programs for at-risk youth of color, schools in intentional communities, outdoor education programs for at-risk youth, or special programs for children, youth, or adults with a wide variety of disabilities. Work with youth has been a continuing area of interest, and we strive to direct students away from work as aides in traditional public school classrooms and toward placements involving the empowerment of youth in anti-racist, anti-sexist, and other movements addressing social inequality.

Governmental placements have included working in focused programs for elected officials or public administrators, regulatory agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency, environmental health departments, city and regional planning agencies, and legislative committees. Students have worked with alternative political parties or on citizen-generated electoral initiatives or referenda. Although few students work with for-profit groups, students occasionally find appropriate placements with them; one student worked with a for-profit group developing, selecting, and distributing media to schools on sex education, family planning, and HIV/AIDS.

In all placements, faculty and staff seek to ensure that students are not just doing repetitive, routine activities (mundane work that develops few skills) or serving as file clerks or receptionists. Every placement has its fair share of routine administrative work, but it is our responsibility to prepare the students for more challenging activity organizing community groups, mobilizing client action, or doing direct educational work with the broader community outside the agency. For example, in work with unions, we encourage students to look for placements involving organizing unorganized sectors of the workforce rather than just providing services to organized union members.

Students sometimes become responsible for starting new projects within their placement agencies after discovering unmet needs of clients or the broader community served by the agency. In some instances students have been responsible for creating new agencies or organizations. One, for example, used his field study as an opportunity to "field test" ideas about starting Barrios Unidos, an organization he currently directs and which has grown to 27 chapters in over fifteen states. Another student had major responsibility for creating a new Family Court system in San Jose, California, when she "discovered" the ineffectiveness of the regular court system in handing family law cases during her field study.

Field studies are currently divided more or less evenly among placements in Santa Cruz County, other places in California and the United States, and outside the United States. In the Santa Cruz area, our students provide significant contributions to local non-profits and it is not an exaggeration to say that, without their thousands of hours annually committed, the social service network would be in profound disarray. Many political changes that transformed Santa Cruz from a conservative Republican town to one of the most liberal in the country (with a string of socialist, gay, and feminist mayors, an extensive social service network, and progressive and environmental policies with local educational, business, and civic organizations) are a result of CS internships. One example is a field study in which a student organized a network of social service agencies and activist groups to redirect county financial resources from road projects, sheriff patrols, and public works boondoggles to childcare, senior, homeless, and other social service programs.

In other parts of the country, students have worked with housing projects in the Bronx; political organizations among Native Americans; unionization efforts in rural Mississippi; and socialist, gay, anti-racist, and feminist newspapers and radio and television programs.

Sometimes placements are with local grassroots organizations like a group of housewives fighting a toxic waste dump near their neighborhood; other students work to transform large corporate organizations and structures — for example, the student who got a placement writing health scripts with a feminist perspective for Dateline NBC and the one who infiltrated the Miss California (segment of the Miss America) contest to expose its sexist bias.

Outside the United States, our students tend to be concentrated in Mexico and Central America; however, students have worked on every continent: with street kids in Zimbabwe, Nicaragua, Mexico, El Salvador, and Italy; battered women's shelters and battered women's groups in Mexico, France, England, Argentina, and Chile; political parties in Quebec, Mexico, and Italy; women's cooperatives in Guatemala, China, Nicaragua, Brazil, and South Africa; midwives in South Africa, Ghana, Guatemala, and Mexico; family planning groups and health centers in every country in Central America and five countries in Africa; youth groups in fifteen countries; HIV/AIDS projects involving needle exchanges and education for sex workers in Thailand, New Zealand, Australia, Mexico, and France; arts groups working with youth throughout Latin America; unions in eighteen countries; peace groups on every continent; economic development projects in Africa and Latin America; peace groups in Palestine and Israel; gay, lesbian, and transgendered groups in Australia, France, Italy, and Mexico; and indigenous groups in a wide variety of Latin American and African nations.

While the critical skills and attitudes which CS students are encouraged to develop and carry with them to their field studies may sometimes be the source of tension between students and their organizational supervisors or other staff in the field study organizations, they are equally as often the basis for improvement in the field study organizations. Of course, teaching students how to make suggestions for change in a way that is respectful of their organizations and that they do not come across as arrogant or impatient is not easy. However, evaluations by supervisors often emphasize their appreciation for the "breath of fresh air" that students bring — fresh ideas, enthusiasm, and a deep belief that positive and meaningful change is possible.

Although a surprising number of students make significant contributions to the social change process while in field study, we understand the limits of what can be accomplished in a six-month period. We therefore emphasize the importance of students viewing the field study as a learning experience. The opportunity for critical reflection in notes students keep every day while in the field and the feedback on those notes are viewed as opportunities to refresh the students' critical approach. Students who write that "there is nothing new to write notes about" are pushed to think about the social change opportunities which present themselves in virtually all community work and to take a more proactive approach — at least in their field notes — to thinking about what might be done to more effectively deliver services or empower clients or communities. The degree to which they can realistically implement the strategies they develop in their notes, of course, varies with the placement, views of other staff, and a host of complex factors.

Although a few students return from field study with a cynical view of the possibilities for change, the overwhelming majority come back excited and energized. The analysis class places them with other students returned from internships and they quickly become aware that they are not alone in having encountered barriers to social change, limits to their ability to solve particular problems, or an inability to overcome the alienation and/or apparent apathy of the people they were trying to mobilize toward some particular goal.

---

Fortunately, it has been our experience that bringing students together encourages the constructive analysis of what they might have done differently to achieve more success in their social change goals. Both by reviewing the students' own self-assessment, and based upon faculty evaluations of the work following their return to campus, it appears that fulltime field study reinforces and strengthens rather than undermines students' commitments as change activists.

## SENIOR THESES

A critical element in the institutionalization of CS rests upon the "tangible manifestation" of the individual student's learning, the senior thesis.

In the beginning and until the requirement was modified in 1990, all students were required to present a senior thesis for examination before being certified as having completed the major. As previously noted, the thesis could take a multiplicity of forms but it had to be tangible, transmittable, and examinable orally. Furthermore, for the first 15 years, the oral examination on the thesis included two CS faculty members and a person from the community or organization with which the student had done the field study.

Although it was not intended for these purposes, the senior thesis collection became a bulwark for the department when it was threatened during recurrent fiscal crises. When CS faced its first external review, we wanted reviewers to be exposed to our students and their products. Meeting with students gave the reviewers a sense of the enthusiasms students brought to CS. Reviewers were invited to pick half a dozen theses off the shelves and examine them overnight. Despite the occasional weak thesis that had been accepted, the overall quality was impressive and the collection proved to be a significant academic achievement on which review after review commented in the most favorable terms. One early external reviewer found the theses, "the equivalent of most master's theses in the social sciences."

The thesis collection continues to grow year by year; it now totals over 950. Approximately fifty percent of the students now choose to prepare a thesis. All senior theses (including those from other departments) are managed by the Special Collections library and are physically housed in Special Collections in McHenry Library or, for older ones, at the University's Northern Regional Library Facility. Theses do not circulate.<sup>6</sup> Because some theses deal with delicate topics, they cannot be photocopied except by the author's permission. Almost all theses are in English but the odd one can be found in another language where the student felt that language would make the thesis more accessible to the community where the student did fieldwork. Student theses have included social science analyses of organizational activities; novels, collections of short stories, and poetry; handbooks for their organizations on how to access

---

<sup>6</sup> Senior theses are not catalogued in the University's Melvyl electronic catalog but can be accessed through the Internet. Begin at the Community Studies Web site (<http://communitystudies.ucsc.edu>), click on "General Information" and on the screen that opens, scroll to "Thesis Requirement Information" and click on "Thesis Data Base." This will open the Thesis Collection search screen (<http://libweb.ucsc.edu/Search.html>). Searches can be made by author, title, keywords, or year of thesis submission. The catalog does not contain abstracts of theses. Theses are available in the UCSC Special Collections of McHenry Library at UCSC. [N.B. a change following publication: Theses are available only at the CS Department.]

services; guides to community resources for clients; and funding proposals for their field organizations. A sample of thesis titles include:

- The Role of Women in the California Agricultural Labor Force
- Training Manual for Lay Persons Handling Welfare Cases
- A Study of the Inadequate Enforcement Policies Concerning Farm Labor Codes in Santa Clara and San Benito Counties
- Palestinians Under Occupation
- Construction Dysfunction: The Role of the Capitalist State in Undermining Community Organization
- Otra Historia Interminable: La Historia de los Campesinos de Ixcamila y su Historia
- Virtual Organizing: Contingent Workers in the High Tech Industry
- Bar Raids and Bible Thumpers: Empowering Queer Young Adults in Dallas, Texas
- Getting the Bugs Out: A Critical History of Insect Control Technology, and Designer Genes: The Emergence of Genetic Engineering
- Liquefying Capital and Liquidating Labor: The Case of Firestone, Salinas, California

The collection draws two to three students each week throughout the academic year. Students preparing for fieldwork are encouraged by instructors to do a keyword search for theses relevant to their field interests; students preparing theses also use the collection as models for their own work.

In addition to the written theses archived with Special Collections, many theses are produced in alternative formats and stored with the Social Science Media Lab, including video documentaries on youth and drug prevention and the history of the abortion issue. One student produced an hour-long audio documentary on the international debt crisis and its impact on Latin American nations that was carried on many National Public Radio stations across the country. Another produced a slide show on the dangers and high costs associated with nuclear power. One student created a musical CD produced by kids at a Boys and Girls Club, along with a guide on how to start and fund an after-school music program for at-risk youth.

Several students each year also complete the senior requirement by teaching a student-directed seminar on issues confronted on their field studies. Some examples include:

- Filipino-American Identity and Community: Current Issues and Challenges
- Environmental Policy and the Sustainability Movement
- Zapata Vive: Chiapas in Struggle
- Critical Passage: Imploding Constructions of Teenage Sexuality
- The Idea and Practice of Cooperation
- Exploring Jewish Identity: Current Issues and Challenges
- Permaculture and Social Change
- Queer Public Health
- The Politics of Health Care in Guatemala
- Feminism and Activism

- Anti-Racist Organizing
- Grant Writing for Non-Profits
- The Web of Life, the Systems Approach to Health
- Women's Empowerment Through Reproductive Knowledge
- Sex Work, Youth Empowerment, American Poverty and Child Welfare
- Teen Pregnancy and Prevention.

Several students have written plays and others have presented theses as works of fiction or collections of short stories. The range of theses has been enormous.<sup>7</sup>

## ALUMNI AND OUTCOMES

CS is currently the fastest growing undergraduate major at UCSC, having increased approximately 30% annually for the last four years. Beginning with an initial complement of twelve students, the program grew fairly quickly and stabilized as a major with about 50 to 60 students annually. Essentially a two-year program, this meant in practice that the program was sending out about 25-30 students a year on full-time field study and graduating roughly the same number each year during the 1970s and 1980s and into the middle of the 1990s.

Since the introduction of the theory and practice seminars five years ago, the program has grown to over 200 majors annually or a graduating class of about 100 students. The program has always had a low attrition rate, graduating over 95% of those who enter the major as juniors or sophomores.

Taken as a whole, there is every indication that CS has been successful in meeting its goal of preparing students to be active in social change activities after graduation and, it is to be hoped, for their lifetimes. Our graduates move into a wide variety of occupations. Perhaps the largest single employment category is directors and assistant directors of non-profit or governmental social service, affordable housing, or public health programs. The second largest occupational category is educators. Our alumni include large numbers of public and alternative school teachers at every level from pre-school to university. Many graduates have developed careers as school counselors, principals and other administrators, or special education teachers, while others work in social service programs serving at-risk youth.

A significant number of alumni work in the public sector as city managers, mayors of small and large cities, and middle-level managers or department heads in city, county, state, and federal government agencies. Over a dozen of our graduates work as union organizers and an equal number as community organizers for groups tackling a wide variety of social, economic, and political issues. Many graduates have positions as community or regional planners. Other alumni are self-employed as consultants in fields like environmental protection and planning, educational innovation, organizational development, and community arts development. Still others work as proposal writers.

<sup>7</sup> Since 1990, because of pressure of increasing enrollments and the stable size of the faculty, a new option, the Synthesis, has been offered as an alternative to the thesis. To fulfill this requirement, students submit a collection of already-written papers plus a new synthesis paper tying the papers together. Currently about one-third of the students utilize this option.

Dozens of other alumni work as medical doctors, physicians assistants, midwives, nurses, and public health educators, while others work as lawyers, most of whom are in public service sector positions as public defenders, labor lawyers, or as counsel for social service and social change organizations.

A growing number of recent graduates have found employment as reporters for print and broadcast media or managing alternative television and radio stations or alternative print media outlets. Several work as documentary filmmakers or on news production crews. Many alumni make a living as writers (fiction and non-fiction, including technical writing) and others have published novels, stories, poems, plays, or have directed or produced video documentaries.

Some of our alumni have made significant contributions in creating new organizations to respond to social needs. As mentioned earlier, Daniel "Nane" Alejandrez created Barrios Unidos, a national organization with 27 chapters around the country working to reduce barrio or ghetto warfare by providing positive alternatives to youth at risk for gang involvement. The organization now employs three of our graduates in its executive management team and others as directors or staff of local chapters. Another graduate, Christine Longaker, played a major role in the creation of Hospice, an organization providing services to terminally ill individuals and their families throughout the United States. Tony Newman, who graduated in 1998, created an advertising agency to promote peace and social justice issues. Margaret Cheap was the first director of the Santa Cruz Community Credit Union, which began with all its assets in a cigar box and currently has over \$40 million in assets and is a major lender to workers' cooperatives, female- and minority-owned businesses, and affordable housing projects. She went on to help found the National Cooperative Bank in Washington, D.C. Another graduate, Ron Garcia, is the Mayor of San Jose, California, while two other graduates, Jane Weed and Christopher Krohn, have been Mayors of the City of Santa Cruz. Graduates too numerous to mention have served on advisory bodies to local, state, and national governments.

A systematic attempt to assess the program's effectiveness in meeting the goal of preparing graduates for lives as social activists was made through a mail survey in 1993, following a recommendation of an External Review Committee. We received responses from 197 of the 745 students who had graduated from the program over the first 23 years. Respondents were fairly randomly distributed across the 23 years. Those years with significantly more or less than the average level of response are randomly distributed over the life of the program with no observable concentrations in the early, middle, or recent years. Of course, respondents may be skewed in their responses to particular issues. Analysis based on cross-tabulations of two issues suggests that support for the program is not related to the length of time since graduation, while the value attributed to various components of the program (e.g., the part-time field study, elective classes, etc.) declines in direct proportion to the time since graduation. Overall, the results reflect positively on CS. They demonstrate that we have been successful in our primary goal of preparing social activists to integrate social change goals into their work and leisure lives.

Seventy-eight percent of the respondents are professional or technical workers with the remainder spread fairly evenly among the other occupational categories. Seventy-three percent were currently employed in jobs with self-described social relevance and 82% have jobs with either high or medium social relevance. Sixty-one percent of the respondents

---

obtained a first job after graduation with high social relevance and 30% said that their field study led to their first employment after graduation.

Three-quarters of the graduates responding to the survey said they were more concerned with the creativity or social contribution involved in a job than having a high salary (5% prefer high wages and 15% rate them equally). Nevertheless, 95% of our graduates have employment histories demonstrating high or medium upward occupational mobility (61 % with high vertical mobility). An examination of the jobs held by alumni since graduation is impressive, with large numbers working as agency directors of non-profit social service agencies or holding management positions in government, legal, and educational institutions. Many have received impressive honors of various kinds. Slightly over half of our graduates went on to post baccalaureate or professional degrees including M.A., Ph.D., J.D., M.D., M.S.W., Education Certificate, and others.

One set of questions on the survey asked alumni to rate their social concern at various periods since entering the CS major. In this self-assessment, those with very high and high social concern went from 66% at the time of entering the major to 87% after graduation. Most significantly, very high or high social concern only dropped to 83% at the current time. Those rating themselves with low or very low social concern went from 8% before entering the major to 5% at the current time. It appears that the CS experience not only raised the level of our students' social concern while they were in the program, but it also helped foster a lasting level of social concern after they left.

Alumni also rated themselves on their social involvement. Unsurprisingly they consistently rated their level of involvement lower than their level of concern. Only 46% rated themselves as having a very high or high social involvement before entering the major. Seventy-two percent rated themselves as having a very high or high level of social involvement after field study. At the time of the survey, 63% rated themselves as very high or highly involved. However, only 12% rated themselves as having low or very low levels of social involvement compared with 25% at the time they entered the major.

It is possible that alumni are simply displaying the high expectations they hold for themselves about social activism. When asked to combine their social concern and involvement and compare themselves with others, 82% of the alumni rated themselves as more socially or politically involved than their neighbors. Only 2% rate themselves as less concerned or involved. Our own assessment of alumni social involvement in community, social, and political activities, as measured by the activities listed in their responses, support the alumni's views of their level of involvement as high compared to others in society. Seventy-three percent engage in some social involvement outside of work, and 61 % demonstrate high or medium levels of such activity. It is possible that these numbers underestimate levels of involvement since alumni may not have listed all their non-work activities.

A comparison of past to current community involvement indicates that our alumni have been fairly consistent in their high levels of community engagement over time. Other responses revealed that 77% of the alumni feel positively about having chosen a nontraditional major as an undergraduate. Seventy-one percent have encouraged others to major in CS.

From anecdotal evidence based on alumni contacts in recent years, it seems clear that CS has been able to do an impressive job of creating and reinforcing a strong sense of social commitment among its graduates.

## CONCLUSION

The CS program has existed as a unique and growing undergraduate program for over thirty years. The program has been through five highly successful external reviews and receives frequent public statements of support from the UCSC Chancellor and campus administrators. While, of course, many educators have succeeded in creating or reinforcing a strong sense of social commitment in their students, entire programs explicitly created to produce the kind of progressive outcomes realized by CS are rare, if they exist at all.

A critical element in supporting the program has come in every external review of the Department. Reviews have been uniformly positive in evaluating the program, assessing the faculty in its teaching and research, and being impressed with the caliber and quality of its students. Perhaps the best way to summarize the accomplishments of CS is to quote from the last two external reviews. The 1994 review committee, commenting on the academic quality of the Department, wrote: "...our assessment is very strong and definitive: the overall approach of CS is intellectually coherent, socially significant, pedagogically innovative, and organized and managed with painstaking care.... Santa Cruz should be extremely proud of what this unit has accomplished in refining a model that combines pedagogy and community service to the enormous benefit of each."

The 1999 External Review Committee came away from its campus visit "deeply impressed with the Department's high scholarly quality, pedagogic integrity and future prospects." Casting its report substantially on the increased interest in universities in experiential education, the Committee found a number of features that "stand out": the long-term fulltime field study requirement for all students majoring in CS, the "rigorous and integrated system of courses to prepare students," and the "distinctive orientation to placing students in field sites oriented to social change."

We would not want to suggest that every element of the CS model is the most appropriate for other programs. The program has gone through changes, many of which were prompted by demands or issues specific to the UCSC campus, funding priorities of the University of California, or other exigencies about which it is difficult to generalize. Taken as a whole, however, we believe that the program has done a remarkable job within existing constraints and provides a model on which to fashion future programs intending to educate social activists within the university.

There are prospects for new programs that build on our experience. Whereas the conditions under which the CS program was founded in 1969 and the present differ considerably, we are persuaded that possibilities exist currently for new programs modeled on our experiment. The birth and continued existence of CS was clearly advantaged by the radicalization of the 1960s and the arrival on the university scene of UC Santa Cruz, anxious to experiment. While such conditions were unique, the present situation may actually offer a context equally conducive to undertaking new programs.

First, there is a growing interest within higher education in experiential learning and "service-learning" where student interest in public service is linked explicitly to academic programs. Generally, there is an increased concern and commitment within public universities and colleges in providing public service to various constituencies, as more and more universities are "celebrating diversity," anxious to reach new constituencies previously not

---

served or underserved by institutions of higher learning, including communities of color and low-income.

Secondly, growing intellectual movements in virtually every academic discipline, ranging from physics to the social sciences and the humanities, are challenging the model of the detached and objective scientist who was expected to approach the object of study only at a distance and avoid any pre-determined commitments to outcomes or sympathetic involvement in the needs of communities or their residents. Anti-positivist movements in the physical sciences have been paralleled by the rise of critical theory and deconstructionism in the social sciences and humanities. The new recognition by academic disciplines of the impact of point of view, the breakdown of the absolute distinction between theory and practice, and the acceptance of practical outcomes as important factors in the university's research mission are transforming the landscape on which new programs can try to plant themselves.

At its worst, it should be recognized that the transformation of the university mission to recognize a public service component and changes in the disciplines themselves to a new engagement with practical issues can lead to the prostitution of institutions of higher learning to the powerful and moneyed interests of the corporate world. At the same time, one result of these trends is a serious compromise, if not the destruction, of the "ivory tower" attitudes toward "objectivity" and insularity that formed the major bulwark against programs like CS in the early 1970s.

Currently, there is also a growing interest by foundations and other extramural providers of funds for service-learning experiments. Literally dozens of foundations as well various federal and state funding sources exist that will provide start-up funds for new programs that attempt to integrate public service into academic institutions. The key for academics with a commitment to social activism is to use these opportunities for new programs that are explicitly focused on service-learning with a social change emphasis of the kind embodied in the CS program.

In summarizing some of the key elements that led to the success of the CS program, we emphasize:

- 1 The importance of locating the program within the academic rather than the student service divisions of the university or college.
- 2 The need to establish the program as an explicit degree-granting department with regular FTE commitments for faculty rather than as a program based on soft-money which can become expendable during any and every economic crisis faced by the institution.
- 3 The need to gain acceptance for regular academic credit for the field study portion of the program as the first stage of program development so that faculty time and commitments are rewarded in the institutionally accepted coin of the realm.
- 4 The need for a structured curriculum with adequate preparation for students before field study and opportunities for structured analysis afterwards.
- 5 The need for a senior thesis, project, or other capstone requirement mandating that students summarize their learning experience in the program and provide tangible and transmittable evidence of their learning.
- 6 The need for a full-time field study coordinator to handle the logistical issues related to students' field studies upon which tenure-track faculty have little incentive to

- focus (including both developing potential placements and dealing with logistical problems while the students are in the field.)
- 7 The need to develop a broad range of field study opportunities for students to provide them with cutting-edge social change and activist opportunities without allowing sectarian limitations on the kinds of groups with which the students work.
  - 8 The need to have students work with existing organizations rooted in communities rather than working "on their own" or with organizations that students form themselves.

Since the year 2000, there are indications that several other universities and colleges are considering programs modeled on or borrowing from what we have accomplished. Colleges in Baltimore, Maryland, and Boston, Massachusetts, have sought our input in planning new CS programs. Given our success in achieving important political goals while maintaining academic legitimacy and developing strong institutional support within a public university, one would expect others to attempt similar experiments in the future. While some academic programs worry that they are "overproducing" graduates in their field, it is unlikely that the problem of too many social change activists is likely to constitute a serious issue for the foreseeable future.

## REFERENCES

- Becker, H. S. 1970. *Campus Power Struggles*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Bell, D., and I. Kristol (eds.). 1969. *Confrontation: The Student Rebellion and the Universities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bills, S. L. 1982. *Kent State/May 4: Echoes of a Decade*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press.
- Busch, L. 2000. *The Eclipse of Morality: Science, State, and Market*. New York: Aldine.
- Freire, P. 1975. *Conscientization*. Geneva: World Council of Churches.
- Friedland, W. H., and D. Nelkin. 1971. *Migrant: Agricultural Workers in America's Northeast*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Gordon, W. A. 1990. *The Fourth of May: Killings and Coverups at Kent State*. Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books.
- Horowitz, I. L., and W. H. Friedland. 1971. *The Knowledge Factory: Student Power and Academic Politics in America*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Lipset, S. M., and S. Wolin (eds.). 1965. *The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretations*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor.
- Michener, J. A. 1971. *Kent State: What Happened and Why*. New York: Random House.
- Patterson, F. K., and C. R. Longworth. 1966. *The Making of a College: Plans for a New Departure in Higher Education*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- University of California, Santa Cruz. 1965. *Academic Plan*. Santa Cruz: UCSC.
- Wallerstein, I., and P. Starr (eds.). 1971. *The University Crisis Reader*. New York: Random House.