REPORT OF A SURVEY OF TUNGHAI UNIVERSITY

Taichung, Taiwan
February 22-March 6, 1964

REPORT OF A SURVEY
of
TUNGHAI UNIVERSITY

Taichung, Taiwan
February 22 - March 6, 1964

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGES
FOREWORD	1
IN GENERAL	4
BEGINNINGS	5
THE STUDENTS	12
THE FACULTY	14
ADMINISTRATION	20
THE CURRICULUM	21
GRADUATE COURSES	24
RELIGIOUS LIFE	26
PLANT AND EQUIPMENT	29
HOW LARGE?	31
SOURCES OF SUPPORT	33
BOARD OF DIRECTORS	36
IN CONCLUSION	38

FOREWORD

With the approach of the end of Tunghai's first decade, the suggestion was made that a review of its development and a summing up of its achievements and prospects would not be out of order and might prove useful. This suggestion, welcomed by President Wu, was wholeheartedly endorsed by the Executive Committee of Tunghai's Board of Directors which, on February 9, 1963, took action asking the United Board to make such a study possible.

This request met with favorable response on the part of the United Board, which on March 21, 1963 approved participation in a survey of Tunghai University and provision of the necessary funds.

After consultation with the Tunghai administration, invitations were issued to the following to serve as members of a team to carry out the proposed survey:

1) Dr. S. C. Leung, former general secretary of the YMCA in China and long-time chairman of the Board of Directors of Hangchow Christian University, now residing in Hong Kong;

2) Dr. Hachiro Yuasa, noted Japanese educator, one-time president of Doshisha University and currently president-emeritus of Japan International Christian University;

3) Dr. Merton D. Munn, formerly dean of Carroll College and currently academic vice-president of Silliman University in the Philippines; and

4) Dr. William P. Fenn, general secretary of the United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia, to serve as co-ordinator and secretary.

At the last minute, illness of Mrs. Munn prevented Dr. Munn from joining the Team. His place was ably filled by Dr. Robert Grose, associate professor of psychology and registrar at Amherst College, who was serving for a year as United Board Visiting Specialist at Silliman University.

Three of the four members of the Team had visited Taiwan previously and had had earlier contact with Tunghai. For Dr. Fenn there was a familiarity which might have resulted, but did not, in boredom and apathy. For Drs. Leung and Yuasa the passage of years--eight in the case of the latter--provided striking and helpful contrasts. Only Dr. Grose arrived completely unfamiliar, not knowing what to expect. But for all, the opportunity to come to know intimately the living organism that is Tunghai and to understand more fully the environment in which it lives and functions was indeed a stimulating and challenging privilege.

After some correspondence the last week of February and the first week of March, 1964, were found to fit all schedules. The members of the Team arrived in Taipei on Friday, February 21,

met for the first time as a group the next morning, and followed a very full schedule through Friday, March 6.

During this fortnight the Team spent two full days and parts of two others in Taipei, a day and a half in Tainan and Kaohsiung, and eight days on the campus and in Taichung. At the end of the period, two nights and a day at Sun Moon Lake, with President Wu on hand for consultation, provided opportunity for uninterrupted review of experiences and tentative jotting down of findings.

Interviews, conversations, and discussions were held with a considerable number of individuals representing the national government--the Minister of Education and members of the Education Committee of the Legislative Yuan; the provincial government --the Governor of Taiwan and the Head of the Provincial Assembly; higher education--Acting President Sen and Professor Tung Ta-ch-en of National Taiwan University, President Yen of Cheng Kung University; business and industry--officials of the China Petroleum Corporation and members of the China Productivity and Trade Center; the church--both nationals and Westerners, in Taipei and especially in Tainan where some hours were spent at Tainan Theological College. Much time was devoted to the Tunghai board, administration, faculty, staff, and students, involving attendance at cabinet and other meetings, individual conferences with chief administrators and department heads, group conferences with other faculty and staff members and representatives of the student body. Campus hospitality, which even included breakfasts, provided helpful opportunities for informal association.

The work of the Team was greatly facilitated by, and its findings undoubtedly owe much to, the voluminous and helpful materials prepared in advance. These resulted from a request made to President Wu in late August 1963, asking that certain data be on hand when the Team arrived and suggesting that, prior to arrival, faculty groups discuss such issues as the following: Tunghai's Goals and Objectives, Strength and Achievement, Weakness and Problems, Christian Witness. It was further suggested that the responsibility be "farmed out" and that both majority and minority reports would be welcomed. Mrs. Mary Eleanor Trimble was responsible for collecting this material as she was for setting up the fortnight's program and clearing all appointments.

The resulting material provided most interesting reading and helpful reference. It was supplemented by additional data and memos provided by individuals at the time of conferences. The Survey Team feels strongly that one of the greatest benefits of its visit lay in this process of self-examination and appraisal and recommends that such self-study be a continuing process.

The Survey Team is indebted to too many individuals who provided hospitality, entertainment, and insights to list all by name. These all contributed to the pleasure of its visit and to such merit as this report may possess. We must, however, express our special indebtedness to Mrs. Trimble, without whose

careful planning we could not have done so much in so short a time; to Mr. Han Lih-tzu, Tunghai business manager, without whose efficient shepherding we might often have gone astray; and to President Wu, a perfect host whose knowledge and patience we never succeeded in exhausting.

We are all most grateful for what to us was a rich and rewarding experience.

IN GENERAL

We would begin this report with a clear and unequivocal tribute to the material, intellectual, and spiritual achievement represented by Tunghai University. We were deeply impressed by what has been accomplished in the twelve years since it was first determined that there should be a Tunghai. Whatever faults and weaknesses it may have, Tunghai is a surprisingly mature and effective Christian university. All credit is due to the members of the Preparatory Committee, the Board of Directors, the Administration, and the Faculty and Staff, to whose commitment and labors the present large measure of fulfillment of the original vision is due. As for the considerable sums of money which have gone into Tunghai, they are an investment, made prayerfully and imaginatively, which is proving a very fruitful and inspiring adventure in higher education.

At the same time we had reason to doubt that that original vision is as clear as it once was and to wonder whether it is still fully applicable. With the achievement of so much in so short a time, there has come a need for a "second wind" and with that need a blurring of vision. We see the need for a reaffirmation of the dream, not only administratively but cooperatively on the part of faculty and staff. More than that, the future in 1964 is not the same as the future viewed from 1952. There is need for an equally clear and challenging vision for the future that now lies ahead. We see as one of our responsibilities not so much the portraying of that vision as the stirring of the spirit for its portrayal by those who are part of Tunghai--directors, administration, faculty. We urge a continuing study of goals and future orientation. In this we would expect no lessening of the spiritual emphases incorporated in Tunghai's statement of purpose but would hope for an equally positive educational, academic commitment.

We have looked upon the survey as a challenge, not to tell Tunghai--its directors, administration, faculty and staff, and students--what to do, but to stimulate to self-analysis and planning which will lead to a clarity of goal and a depth of commitment which will be more creative and productive than any pattern imposed from without can ever hope to be. Necessarily we shall be expressing opinions and offering recommendations, but we expect these not to be accepted without question but to be weighed with care and adopted only on the basis of conviction.

BEGINNINGS

Tunghai University is a result of the closing of mainland China and the opening of island China, the island of Taiwan, or, as Westerners long knew it, Formosa. In the spring of 1946, very soon after the end of World War II and the Sino-Japanese War, the Presbyterian Church in Formosa, at last free to develop a private, church-related college, sought the aid of the United Board for Christian Colleges in China in the achievement of that goal. The United Board was then engaged in the all-demanding task of rehabilitating the thirteen "China Colleges," battered by eight years of disuse and misuse, and could not undertake further responsibility. By 1951, however, when the call came again, the doors to the mainland had been closed and the United Board was free to respond.

In February 1952, the United Board's executive secretary, Dr. William P. Fenn, made an exploratory visit to Taiwan to discuss the situation with educational and religious leaders. In May he presented to his Board a memorandum recommending United Board cooperation in the development of a then-nameless Christian institution of higher education in Taiwan. The Board responded favorably and enthusiastically, and Dr. Fenn returned to Taiwan in June to work out with people there a practical program of development.

It was agreed that, instead of an immediate assembling of teachers and students, time would be taken for careful planning so that the college would not be a mere duplicate of the past or of the rather uninspiring present, but something creative and looking to the future. One of the first steps was to set up a Preparatory Committee, composed of six Chinese and three Westerners, under the chairmanship of Mr. Han Lih-wu, a graduate of the University of Nanking and former Minister of Education. After registration with the Ministry of Education, an official Board of Directors was formed, with Mr. Han as chairman. This met for the first time on October 2, 1953.

From the start emphasis was placed on the fact that the proposed institution would be "for the people of Taiwan," a cooperative enterprise on the part of the local population, whose dream it largely was, of those who had come from the mainland with rich experience in higher education, and of the church in the West, which was blessed with material resources. Even before there had been a decision to develop a college, a search was initiated for younger Taiwanese who might be trained abroad for positions of leadership in the new institution.

There was agreement on many of the specifications listed in an early United Board memorandum, especially on the following: that the college should

1) be relatively small. The round figure of 700-800 was taken as a guide;

2) be residential both for students and for faculty;

3) depend largely on full-time service, which should be rewarded with the means for respectable living;

4) be content with a limited but relevant academic program in the development of which would be sought opportunity for exploration and divergence from standard patterns;

5) seek for its students a continuing awareness of the environment in which they live and avoidance of the ivory tower and the scholar caste;

6) emphasize the international and intercultural without losing sight of national and Chinese needs;

7) be church-related without being church-dominated, serving the needs of the Church in no narrow sense but supporting and strengthening the Church in its life and work.

The memo closed with the statement that "these, or any other specifications, will have meaning only as they become part of the thinking of individuals and groups in Formosa."

In October 1952 the Trustees of the United Board wrote to Dr. Cheng Tien-fang, Minister of Education, as follows, referring to the proposed university as "a permanent addition to the educational resources of Formosa":

> "We also welcome concurrence in our view that the proposed institution should not follow the pattern of former days but attempt to establish its own pattern, serving the needs of Formosa in unique and appropriate ways.... We believe the institution should not attempt to be all things to all men and should choose its own distinctive fields and emphases in the light of local needs and particular purposes of such a Christian institution.
>
> "Needless to say, we are thinking of a Chinese institution, registered with the government, under a Chinese president, and largely staffed by Chinese. We hope that the directors and administration will wish to keep an international tone; the United Board and mission boards will wish to cooperate in achieving that end.
>
> "We do not have in mind a large institution, but a relatively small one known for its high academic standards and for its emphasis on character...."

Dr. Cheng replied, agreeing with these principles.

An official Statement of Aims and Purposes was adopted on

November 10, 1953. Because of its significance we quote it in its entirety.

"The establishment of a Christian university in Taiwan is the result of the deep sense of need for such an institution felt by the Christian community in Taiwan and the concern of the Christian friends of China overseas, expressed through the United Board for Christian Colleges in China, that the services of a Christian university should be available as a permanent element in the life of Taiwan. Charged as we are with the responsibility of directing this institution in its initial stages, we, the members of the Board of Directors, join in this statement of Aims and Purposes.

"Having chosen the Christian faith as our faith, we find our choice profoundly affecting our view of education. For us the universe and its fullness are God's and He and it are truly understood only as Jesus Christ is confessed as preeminent, and as the view of God and man which He revealed in His life and teachings are accepted as true.

"We believe that the Christian faith supplies the moral strength which sustains the most rigorous educational ideals and which inspires the continuing attempt to reach them in that atmosphere of free and insistent enquiry which alone insures the development and support of the democratic ideals and institutions of a good society.

"We believe through Him in the inherent worth and dignity of human life, and that the mind of man, when inspired by and possessed of His Spirit, will respond in a free and honest search for truth to that which is good and true and beautiful.

"In the light of these convictions we join in the founding of a university which is dedicated to the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Way, the Truth and the Life, and in which at work, play, service and worship this fact is central. It is evident that from the beginning such an institution would be closely related to the Christian churches, and that its development would be largely in the hands of the Christian community in Taiwan. Moreover it should become self-supporting at the earliest possible date, and so free its American friends for other services to China.

"We believe that a Christian university has a threefold task to perform. It must provide for its students and faculty a community of learning which will foster a sense of Christian vocation. It must teach all courses so as to challenge the secularization of thought so common in our world. It must train and develop for Christ and His church those students who have been brought up in the Christian tradition so that they may be equipped to bear a lifelong witness in every area of life, while leading those students of other backgrounds who choose to attend the university into a knowledge and understanding of Christianity and by God's grace to the acceptance of this faith.

"To fulfill the first objective we believe that admission requirements should give full recognition to character and purpose as well as to high academic promise; that provision should be made to assure a good proportion of Christian students in the student body; and that the university should not plan to serve more than 700 students.

"We believe that the President and other members of the administrative staff should be men and women of demonstrated Christian conviction and purpose. In the selection of the faculty, other things being equal, preference should be given to those of demonstrated Christian purpose. However, under certain academic conditions, appointment might be given to those of other than the Christian faith who are in full accord with the purposes of the university. In no circumstance should these appointments involve more than one fifth of the teaching staff. All appointees should give their full time to the service of the university and be ready to take an appropriate share of responsibility for the conduct of the internal affairs of the university.

"We believe that the administration and the faculty should encourage students to the measure of their abilities and training, to take responsible charge of student activities, and that faculty-student relationships should give practical expression to those democratic values which are natural to a truly Christian community.

"We believe that the interests of such community would require students to learn to use their hands while in the university so that when they graduate they would be willing to use them for practical purposes of livelihood and in the training of others. A required work-program, similar to those successfully used in some of the colleges in America but adapted to the situation in Taiwan, should mark the university from the beginning, and should lead naturally to the extension of practical services to the community beyond the campus. Such a program requires the university to be completely residential. Undoubtedly it would call for a system of scholarship aid which would prevent the residential requirement from becoming prohibitive to some worthy students.

"As a co-operative community of learning and labor the university should be organized with a minimum number of clerks and servants. It should furnish all its staff with a respectable living wage, in the fixing of which due consideration would be had of the family and other responsibilities of the person employed as well as to his academic or other rank.

"Serving as it will a predominately agricultural community, the campus should be planned to include a farm which would be worked by the students, afford them opportunity to participate in scientific agriculture, provide some students with means of self-support, and furnish the university with some of the commodities required for daily living.

"In the fulfillment of its second function we believe that

the faculty should be composed of men and women who combine sound scholarship, demonstrated teaching ability and a real sense of vocation. They should be concerned with the free and honest pursuit of truth and its relation to the practical situations out of which their students come and into which many of them will return. They should realize that a teacher's desk is neither a pulpit nor a political rostrum, that propaganda of any sort is not teaching, but that there is no significant recognition of fact without interpretation, and that there is no significant interpretation without some center of integration. In this university that center of integration is to be found in the assumptions of the Christian faith as it confronts the assumptions of the secular world.

"We believe that teachers of this kind will not be concerned with the narrow compartmentalization of their work but will recognize that the highest integrity and thoroughness of scholarship require teaching which leads students to see the relationship of any given course to the whole of truth and life.

"We believe that every member of the faculty should be encouraged to carry on research projects in his own field, and that opportunities should be furnished him, as the resources of the university permit, for that travel and study whereby his academic competence would be increased, his teaching skills improved and his inner life enriched.

"We believe that every effort should be made to assure that the relation of the faculty member to the university should not be that of employer-employee but that of a participant in a cooperative endeavour.

"The third task of the university is an equally important one. Its fulfillment requires adequate provision for study, worship and action. We believe that the curriculum of every college in the university should provide elective courses in the history and philosophy of religion, in the Bible and the great Christian classics. These courses should meet the same scholarly tests as are applied to other courses.

"We believe the university chapel should be given a prominent place among the buildings on the campus and that it should provide an adequate setting for chapel services through the week and the worship of the university church on Sunday.

"We believe that the organization of student Christian groups should be encouraged and given wide freedom in the development of their programs of study, worship and Christian action.

"We believe that there is a continuing place on a university campus for informal discussion groups in which students and faculty may explore together the social and other implications of the Christian faith.

"We believe that a Christian community cannot live to itself alone. It must realize and accept the responsibilities of

privilege. These require a due concern for the life of the community about the campus, for the interests of the State, and for the support and strengthening of the Church which makes possible this community for learning.

"We envision this university as being distinctly related to the needs of Taiwan. It should lay great stress upon the cultural heritage of its students as it is expressed in the history, philosophy, art and religion of eastern Asia, particularly of China. However it must be universal in spirit, insuring in its students the development of that world view which is of the essence of Christianity. We believe it should welcome to its ranks student and faculty members from other lands. Its constant aim should be the training of men and women for unselfish service to their time, beginning in Taiwan and reaching to the uttermost parts of the earth.

"To the accomplishments of these Christian aims and purposes we, the members of the Board of Directors, herewith dedicate ourselves."

The United Board cooperated actively with both Preparatory Committee and Board of Directors. Representing the United Board in Taiwan at various times were Dr. Thomas W. Graham, dean emeritus of Oberlin School of Theology (1953-54), Dr. Theodore H. E. Chen, one-time president of Fukien Christian University and currently head of the Department of Asian Studies of the University of Southern California (1954), and Dr. Arthur L. Carson, president of Silliman University from 1939-1953 and at that time with the United Board (1956). Dr. Fenn made frequent shorter visits. Dr. T. Y. Wu, one of the first faculty members recruited, went to Taiwan in April 1954 and was active in the preparations for opening.

Competition for the honor of providing a home for the new institution was keen. Communities and individuals offered a total of fifteen different sites in or near the cities of Taipei, Taoyuen, Chungli, Hsinchu, Taichung, Changhwa, Tainan, and Kaohsiung. The choice finally fell on a hillside lying between Taichung and the Straits of Formosa, where the Municipality of Taichung offered the use of 345 acres. A major portion of this land was to be the gift of the Municipality; the remainder was to be purchased by the United Board. In addition to the attractiveness of the site, overlooking the rich Taichung plain and facing the great eastern mountain ranges, and its adequacy, was the advantage of some of the island's finest climate. An important consideration also was the central location, midway between nationally-minded Taipei and locally -oriented Tainan.

In planning the new campus, the future Tunghai was fortunate in securing the services, without cost, of one of America's greatest architects, I. M. Pei. Himself a product of St. John's University, Mr. Pei entered with enthusiasm into the task of providing the new institution with suitable buildings, contributing generously of his skill and time. Under his leadership,

Messrs. C. K. Chang and C. K. Chen helped plan and build the present complex of academic and residential buildings.

Mr. Beauson Tseng (Tseng Yueh-nung), noted Chinese scholar and professor of English Literature at Taiwan National University, was elected Tunghai's first president in March 1955. Classes began in October 1955 with 200 freshmen selected from among some 5,800 who took entrance examinations. Faculty had been recruited from experienced educators in Taiwan, many of them previously associated with the Christian colleges of the mainland, together with a number of Americans, also with China background. Miss Elsie M. Priest, long-time treasurer of the University of Nanking, Ginling College, and, during the war, of other China Colleges, served as Controller from 1953 until her retirement in 1960.

Upon the retirement of President Tseng at the age of 70, Dr. Wu Teh-yao, who had been serving as Dean of Arts, was elected Tunghai's second president. A graduate of the University of Nanking, Dr. Wu is a political scientist specializing in international relations.

THE STUDENTS

The selection of students for Tunghai appears to be efficient and generally satisfactory. The vast majority enter on the basis of government exams, which thus far appear to be a relatively accurate measure of achievement and, less surely, of ability. The system of quotas for institutions and departments, which often result in a student's being assigned to the institution of second or third choice, is probably necessary where certain institutions are so much more popular than others. For obvious reasons, Tunghai does not yet compete with National Taiwan University in drawing power and finds Cheng Kung a powerful rival. But Tunghai loses few if any students who make it first choice even though it receives a considerable number for whom it is second or third. Many of the latter are among the best students, and most eventually find in Tunghai what they are looking for.

Where this system causes the most trouble is in the increasing percentage of girls who are coming to Tunghai. This has risen from 25% for the first years to 35% today. Since dormitories were planned on the basis of one girl to three boys, the girls' dormitories are being overtaxed. We hold no brief against girls, but we question whether this expansion in their number should be allowed to continue. We suggest that the line be held where it now is--one girl to two men--and that such increase in dormitory facilities as is possible be in those for girls. We understand that, with the shift of single men faculty to their new residence, the men's dormitories are adequate to meet anticipated needs.

The students admitted by examination all come from the top 12% of the 30,000 who take the examination. The 230 accepted in 1963 were among 2,200 who applied to Tunghai, or roughly one out of 10 applicants. These are good ratios and should ensure a high calibre of student. In addition, 25 students are admitted annually without examination, coming from the top 10% of the graduates of certain schools which have a superior record. These prove to be good students though not the best. We suggest that this privilege be granted with restraint and to no schools which apply on other grounds than demonstrated quality. We are unable to say whether the fact that a total of only 203 courses were failed in the first semester of 1963-64, representing approximately 5% of all the courses taken, reflects the high quality of students or the tolerance of the faculty. Probably both factors apply. We believe Tunghai is receiving good students, though not the best; and that it is applying respectable standards which might well at times be higher.

What about Tunghai's hold on those who are admitted? Every year some 25 students transfer to other institutions: some because of disaffection with Tunghai, others in an effort to get into the original institution of first choice. But the total loss is small, with 83% of those who enter graduating. Some of the loss is compensated for by some 10 students (out of over 100)

who are admitted as transfers. It seems that both the drawing power and the holding power of Tunghai are good.

We were struck by the fact that there is no student government at Tunghai, a situation which is in marked contrast to that which exists in many other parts of Asia. We make no attempt to judge the reasons for government restrictions in this area, which we understand arose from experiences on the mainland. We would commend the less formal use of class representatives to disseminate information and to raise questions.

We judge from the report that there are over 60 student clubs on the campus that there is no need to urge participation in extra-curricular activities! Possibly restraint is indicated. But there is need for development of a sense of responsibility. And a Christian college must do something about this, even under present conditions. Within the limits allowed, we suggest involvement of students in the sort of thinking about and planning for Tunghai represented by this study.

We were particularly impressed by the honor system which was initiated by the students themselves. Application to campus, dormitory, and classroom would seem to provide valuable training in some of the qualities with which such an institution as Tunghai is especially concerned. The "Honest Committee's" concern for the needs of workers is representative of that relationship to environment and that sense of social responsibility which were part of the original hope for Tunghai. We hope that the relative self-sufficiency of the Tunghai community will not be allowed to isolate students--or faculty--from the surrounding community.

THE FACULTY

We were favorably impressed with the quality of the faculty and staff which have been assembled at Tunghai. For so young an institution and one laboring under the handicaps imposed by conditions in that part of the world, Tunghai has, we believe, a faculty of some stature and of encouraging potential. There is a somewhat surprising nucleus of outstanding scholars and teachers, and a promising group of younger members who will bring added strength to Tunghai if they can be given needed training and can be retained.

While advanced degrees are not the only criterion by which to judge an academic community--and, in individual cases are not always applicable--they do provide some indication of the general adequacy of scholarship and training. From this point of view, Tunghai falls somewhat short. Only some 19% of the teaching faculty have achieved the Ph.D. or its equivalent; even for full professors the figure is only 30%. In 160 representative church-related colleges (not universities) in the United States, the median for all faculty members is between 35% and 40%, with some institutions in the 70's and 80's. Dr. Myron Wicke of the Methodist Board of Education has pointed out, very conservatively, we believe, that "when fewer than 20 per cent of a faculty of a senior college have achieved the doctorate, there is room for improvement."

We are also concerned that so high a percentage (43%) of full professors claim nothing higher than a B.A. While we realize that in certain fields, such as Chinese, there have been other standards of measurement--though even in this area modern scholarship is giving advanced degrees significance--and while we recognize certain cases of important non-degree advanced training, we do suggest that this situation be corrected as opportunity offers.

We did not have time, and made no attempt, to judge character and attitudes, though outside opinion appeared to rate Tunghai faculty as superior in this respect. This is certainly to be hoped for, even expected, in a Christian institution. Nor were we able to give adequate attention to qualifications as teachers, even though we would lay great stress on Tunghai's role as a teaching institution. Little evidence was presented, however, to indicate widespread departure from traditional lecture methods, though there is some noteworthy use of the seminar. The English Department is forward-looking in its use of modern language-teaching techniques, even though badly handicapped by lack of equipment. We also heard of a few individuals who belong in the category of "natural born teachers." On the whole we did not find the concern for and interest in teaching which might have been expected and certainly should be hoped for in such an institution.

One statistic of interest is the percentage of the faculty who are professing Christians. The figure at Tunghai is

approximately 50%. Though there are differences of opinion as to appropriate ratios--one member of the Team coming from an institution where the percentage for full-time faculty is 100--the fact that the standard set by the Board of Directors is 80% makes the low proportion indicated a matter of concern. This concern is strengthened when Western faculty members, who are almost 100% Christian, are left out of the calculation. Less than 38% of the Chinese faculty are Christian--or, if one leaves out non-teaching assistants, 42%. Full professors (Western included) with 64% Christian, approach the standard set; but the figures for Associate and Assistant Professors and for Lecturers on whom the future is supposed to be built, are only 42% and 45% respectively. Without attempting to determine desirable percentages for Tunghai--a matter for the Board of Directors--we would draw attention to what we consider a weakness and a danger in a Christian institution with Tunghai's purpose and opportunities.

We do this with full realization of the difficulty faced in the recruiting of faculty. In certain fields, such as Chinese, Christian scholars are rare. The Christian community on Taiwan constitutes a very small part of the total population. Export from Taiwan greatly exceeds import. However, the fact remains that the Christian character of the faculty is basic to a full understanding of the nature and purpose of Tunghai and a vital factor in the fullness of the education which it provides. We therefore call attention of both the Board of Directors and the United Board to this situation and what we believe to be the need for a new commitment and renewed efforts. Specifically, in the search for a Christian scholar in the area of Chinese studies, we wonder whether an American scholar might not be challenged to come. The attempt would be worth making.

We confess to some uncertainty in regard to production and potential in the area of research. We were assured by President Wu that Tunghai faculty are involved in more research, relative to numbers, than are the faculty of any other institution in Taiwan. Since Tunghai faculty do not, like many of their peers elsewhere, carry two or three teaching posts, they should have more time for research. The Tunghai Journal is evidence that there are considerable quantities of publishable results. We have been assured by external scholars that many of the articles are worthwhile, even if not always outstanding.

There appear to be more opportunities for research in the areas of the humanities and social sciences than in the natural sciences and engineering, the result, no doubt, of generally greater requirements of apparatus and materials in the latter fields. Yet there was evidence of worthwhile and not too costly research in fish, frogs, and birds. There would appear to be a fruitful area for exploration in the problems of food-processing, a matter of considerable importance to Taiwan economy and an area where financing might not be too difficult to secure. In the social sciences sociological and economic studies of Tunghai's environment have a potential significance which is being only partially exploited.

We would not appear to suggest increased research as a substitute for creative instruction. We consider the quality of teaching as of paramount importance. But we believe that research is not unrelated to that goal, especially as it reflects and stimulates an essential intellectual aliveness. We reluctantly confess that we failed to sense a pervasive atmosphere of scholarly curiosity and mutual stimulation. There is evidence of poorly conceived projects and a failure to apply modern techniques and standards.

Nor did Tunghai impress us with its intellectual ferment. We did not get the feeling that as yet there is much interaction between faculty members at Tunghai and those from other universities. It would seem to us that one of the important contributions of such an institution as Tunghai should be its impact upon the academic groups and research disciplines of the larger community.

With a faculty-student ratio of somewhere around 1:8, Tunghai appears to be well if not over-staffed. Even if assistants are omitted from the calculation, the figure stands at 1:10, a ratio which would in many places be considered luxury. Few institutions in the United States achieve this ratio. For good private institutions the figure is more likely to be 1:12 or 1:15. Even a ratio of 1:20, which is not rare, need not in itself be proof of weakness. It is no longer automatically assumed that a low ratio is essential to quality.

We realize that there are factors at Tunghai, such as the larger number of small sections in courses in the English language, and the relatively light average teaching load (8-9 hours compared with the 12-13 hours common in the United States) which contribute to this situation. But we see little if any need for adding to the total number of teachers and suggest that any modest increase in number of students will not require additions to the faculty. Any proposal for additional faculty should be very carefully scrutinized.

As additional faculty are clearly needed and as replacements are made, we would encourage President Wu in his policy of seeking top men. Since the combination of scholarly excellence and the qualities of mind and spirit which should be a requirement in all key personnel is difficult, we suggest long-range planning accompanied by early and active search.

Our attention was inevitably called to the question of salaries, their adequacy at various levels, and the material and spiritual factors in the attraction to Tunghai of its Chinese personnel. We found this an interesting area but not one where an outside group has great competence. We shall limit ourselves to reporting observations and making a few general comments.

Salaries at Tunghai appear to be considerably better than those at government institutions, but differing terms and conditions make comparisons difficult and at best only suggestive. At government institutions lighter teaching-loads and

freedom to accept outside employment are factors hard to overlook. It would seem that such superiority in cash benefit as may exist is not enough to tip the balance easily. On the other hand, Tunghai salaries clearly cannot compete with those in industry, a more or less universal situation. It would be easy, and true, to say that salaries are far too low, but the cure is so difficult that it is probably wiser to say that while on the average they are perhaps adequate, every effort should be made to improve them.

Effort was made to impress us with the range in salaries as between lofty professor and lowly assistant. The range is great, though we have not been able to confirm the ratio of 1:6 reported to us and have found 1:4 a more representative figure. (Differences in size of family make comparison difficult.) We are sure that the life of neither is one of luxury. Possibly greater opportunity for the assistant for self-advancement through further study or research might compensate for necessary inadequacies in salary. We content ourselves with calling attention to this problem of which we are sure the administration is fully and sympathetically aware.

We would commend provisions for retirement which have been made or are planned. The lump sum available upon retirement, though it does not protect as does a pension, appears to meet local preferences. It is not munificent but provides very significant protection to him who uses it wisely. Adjustment of terms in those cases where, because of the age of the individual and the youth of the institution, protection would not have been meaningful has resulted in a policy that seems to us both fair and, in the circumstances, good.

Granted that Tunghai salaries are unlikely, in and of themselves, to attract men and women to Tunghai, what does? Probably the environment. "Tunghai is a pleasant place to live, to teach, and to study." These are good reasons. We would be happier, however, if we could truthfully add "a dynamic and stimulating intellectual atmosphere." This Tunghai has not yet fully achieved.

The chief avenue through which the faculty give expression to group concern and raise with the administration questions in the area of welfare and group life is the Chinese Professors Association. Stated purposes - including high standards and "cultivation of spiritual seeds" - are largely unexceptionable, and we were given to understand that the Association has made constructive contributions to the development of Tunghai. At the same time, we gained an impression that such is not always the case and that there is a narrowness of organization and concern that may well lead to the missing of opportunities for the most positive contribution.

We find it difficult to understand why, in such an institution as Tunghai, such a faculty organization should be limited to Chinese. Nor is it clear why it is not inclusive of more of the faculty. We suggest that consideration be given to including

all faculty, Chinese and Western. And a clearer line might well be drawn between faculty and administration. Since some members are also deans, their membership reduces the top administration to one or two people, one of whom is also a professor. It would appear that the organization should either include all who teach or exclude all who hold administrative posts, thus reducing otherwise inescapable conflicts of interest.

Above all, however, we urge a broadening of concern to include the social and academic as well as the economic, and to provide greater emphasis on the welfare of the community.

As was indicated earlier, three racial or cultural strands enter into the staffing of Tunghai: two of them Chinese, the local Taiwanese and the more recently arrived Mainlanders; one of them Western. We believe that the resulting cross-fertilization and mutual stimulation has an as yet not fully realized potential for enrichment of Tunghai's contribution. But we also recognize some of the problems created.

We share the hope of the Board and of the Administration that more and more qualified Taiwanese can be recruited for the faculty and to fill important administrative and scholarly positions. Progress has been slow in spite of earnest effort. United Board efforts to train Taiwanese leadership, which began before there was even a decision that there should be a Tunghai, have had very limited results because of the difficulty of finding qualified candidates committed to return and the failure of those recruited in the United States to leave that country. Nor has it been possible, with one or two notable exceptions, locally to recruit fully trained Taiwanese scholars, of whom there are not a few. We believe that, in addition to intensified efforts by the administration, there is needed a clearer Taiwanese recognition of the importance of the stake they have in Tunghai. To this process, the Church in Taiwan could contribute much were it to accept the fact that Tunghai, though going beyond the hopes that inspired the Church's original invitation to the United Board, is both a vital part of the Church's life and a rich potential for strength.

The Western members of Tunghai's faculty and staff constitute, we believe, an integral and essential part of the type of institution Tunghai seeks to be. Tunghai can be first-rate without this foreign element, but it would be the poorer. It seems to us important that Free China be enriched by the values which representatives from the West can bring to its peculiar adaptation to the modern world. We would also encourage the addition of representatives of other Asian cultures. Tunghai is in no danger of being a Western institution, which it should never become, but in an element of internationalism it has something unique to contribute to a new Taiwan, a new China, a new World. In spite of problems, we believe there might well be a definite understanding that the presence of a strong nucleus of Westerners--including Europeans as well as representatives of the English-speaking West--is a desirable and permanent feature of Tunghai.

On this point we feel certain. We are not sure, however, that the representatives of the West are as yet making the full contribution that should be expected of them. For this situation we believe that there are several reasons.

With certain clear exceptions, Western members of the faculty have not been of sufficiently high scholarly achievement and capability to compare favorably with many of their Chinese colleagues. We urged that higher academic standards be set in the selection of Western members of the faculty.

Too few Western faculty and staff members have become "permanently" identified with Tunghai. In the initial stages, short-term use was wisely made of American teachers, often retired, to fill temporarily vacant posts; but the time has come when a greater continuity of service and of involvement is needed. We do not depreciate the value of short-term visiting scholars, but we do see a need for a larger nucleus of highly qualified Western scholar-teachers for whom Tunghai is home.

The large number of young American instructors just out of college themselves is an element both of strength and of weakness. Usually superior in ability and character, these young people perform an important function in the classroom, largely through the handling of sections of English, and outside the classroom render services which no other group, Western or Chinese, can provide. But, seven to eight in number, they constitute perhaps a larger percentage of the Western faculty, if not of the entire faculty, than Tunghai can as yet absorb with complete ease. We do not recommend a reduction in numbers, though we would question any increase; but we believe that a strengthening of the more active Western faculty and greater encouragement of identification with Tunghai will contribute to the smoothness and fruitfulness of this relationship.

Finally, we urgently recommend that Western faculty and staff of all ages become an integral part of the university and not visitors - in their own thinking and actions and in the thinking and actions of their Chinese colleagues. They themselves need to become a more natural part of their environment; their colleagues must help them in the process of identification.

In concluding this section we cannot too strongly state our conviction that the future of Tunghai depends far less on its physical features, essential though buildings and books and apparatus are, than on the quality of the faculty. The faculty will always be Tunghai's major resource, and we urge that in its building up only the highest academic and spiritual standards be applied.

ADMINISTRATION

We would be remiss were we to fail to recognize the great achievement and continuing quality of performance of the Administration. The building of a university is difficult at best; under conditions in Taiwan - physical and psychological - normal difficulties are compounded. We believe that Tunghai presents a picture of wise and efficient leadership.

Naturally there are areas of weakness or uncertainty. The fiscal and material management of the University, which has in the main developed an enviable reputation, needs the added strength which eternal vigilance requires. We are happy to know that the Bursar, who has so ably carried an impossible load alone, will soon have the help and backing of a controller. Tunghai's reputation for honesty and efficiency is a major contribution to education and society.

We believe that the strengthening of these offices will bring important support to the president. It is our opinion that President Wu, for whose wisdom and skill we have profound admiration, is carrying too heavy a load because he is too alone. We have seen too many presidents spoiled by too great aloneness in the handling of problems to have easy minds.

THE CURRICULUM

The academic program at Tunghai presents a somewhat unusual appearance. In spite of careful early planning, it does not follow a logical and consistent pattern. Tunghai is neither clearly a liberal arts college nor distinctly a multiversity. To colleges of arts and science is attached a college of engineering. This, we understand, was not as originally planned but has been dictated in part by ministry of education rules and in part by public pressure.

When Tunghai was first conceived, it was hoped that it would have colleges of arts, of science, and of public affairs. American sources of support were fearful of the cost of such technical departments as would have been welcomed by a technology-minded public: medicine (first choice), engineering (second choice), and agriculture. Furthermore, at that time experts stated categorically that Taiwan had a plethora of engineers and adequate colleges of agriculture. Good medical education was recognized as having priced itself out of the church. But the Ministry of Education refused to approve a college of public affairs and for a number of years Tunghai consisted of two colleges only, meriting the name of university on the grounds of intention rather than of performance. However, a department of chemical engineering was early added to the College of Science, and that ultimately became the nucleus of the recently formed College of Engineering.

Meanwhile, the College of Arts had had to absorb the three departments of economics, political science, and sociology which were to have constituted a college of public affairs. It therefore has six departments, the other three being Chinese Language and Literature, Foreign Languages and Literatures, and History. While it would be possible to create two colleges out of these six departments (one college to be under another name than College of Public Affairs!) we see no great advantage in doing so and would question the adding of another dean and dean's office.

On the other hand, we are persuaded of the desirability of adding a minor department of music. The need for teachers of music for elementary and secondary schools and of ministers of music and organists for churches is considerable and one which Tunghai might logically meet. It already has physical facilities in its Fine Arts Building and considerable talent on the campus. Should adequate financing prove possible, such a minor department would be a justifiable addition to the College of Arts.

We also feel that there is an obvious and surprising lack in the absence of any department of religion and/or philosophy. We believe at least a minor department in these fields to be a vital part of any university and especially of such an institution as we conceive Tunghai to be. As we point out later, we consider the filling of a chair of religion one of the most critical personnel needs.

Since loss of the Department of Chemical Engineering to the new College of Engineering, the College of Science has consisted of the Departments of Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. A few basic courses in Mathematics are included under Physics, and there is some pressure for establishment of a Department of Mathematics. In this world of quantification there would appear to be strong arguments for such a department, but we suggest careful study of the situation. How great is the demand? Are service courses or a minor enough, or must a major be offered? Can a major be added without drastically increasing total enrolment? And how will such a department be financed?

The College of Engineering now consists of the Departments of Architectural, Chemical, and Industrial Engineering. With the exception of Chemical Engineering these are among the least expensive of departments of engineering. Fortunately so, for even the support of these is likely to strain resources to the limit, especially in the matter of equipment. Such departments as electrical and mechanical engineering are, we believe, out of reach of Tunghai within any future we can foresee.

However, we recognize the probability that engineering programs will ultimately be forced to cover five years. Whether, in light of the economy of the country, such a requirement is presently practical or wise, we do not know. But we suggest that it is not too early to begin study of the problem: the requirements in the way of faculty, the effect on students going abroad, financial aspects, etc.

We were several times met by the statment that "there are not enough teachers on the campus" -- a statement which we find it hard to understand unless it reflects a desire to have a greater variety of course offerings, a development against which we would earnestly counsel. Proliferation of non-essential, even if attractive, courses has against it not only harsh financial realities but the lack of necessity for over-specialization at the undergraduate level. We believe Tunghai would be wise in adhering to a minimum core of really essential courses. With some minor exceptions, present course offerings appear to meet all essential needs.

We deal elsewhere with the religious program at Tunghai, but here we interject one phase of that because of its implications for the curriculum. We did not find at Tunghai what we had expected to find and what is to us an essential in any broadly conceived program, especially at a Christian institution, and that is a solid and orderly program of academic courses in religion. This fact we can excuse only on the ground, which carries little weight after ten years, that suitable instructors are lacking. Visiting lecturers, no matter how highly qualified, cannot be more than a temporary expedient. They should actually continue to supplement the work of a permanent member of the faculty.

General Education at Tunghai appears to us to be only a partial success. It is a feature with which we find ourselves

wholly in favor. It is one of those unique contributions which are greatly needed in Asia, where there is so strong a trend toward narrow specialization. Yet it has proved at Tunghai, as at so many institutions elsewhere, a peculiarly elusive goal.

For one thing, it is not fully understood. Appreciation by students grows, with many alumni approving, but too many of the faculty neither understand nor sympathize. We trust the process of education will be continued, but we suspect that understanding and sympathy will depend largely on a greater degree of success.

For success, we believe that a few key teachers will have to be found or trained, and that suitable materials will have to be prepared. Courses which are not well taught and materials which are not suitable, do more harm than good. We suggest the need for someone to have charge of all sections of each basic subject and for some one person to serve as coordinator for all three units--humanities, social sciences, natural sciences. We commend efforts which are being made to improve the situation and urge that there be no slackening of determination to make of this unique feature an effective and stimulating contribution to educational practice not only in Taiwan but elsewhere in Asia.

To us much education, not only in Taiwan but in other parts of Asia, appears to have its sights set too exclusively on technical training for specific jobs and to be too little concerned with preparation for growth in wider avenues of service. We believe that Tunghai can make a peculiarly significant contribution through continued and even greater emphasis on the liberal arts. General Education will contribute to this emphasis.

As the catalog states in no uncertain terms, "The Student Labor Program is an integral part of the educational program of Tunghai University. It is designed to train scholars who are not afraid to soil their hands." It is therefore logically considered in a section on "The Curriculum."

The Labor Program is possibly the most nearly unique feature at Tunghai. It received a splendid start from Dean Charles Shutt of Berea College; it passed through doldrums when the original enthusiasm cooled; and it now appears to have established itself as an integral and generally well-run part of life at Tunghai. As classes have graduated and come to look back with approval, reluctance on the part of the students has largely disappeared, though apparently there is still some lack of understanding on the part of the faculty.

The Labor Program is a success. But it is not without difficulties. There is need for more opportunities for labor than the isolated Tunghai community provides. And there are problems of financing the Work-for-Study Program, where half of the NT$6 (US$.15) an hour pay is actually a form of scholarship aid. These problems do not appear to be insuperable, and we cannot too strongly urge full continuing support of this feature which has, with so little success, been so widely imitated. Tunghai apparently has what has been pointed out as the one real essential for success - the Christian spirit.

GRADUATE COURSES

One of the major issues presented to us was whether or not Tunghai should develop graduate courses and possibly a graduate school. The question was raised at all levels, by directors, administration, faculty, and students - and by outsiders. Opinions are strongly held and were often ably expressed. We gave the matter careful consideration before arriving at conclusions which we found inescapable under the circumstances. These were based largely on the following considerations:

First, we believe that Tunghai's basic purpose is as an undergraduate institution, and that its major contribution will be made at this level. We would caution against any development which threatened the quality and effectiveness of the undergraduate program.

Second, we do not believe that the presence of graduate courses is essential to the academic welfare of all scholars. Conversely, we know that it can distract from concern for basic instruction. How important such courses are psychologically depends upon the individual.

Third, we doubt if graduate courses are essential to scholarly research. There is no doubt in our minds that worthwhile and satisfying research can be carried on by the scholar whose teaching does not extend to post-graduate courses.

Fourth, we believe that anything but very strong graduate work is bound to prove second-rate. There should be no room for the second-rate at Tunghai.

Fifth, we are not convinced of the need for a graduate department. We are not sure that it will prove an attraction for those who would not have come to Tunghai anyway, or that there is an overwhelming demand. We suspect that the best graduates will go abroad anyway.

Sixth, we are aware that graduate work is certain to constitute a heavy financial strain. Unless this certainty is foreseen and provided for in advance, graduate work can only compete with undergraduate, to the harm of the latter. We would therefore urge that no beginnings be made without reasonable assurance of adequate financial resources.

Seventh, we suspect that those who speak of environment and equipment as "adequate" are indulging in wishful thinking. The Library may be next in size and quality to that at Taita, but that does not mean that any areas (except perhaps Chinese) are adequate for graduate research. And surely the need will quickly appear for expensive scientific equipment.

We recognize that Tunghai has many faculty members competent to offer courses at the graduate level, but we would be loath to have these drawn away, as they would almost inevitably

be, from the undergraduate instruction which we consider the heart of Tunghai's contribution. Moreover, a few post-graduate courses dependent on the qualifications and interests of the undergraduate staff would not be likely long to constitute a satisfying graduate program. In the case of most departments additional faculty would have to be secured.

We recommend, therefore, that Tunghai continue, for the time being, pursuit of its original objective of becoming a very strong undergraduate institution of limited size, concentrating on quality of instruction within a limited program and producing graduates who can make their way with distinction in graduate schools elsewhere, whether in Taiwan or abroad. This in itself is a demanding goal which has not yet been fully achieved.

This does not mean that, in another decade, Tunghai will not find it desirable, perhaps necessary, to develop full-fledged graduate work in certain areas. It means that we do not consider Tunghai prepared at this time, either financially or academically, to embark on a broadly conceived program of graduate courses. In one area only do we see adequate present potential, and that is in the field of Chinese studies. Here there would appear to be both a solid foundation and a reasonable need. Students are not likely to be drawn abroad, except perhaps to Japan, and emphasis on such studies seems to us desirable in a Christian institution. However, we caution against such a development without assurance of faculty not only qualified academically but varied in background and point of view. We strongly recommend that there be Christian scholars in this department. We also suggest the desirability of greater emphasis on modern scholarship and methods. Finally, we would point out the need for assurance of financial undergirding for a development which cannot but add to the budget.

RELIGIOUS LIFE

Tunghai is in a very real sense the baby of the Church. At the same time it is also an orphan. From the Church came the original idea and call, but from the Church today comes little support. There is a continuing and, we suspect, growing interest, but this is often balanced by bewilderment if not by resentment. The simple fact is that Tunghai is not what it was expected to be. It is not under the control of the Church and is not a sure answer to the needs of the Church's children or its secondary schools; it sets standards and adopts practices which the Church does not fully understand. Yet Tunghai is of tremendous value to the Church, psychologically and practically. The Church of Taiwan would be the poorer and weaker if it were to have no links with Tunghai University, however tenuous those may at times be.

There is obviously fault on both sides. Only recently has there been significant conscious effort on the part of the University to explain itself to the Church. We commend President Wu's efforts but urge him and the Tunghai Board to take further measures to encourage understanding. Recently, we were told, there has been a growth in appreciation on the part of the Church, even though there has been little if any increase in aid, but we suspect that the Church does not yet understand the mission of the University. We saw little evidence of an appreciation of Tunghai's high standards though it seems likely that, were those to slip, there would be criticism.

We are encouraged by the increasingly close and mutually beneficial relationship between the University and Tainan Theological College. The giving at Tunghai of a year of liberal arts for students of the college and the participation of Tainan faculty in general education courses at Tunghai seem to us splendid examples of cooperation. We feel that a second year at Tunghai would be worth considering if dormitory space were available. And there are other possible areas for cooperation which would not only enrich both institutions but bring Tunghai into clearer focus as a part of the Christian movement with its own peculiar witness. It cannot do the Church's job, any more than the Church can do its job, but it does have an important contribution to make to the Christian witness in Taiwan.

We would suggest that Tunghai should become increasingly a focal point for ecumenical Protestantism on Taiwan, offering training for leadership, facilities for conferences, etc. It should also seek to serve the Church more clearly in a pragmatic way through training in social case work, through encouragement of Christian writing, etc.

Such an institution as Tunghai has two goals which it is sometimes difficult to keep in balance: the academic (service) and the spiritual (evangelism). It seems to us that Tunghai has succeeded perhaps better with the first than with the second. While we can see no place for a Christian university which is

not academically respectable, we also cannot justify the Church's involvement in a university which is not spiritually productive. We do not mean to imply that Tunghai is a lost cause - far from it - but we were disturbed to find inadequacies in its religious program and life.

Figures might appear not to support this concern. Of entering freshmen 12-15% are Christians; of departing seniors 20-25%. We rejoice in this record. Christian students meet every Thursday, and many groups gather in faculty homes. There is an annual spiritual emphasis week. Attendance at the weekly chapel service, which is voluntary, averages 150, which is a better record than is achieved in many institutions. There is a work camp project across the road and a Sunday School for neighborhood children. There is obviously much commendable activity.

We were troubled, however, to know that Tunghai is not well represented at student conferences. It was reported that there had been no Tunghai students at an island-wide conference held between semesters. We were unable to analyze the causes but wonder whether in this fact may not be reflected a complacent parochialism. Tunghai should, we believe, lead in student Christian activities in Taiwan.

One gains the impression at Tunghai that much that goes on is on the surface and does not penetrate very deep. The realistic, materialistic students are not given the dreams they need and seek.

The faculty too appear to be content with a church life which, fine though it may be, seems often unrelated to their lives in the world of the mind. There is a "Church Retreat" but no faculty retreat. There is no Faculty Christian Fellowship.

In the Luce Chapel and its Religious Activities Building, Tunghai is extraordinarily well supplied with the physical facilities for worship and other organized expressions of religious life. We would also recognize the devoted services of the chaplains who have served Tunghai since its beginning. However, we would strongly support the determination to secure an outstanding Chinese to fill that crucial position and we would urge that greater emphasis be laid on the bringing to the campus of stimulating religious thinkers, both Chinese and Western, for regular church and chapel services as well as for special occasions. But a chaplain of intellectual as well as spiritual stature, able to challenge thinking at both student and faculty levels, is a paramount need.

It seems to us essential that the religious life of Tunghai should extend far beyond the campus and reach creatively into many phases of Taiwan life - not only Taiwan church life, where it should prove an intellectual leaven, but into government, education, business, and society. One educator in a secular institution said to us, "Tunghai's religion is good for Taiwan." We agree that it could be and believe that it should be.

As it is, we have the feeling that, as one student put it, religion at Tunghai is "only a branch of extra-curricular activity" and is not in position strongly to challenge the university community, not to mention the larger Taiwan community. There appears to be little if any impact from Tunghai professors on the larger community. We believe that, given its goals and advantages and the environment in which it exists, Tunghai should play a more active part, giving positive leadership, in cooperation with such institutions as Tainan Theological Seminary, in the field of religious thought and knowledge. There is need in Taiwan for a real encounter between the Christian and the non-Christian world, and in that encounter Tunghai should play, we believe, a central part.

As one step in this direction, we urge the earliest possible establishment of a chair of philosophy and religion occupied by an outstanding scholar fully the peer academically and intellectually of other professors. We would hope that he could be a Chinese but recognize the possibility that the post might have to be temporarily filled by a Westerner pending discovery or preparation of a Chinese. We also suggest that his work might well be supplemented and strengthened by visiting scholars of various races and cultures.

PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

As has already been stated, we were impressed by the magnificence of Tunghai's site and by the beauty of the campus. To those who are accustomed to the inadequate and unattractive quarters accommodating many institutions, Tunghai undoubtedly suggests luxury. There is spaciousness and beauty, but not, we think, luxury. Indeed, with occasional exceptions, buildings represent relative austerity as compared with much contemporary construction, even on Taiwan. The argument advanced by government, that there is room for more than Tunghai's present enrollment leaves us unmoved. There is no need to build a city university in the country. And there is, we believe, an important and justifiable value in Tunghai's spaciousness.

We were not able to make a detailed examination of physical space, but we gained the impression that comments we received were not always the result of objective study. While we do not question the urgent need for a third quadrangle to house the College of Engineering, we have doubts as to the efficiency with which existing space is now being used. Many classrooms and laboratories stand idle for considerable portions of the day. We appreciate the problems of scheduling, especially if consideration is given to all the wishes of teachers, but we believe that administrative care and faculty cooperation could, without new construction, considerably relieve the present situation.

In one building there is clear overcrowding, and that is the library. The wings of the library building, now used for classrooms, should be released for their intended purpose. This can easily be done when the third academic quadrangle is constructed. We suggest, however, that more efficient use of the other quadrangles, as suggested above, might provide some earlier easement.

Another apparent lack of space is in the case of offices. The English department, with its large number of instructors and its great use of conferences, appears to suffer most in this respect. We do not recommend luxury, but we believe that usable non-classroom working space for teachers is desirable. Advantage might well be taken of both the new quadrangle and more efficient use of the old to alleviate this situation.

In equipment, Tunghai clearly cannot compare with its two major rivals, Taita and Cheng Kung. The availability of government funds and substantial gifts from abroad combine to give these two institutions an advantage which Tunghai can probably never match. However, not all the equipment possessed by either of these is essential for an institution with an undergraduate program and limited objectives such as Tunghai has. What is essential is basic instructional equipment and some facilities for research. How does Tunghai stand in these matters?

It would appear that, in most departments, even minimum essentials have rarely been available. Moreover, in the older

science and engineering departments, there has been inadequate replacement and development. There is need both for improved annual upkeep and for new equipment. Funds should be sought for these purposes. In the case of the third engineering department, that of Industrial Engineering, there is obvious need to build up equipment almost from scratch.

Among the Arts departments, the only one requiring specialized equipment is the English Department. Here, modern methods in the teaching of foreign languages require a speech laboratory such as Tunghai does not now possess. Available equipment is shockingly inadequate, especially in comparison with the modern laboratories at Taita and Normal and Fujen. Tunghai's outstanding reputation in this field is gravely threatened by this lack. (Since the time of the survey, word has been received of a grant to enable installation of the much-needed laboratory.)

The Tunghai library is generally acknowledged to be second in Taiwan only to that at Taita. Its collection of over 80,000 volumes (two-thirds of them in Chinese) is surprisingly good for so young an institution. There are areas of weakness, and the Western books as a whole still need substantial strengthening before Tunghai will have achieved the minimum for which it should aspire. Special funds need to be sought for the purpose of rapid development while there should be increased allocation in the budget for yearly acquisition.

Once the two wings referred to above have been freed from their present use, the Library building should provide adequate space for any likely enrollment. Space now available is not only overcrowded; it is in parts quite inadequately lighted.

HOW LARGE?

On no subject did we hear more discussion than on that of the size of Tunghai. For this we were not unprepared, for the trend in East Asia is almost universally toward large numbers. Even church-related institutions have frequently succumbed to internal conditions and external pressures; enrollments run into the thousands and even tens of thousands. There is something to be said for large enrollments if one looks only at the demand or listens sympathetically to government pressures. But we do not believe that the major responsibility of the Christian college is to meet quantitative needs--especially when there is no answer to the question, "Education for what?" in regard to either the graduate's potential or his opportunity. There is also superficial plausibility in the argument for large numbers as a means of balancing budgets. We are convinced, however, that numbers, at whatever level, are an answer to financial woes only at the cost of dilution of the educational product offered.

We were unprepared for the strong dissent to this trend toward quantity which we heard voiced by many, especially by those themselves caught in the unhappy spiral of swelling numbers. Several educators, unrelated to Tunghai, spoke with envy of Tunghai's policy of quality rather than quantity and of its ability to keep itself within numerical bounds. With this feeling we whole-heartedly agree. We believe that the original decision to limit the size of Tunghai was a wise one and that it should be reaffirmed and strictly adhered to.

We see in the arguments for increased size, most of which were, strangely, advanced from within Tunghai rather than from without, a disturbing confusion in regard to the purpose and nature of Tunghai and, indeed, the nature of the educational process. The largest institution is not necessarily the best. Admission of larger numbers does not insure admission of better ones. A limited exposure of many to Tunghai's spiritual and intellectual environment cannot have the same effect as the more concentrated exposure of a few. Indeed, the environment itself will be greatly changed. Tunghai's development has been guided by the belief that peculiar values, intellectual and spiritual, result from education in a community which, without being narrow, has certain common assumptions and where there can be close and frequent contact between teacher and student. We believe that this should continue to be the goal.

There are also practical considerations. No great increase in enrollment can be effected without serious physical academic dislocation. A doubling of enrollment--the increase most commonly advocated--would either double the size of the classes or require additional teachers. While we recognize that the size of some classes could be increased without harm, we believe any considerable overall increase would seriously change the nature of instruction at Tunghai. And such increases would inevitably require the addition of assistants. Such doubling would also make necessary construction of additional dormitories,

for we cannot accept the idea that double-deck beds--and the doubling of the number of desks, chairs, and wardrobes--would provide a satisfactory answer. Additional faculty would make necessary expansion of the residential area, which is already fully occupied. It appears unlikely that there would be enough large-size classrooms. And it is certain that the library would be overcrowded.

We strongly urge that Tunghai continue to accept definite and severe limitation as to size. We do not suggest an optimum figure, for we do not know what that should be. While the initial ceiling which has so far served as a guide has proved useful and should not lightly be abandoned, it probably should be reconsidered in the light of experience and present knowledge. There is an optimum figure, which may be lower, though we doubt it, and which may be higher, though we believe it will not be greatly so. Such a figure depends on such factors as physical facilities, academic program, and size of classes; and of course on basic policy as to the type of institution desired. There are plateaus of economic efficiency beneath which costs are excessive and above which service suffers. How many students can Tunghai handle with its present facilities and staff, and on its present academic program, without undesirably diluting that program and its own character or requiring additional staff and facilities? We would point out the need for a department-by-department study to determine the optimum enrollment for Tunghai.

Once again we would emphasize what we consider to be the over-riding demands of quality. We believe that numbers must be commensurate with the requirements of excellence and the educational ideal of Tunghai. We believe that those ideals should continue to stress not only quality of instruction but the residential character of the institution which contributes to its uniqueness and without which there would be a loss of instructional and other values.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

We have been unable to escape the conclusion that financially Tunghai is in an unhealthy condition. It is too dependent on foreign sources of support to have adequate freedom of movement or initiative in planning; it has too little other income to encourage development or even to provide stability. Of its total budget of approximately NT$10,000,000 (US$250,000) some 72.9% comes from abroad, either in cash (64.1%) or in personnel (8.8% on the basis of Chinese equivalents). Only 27.1% comes from local sources, almost wholly from student fees. These are budget figures which indicate an expected deficit; the actual situation at the end of the year, when the deficit will have been met from local sources, will show a slightly different ratio. But it is safe to say that over 70% of Tunghai's operating costs will have been met by contributions from abroad. This leaves Tunghai dangerously exposed to outside forces and inadequately rooted in the community it serves.

This dependence on foreign sources, which means the United Board (and through it mission boards), has resulted, we believe in an unfortunate degree of involvement of the outside groups in decisions which would normally be made locally. We do not think this is required or even desired by the United Board, which is firmly committed to a policy of local autonomy. But such involvement is encouraged by the fact that the university program is affected by United Board capacity or willingness to contribute to its support. The situation is probably aggravated by the United Board's being considered by Tunghai, and having been in fact, Tunghai's "Board of Founders." This is not a legal status; it reflects the great part played by the United Board in the establishment of Tunghai. There is also, perhaps, an element of desire on the part of Tunghai to share responsibility, coupled with a too-great readiness to help on the part of the United Board.

We suggest that the United Board give Tunghai assurance of a fixed annual income for a definite period of years--five as a minimum, eight (two college generations) as an optimum. Capital needs and projects would be judged separately on their own merits.

Such an arrangement would place responsibility in planning where it belongs; locally. The advice of the United Board could still be sought when desired, but it would not be thought of as essential for most decisions even though United Board satisfaction with directions being followed would continue to be a long-time factor of importance-- inescapably so for responsible stewardship but not seriously inhibiting local planning. Such an arrangement would be a demonstration of confidence on the part of the United Board which we believe would not be misplaced.

It would also make development of Tunghai dependent on the securing of local resources rather than on ability to persuade an outside body. This would be a healthy step. The addition

of departments and of staff, the raising of salaries, and the level of tuition fees would be problems for the board and the administration to decide without reference to the United Board.

We have sensed, without however having had opportunity to pinpoint, the need for a greater sense of stewardship at various levels. This is probably in part the result of over-reliance on external support. Whatever the cause, it may result not only in less efficient use of resources but, even more significantly, in a diffusion of common purpose and a weakening of esprit de corps. Here we believe that there is need for better internal public relations in the understanding of policies and goals and wider participation in functions where understanding and cooperation are vital.

It is clear that increases in Tunghai's budget will have to be met locally. We suspect that this is inevitable for we think it most unlikely that the United Board will be willing or able to provide annual increases in its support. We also think it desirable, for we do not believe such increases in support good for Tunghai, even if practicable. We see three possible major sources of local support: fees, investments, and gifts.

We find student fees unnecessarily and undesirably low. At present we understand that Tunghai's fees are the lowest among private colleges in Taiwan. We do not know how much they should or could be raised, but we see no reason why they should not reach the maximum the government permits. Even a fifty per cent increase would raise tuition to only US$75 a year, but would add some US$20,000 to income. Provision of scholarship aid for those truly unable to pay would prevent suffering in needy cases.

Tunghai has no cash endowment and is unlikely to have any significant amount in the foreseeable future. We see no chance of great sums being provided from abroad (though assured United Board support does constitute the equivalent of a multi-million dollar endowment), and the likelihood of local endowment funds of any considerable size appears slim. But Tunghai does possess valuable assets in its land, part of which is planted to sugar cane and part to acacia trees. With the elimination of the unfortunate squatter problem, which has persisted entirely too long, more land will be available for production, and the passage of time will increase the acacia yield. We do not know what the ultimate income will prove to be, but we suspect it will be the equivalent of a multi-million NT$ endowment. We suggest that thought be given to other possible resources of a similar nature.

Even with the two sources tapped to the limit, Tunghai is faced with the necessity for raising funds from business, industry, and the general public. We see no reason to doubt that the money is there. That is evident in the standard of living in Taiwan and in the substantial support given to other institutions when conditions are right.

We urge a study by those better qualified than we are to make it, of the necessary conditions for this sort of support for Tunghai. We suggest, however, that it will be necessary to disillusion the public in regard to the extent of support from abroad. We also urge greater cultivation of understanding and good will on the part of the Church and of Taiwanese in general. In other words, public relations. This will involve not only publicity but service. Much has been done, but much more needs to be done to make people not only aware of Tunghai but appreciative of, even indebted to it.

We would hope that, during the next decade, there could be such a shifting of balance that local sources would be supporting at least half of an increased budget, leaving the United Board no longer the major partner.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

We would congratulate Tunghai's Board of Directors on the institution which has developed under their direction and to which they have contributed so much time and thought. There have been moments of difficulty and of uncertainty which have been wisely and boldly met, storms which have been safely weathered. We can well imagine that building from nothing to the Tunghai of today has not been an easy or simple task.

At the same time we must admit to some concern over certain impressions which we gained. It was disturbing to have one director repeatedly say that he did not know enough to comment on conditions, and another state that he did not know what was going on. We would be the last to advocate over-zealous involvement in details, but we do feel that a greater familiarity with general developments is highly desirable. Certainly there is need for complete clarity in regard to goals, especially the Christian goals.

There seemed to us to be some confusion as to the part a board of directors should play. One comment was that the directors were not interested in academic matters; another that they concerned themselves only with technical and routine matters. We would support the hope, expressed by one member, that there could be more discussion of long-range policy. Many of the questions which are raised in this report must be answered by the directors after thorough study.

Whether two meetings a year provide sufficient opportunity for such study and discussion is a question. Especially if they are limited, as we were given to understand, to a few hours in an afternoon or morning, it would seem that time is too limited for more than routine actions.

We would also ask whether the board might not helpfully be strengthened in one or two respects. Though there is a natural preponderence of clergymen, there is fair representation of other professions and walks of life. However, there would appear to be, on the basis both of training and experience, somewhat inadequate acquaintance with the nature and needs of higher education. At the same time, we wonder how fully directors who carry, as many do, multiple similar responsibilities in connection with other educational institutions, elementary, secondary, and higher, can concentrate on the problems of Tunghai.

One specific problem we especially call attention to: that of local fund-raising. Though we are impressed by the part the Board has played in the development of Tunghai, we cannot escape the impression of a certain lack of financial responsibility. As we pointed out earlier, greater local support seems to us essential for the health and growth of Tunghai. The Board of Directors has a fundamental responsibility for such activity and must play a major part in it. It is not enough to throw the

burden on the shoulders of the president. He too must be involved, especially in planning, but the directors must share very fully in the heat of the battle. If we are correct in thinking that lack of activity heretofore has been partly a result of the belief that the United Board will provide, we would point out not only that this is almost certain to prove a groundless hope but that it would not be good for Tunghai were it true. We cannot too strongly urge the Tunghai Board of Directors to undertake actively the vital task of raising money in Taiwan--where we are confident there is money, provided the spirit is willing.

Having said so much, we would reiterate our conviction that the Tunghai Board is an excellent board which has done much but whose potential strength has not been fully tested and whose initiative has not been fully drawn on. We only suggest that it be strengthened by the addition of a few members with special qualifications in education and finance.

IN CONCLUSION

We believe that Tunghai represents remarkable achievement for one decade, especially under the circumstances which it has had to cope with: a nation at war, a nation divided; economic difficulties, political problems. A surprising percentage of original hopes has been realized. Not the least significant feature of Tunghai's growth has been its creative quality. Tunghai has not followed other institutions too closely, even its spiritual ancestors the China Colleges, nor has it had to conform to too rigid an official pattern. One of the most valuable privileges it was granted was that of a degree of experimentation which had long been absent from the educational scene in China. Without that, and without the will to explore new paths, Tunghai might well have been an uninspiring imitation of an uninteresting standard.

We are convinced that a Christian university must be a pioneering institution. Notable ones of the past have been. Colleges of the future are not likely to be greatly rated unless they too are. We have seen clear evidence of the pioneering spirit in Tunghai's beginnings; we still note some hopeful signs. The Labor Program was a new and creative idea in Taiwan, if not in Asia. General Education, though already a force in Japan, was new to Taiwan. It has much to offer to the whole area, which has concentrated on training specialists but has failed to educate men. Tunghai has led in the teaching of English, carrying on the tradition of the China Colleges but responding to new and increased demands. And there are indications of the pioneering spirit in research, as in the study of local fauna. Something has been done, but much more can and should be done. For example, we would like to be able to report more experimentation and blazing of new trails in Tunghai's basic task, that of teaching. To the extent that there is emphasis on the teacher-student relationship there is pioneering in a field badly neglected in Asia. But we would like to see a greater breaking away from traditional ways. Teaching is still too generally thought of as passing on facts by uninspired methods. Eventually consideration might be given to an honors program for the very gifted student. There are other areas.

We were interested in the evaluations of Tunghai which came to us from many sources. These ranged from "foreign, second-rate, going-abroad institution," which appears to be a fairly popular label, to very high praise from educators, government officials, and industrialists. The first is easy to understand. Tunghai is largely dependent on foreign support and has a considerable number of foreign faculty and staff. Tunghai has not yet achieved the popular reputation of older and larger government institutions. And Tunghai graduates are understandably successful in passing going-abroad examinations and in securing opportunities abroad. This popular picture, though not flattering, is not entirely surprising.

We were, however, surprised--and impressed--by the volume

and apparent sincerity of the praise. We were informed by a Ph.D. in engineering that America-bound Tunghai graduates in engineering were equal in training to those in other institutions and "better in English and character." We were told that, even though it is private, Tunghai is regarded as in a class with Taiwan National and Cheng Kung Universities. The quality of faculty and students was reported to us as high. A more cautious statement spoke of Tunghai's reputation as "good, and improving." Even allowing for a certain amount of courtesy, we were impressed by the unexpectedly high standing Tunghai has obviously achieved in its first decade.

It seemed clear that Tunghai has overcome much of its early difficulty in selling itself to teachers and students. Reasons we were given for its growing attractiveness included the following: concern for the individual, contact between teacher and student, fewer distractions, a better curriculum (less fancy, more fundamental), superior teaching (fuller use of time, greater variety of methods), more Westerners, residential character, full-time faculty, Christian atmosphere. It was pointed out that Tunghai is noted for efficiency (getting along with a limited staff) and for integrity (no bribery of officials or yielding to pressure). This is high praise. It is also, we believe, a good listing of qualities which, if emphasized, can contribute much to Tunghai's future greatness and uniqueness.

We are strongly under the impression that Tunghai was started at a crucial time in the life of both the nation and the church. We believe that it joined the march of events when the nation was learning to work together, and that it was needed to strengthen the nation by joining the Christian spirit to a developing nationalism. The commitment to the belief that God is Father of all mankind and that man has one destiny gives it peculiar significance at this time. We look upon it as a national institution, but one with an international world conception.

We are not unaware--no one paying more than a flying tourist visit can be--of the tensions that exist in Free China. The existence of majority and minority groups who, while stemming from the same cultural roots, do not fully share the same conception of Taiwan's present and future, induces strain at many levels of social, economic, and political life. Uncertainty in regard to the future, which is so largely dependent on forces beyond the control of people on Taiwan, threatens morale and discourages idealism. Whether there has actually been deterioration in morale, there is disturbing evidence of weakness in individual and group morals. One can quite honestly marvel that, under the circumstances, conditions are not far worse, but the fact remains that there is need for resistance and answers to corrosion in these areas. And for an institution which is concerned with leadership in the local situation, the lack of openings for graduates, the emigration of all who can leave, and even the mere desire to leave, which affects both majority and minority groups, are factors influencing goals and determining program. We are encouraged in our hopes for Tunghai

by the relatively positive and healthy nature of its response to this situation.

In closing, we would repeat the urging that has been implicit throughout this report, that the Board of Directors, the administration, and the faculty seriously study the challenges and the opportunities Tunghai faces and themselves plan for the years ahead.

We see in the situation in which Tunghai lives a challenge to Tunghai as an educational institution seeking to provide more than information and techniques, and as a Christian institution concerned with spirit as well as with mind. We believe it is called upon to demonstrate democracy in practice as well as in teaching, to adhere vigorously to the highest moral and ethical standards, to mediate between peoples and cultures, to have and to share a sense of mission and commitment, and in these ways to serve not only Taiwan and Free China but the world as well.

- o O o -

東海大學圖書館
TUNGHAI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

REPORT OF A SURVEY OF TUNGHAI UNIVERSITY
February 22 -March 06, 1964
Taichung, Taiwan
電子書

發 行 人/ 東海大學圖書館

出 版 者/ 東海大學圖書館

電子書設計製作/ 東海大學圖書館　李光臨

電子書網頁平台維護/東海大學圖書館/江維信/李光臨/陳天佑

地 址/ 40704 臺中市西屯區臺灣大道四段 1727 號

電 話/ (04) 2359-0121

傳 真/ (04) 2359-2622

網 址/ www.lib.thu.edu.tw/

電子郵件/ libedb@thu.edu.tw

E I S B N： XXX -XXX-XXX-XXX-X (PDF)

出版日期/ 2022 年 5 月

電子書檔案格式/ PDF

播放軟體/ Adobe Reader