

Maryland Overseas Troubles, Difficulties and Victories The 1970s to the 1990s

Joe Arden
February 2021

INTRODUCTION

From the late 1960s through the end of the 20th Century, Maryland experienced the most stressful challenges of its more than 70 years overseas. During this period, there were times when Maryland definitely could have lost its role as the principal provider of post-secondary education in the American military world.

The center of these problems was in Europe where, yes, Maryland could well have been forced to pull up stakes and "go home." If that had happened, the impact would beyond question have been highly negative for Maryland's entire worldwide program. This difficult period in Europe stemmed from a combination of three factors: a) the number of institutions that came overseas to offer courses, b) the role of civilian education officials, and c) Maryland's contractual relationship with the U.S. military.

THE ONLY GAME IN TOWN

From 1949 until well into the 1960s, Maryland was the only American university teaching the U.S. military overseas. We were, quite literally, the 'only game in town.'

This privileged status stemmed from Maryland saying, "Yes," in 1949, when the Pentagon was attempting to identify a major American university willing to offer classes on U.S. military bases in Europe. In 1956, the same perspicacious administrators in College Park again said "Yes," when in Asia the military needed to replace the small University of California, Berkeley program offered for a short time in the early 1950s. Maryland, in effect, claimed "squatters' rights" for nearly two decades and established itself as "the university upon which the sun never sets."

THE 1960s: NEW GAMES COME TO TOWN

This 'only game in town' status began to change in the mid-1960s as University of Oklahoma, University of Southern California and Boston University began to offer graduate courses, initially in Europe, and in the case of OU and USC, soon in Asia as well. These three universities, however, operated exclusively at the graduate level.

A special thanks to John Golembe for playing an extremely important role in this memoir. As had been our pattern writing proposals in Heidelberg during the 1980s and 90s, John and I have gone over this memoir line-by-line. We had to brush away 40 years of cobwebs, often chagrined at how much of the past was difficult to recall. I hope that we have correctly recorded the most important events. Thanks to skillful editing, John greatly improved my first drafts. I am very pleased that he was willing to spend lots of time enabling this memoir to be written. Thanks also to Denise Sokolowski whose recollection of details was valuable and to Paula Harbecke who provided helpful suggestions on the final draft.

Maryland also could have begun graduate programs around the same time. But, with the exception of a small Counseling and Personnel Services (CAPS) master's program on Okinawa and briefly in the Tokyo Kanto Plains area, Maryland focused overseas almost entirely on undergraduate programs. In fact, CAPS was an exception made primarily because prominent Japanese on Okinawa asked U.S. Forces, Japan (USFJ) and Maryland to offer a graduate program that also would be open to Japanese nationals.

Until the late 1960s University of Maryland University College (UMUC) continued to be the only institution offering undergraduate courses on U.S. military installations overseas. That began to change when two community colleges – City Colleges of Chicago (CCC) and Central Texas College (CTC) – were invited to Europe to offer "technical-occupational" courses and, in some instances, courses by video.

THE 1970s: CAN'T TELL THE PLAYERS WITHOUT A SCORECARD

What had been a controlled growth in the number of academic institutions serving the U.S. Forces overseas became an avalanche in Europe in the 1970s, introducing an era known as the "Revolving Door of American Education." This began when the director of the United States Air Forces Europe (USAFE) education program, Dr. K. Douglas Beakes, invited a large number of schools to begin undergraduate and graduate programs on Air Force bases. Under the rules then in existence Dr. Beakes had unilateral authority to invite universities to begin programs in Europe and was not reluctant to do so. Indeed, the USAFE education policy seemed to be "the more the merrier."

This approach caused so much concern that on March 5, 1981 an investigative article in *Stars and Stripes* noted that "at least 10 schools" had come and gone from USAFE over the previous decade, including: "Wayne State University (1969-73), Washington Technical Institute (1972-74), El Paso Community College (1973-76), University of Nebraska at Omaha (1972-75), Harford Community College (1974-78), and Big Bend Community College, (1974-77)." Some schools were in Europe so briefly, the article noted, that the reporters couldn't pin down dates, including "New England Aeronautical Institute, Roosevelt University and later American University."

Other schools that USAFE invited during this period included University of Arkansas, University of Utah, Troy State University, Ball State University, Vanderbilt University, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, and Central Michigan University. A few, such as Troy State and Embry-Riddle succeeded in maintaining programs into the 1980s and 1990s. *Stars and Stripes* found that nearly all that departed, however, did so because "destructive competition" led to unsustainably low enrollments.

A GATHERING STORM IN EUROPE

The sudden increase in post-secondary institutions brought unfortunate developments for the UMUC's European Division. First, the universities contracted to offer graduate programs increasingly sought to offer undergraduate degrees as well. Second, the community colleges contracted to offer technical-occupational courses – CCC and CTC–

increasingly sought to also offer general education requirement (GER) courses in the humanities, social sciences, math and sciences.

That community colleges wanted to offer GER courses was understandable. On their home campuses in the States, such courses were a required in their technical-occupational degree programs. Thus, they wanted to offer the same courses in Europe rather than having their students transfer in GER courses taken with Maryland.

But for Maryland, the GER and traditional academic courses were our life's blood. If, given the finite number of students at each military installation, the two-year schools that came to Europe to offer technical-occupational courses could also offer traditional academic courses Maryland would be placed in an untenable situation. This was made all the more the case by how the two-year schools staffed classes.

During the 1970s, the two-year schools exclusively used part-time faculty in Europe and required that instructors hold only a baccalaureate degree. In addition, these schools often paid faculty "by the head." If a class had six students, the teacher would be paid less money than with if there were twelve students, but the course would still take place. Expressed crudely, Maryland quickly found that, "bad money drove out good."

Many Education Services Officers (ESOs) were attracted to offering English 101, Psychology 100, etc., with the two-year schools because their courses could take place with considerably fewer enrollments than needed for a Maryland class to "go." For Maryland in 1970s Europe dealing with ESOs, particularly at Air Force bases, regarding which school would teach which courses became an increasing challenge.

A complicating reality was that to earn high performance ratings and get promoted ESOs would often offer as many courses as they could, have as many of those courses "go" as possible and maximize the number of academic institutions on their installation. These were important factors in determining whether ESOs were promoted to the next civil service grade. Therefore, ESOs were increasingly willing to encourage schools that had been invited to Europe to offer technical-occupational or graduate programs to offer undergraduate academic courses.

In short, in Europe during the 1970s, a perfect storm for Maryland, and indeed for post-secondary education in Europe, was brewing:

- The universities invited to Europe to offer graduate programs were anxious to also offer undergraduate programs.
- The two-year schools invited to Europe to offer technical-occupational courses were anxious to offer GER and traditional academic courses.
- The USAFE Education Chief was keen to invite to Europe as many universities and community colleges as possible.

- ESOs, primarily at USAFE installations, had strong incentives to increase the number of academic institutions represented on their installation and to be able to select which school could offer which courses.
- The “market” of potential students simply was not large enough to support this developing environment. By the mid-late 1970s, uncertainty and chaos were becoming the hallmarks of the era.

THE STORM TOUCHES DOWN

I served as an Area Director in Europe from 1971-1975. During that era, there was an Area Director for Germany, an Area Director for the United Kingdom, and an Area Director for "everything else." My official title was "Area Director, Benelux, Mediterranean, Middle East and North Africa." I reported to Dr. T. Benjamin Massey, the European Division Director. From the very start I loved my job.

An Area Director's primary responsibilities were to a) agree upon course schedules with the ESOs at all installations in one's geographic area of responsibility, b) assign faculty to the courses being offered at the various installations, c) maintain the needed overall per-course enrollment average for Maryland to make it financially. In addition, Area Directors were to keep the Maryland ship above water and on a steady course in, respectively, Germany, the U.K., and 'everywhere else.'

In one of my first meetings with Ben Massey, whom I had known in Asia in 1969-70 when he was Director of the Far East Division and I was teaching there, he explained that "We Maryland" were to offer all the courses traditionally considered to be "academic." He also explained the importance of maintaining the then required average of 20 students per class. Each class did not have to have 20 students nor did each military installation have to average 20 students in its Maryland classes. But that had to be the overall average class size I achieved for my geographic area of responsibility.

During academic years 1971-72 and 1972-73, when traveling to various Army, Air Force and Navy installations in 'my little kingdom,' I became increasingly aware that the two-year schools were often keen to 'invade" Maryland's space and offer academic courses. I also quickly came to understand that many ESOs believed that they had the power to decide "which school offered what" on their installation. If a two-year school could offer English 101 or Math 101, and have the class “go” with as few as 6-10 students, "Why, Joe, should I schedule the class with Maryland with your need for a 20 average?"

To reply, I became skilled in explaining, as diplomatically as possible, why better qualified Maryland faculty with graduate degrees who met the academic standards of a major American university would almost certainly provide a more valuable learning experience than the faculty of two-year schools, who rarely held graduate degrees. I also attempted – sometimes subtly, sometimes less so – to touch upon the advantage to students of a 'name

school' such as the University of Maryland. (In this regard, I was greatly assisted by the high national rankings of Maryland's basketball teams in the 1970s. Maryland, a power in the Atlantic Coast Conference, was regularly ranked in the "Top Ten" nationally, and all students had heard of the school.)

With the coming of more and more schools by academic years 1973-74 and 1974-75, I was spending more time attempting to ensure that Maryland courses were on the schedule at the various installations and less time advancing the program by identifying and assisting faculty, meeting with students, etc. Out of necessity I was becoming a traveling salesperson who needed to explain to ESOs why "my product" should be on "your shelf" rather than the product of "X School."

Frequently I found myself fighting an uphill battle. I would arrive at an installation with a Maryland schedule agreed upon by the ESO and faculty assigned to find that half the courses to be offered by Maryland were also being offered by other schools in the same academic term. On one particularly memorable visit, I arrived at Torrejon Air Base in Spain to discover three different institutions offering the equivalent of English 101 and a half dozen other courses on the Maryland schedule were also being offered by another institution. By the mid-1970s, academic chaos was fast becoming the order of the day at many installations in Europe.

OTHER SIDES OF THE STORY

The 1950 classic Japanese movie "Rashomon" by Akira Kurosawa explored how eyewitnesses to the same event can have very different views about what happened and why. I have attempted to provide a factual account of the developments that led to the situation that existed in military education in the 1960s and 70s but have touched little on the attitudes, emotions and feelings of the key players involved.

At the time, many in Europe felt the above situation reflected in large measure a conflict between Maryland and the Chief of USAFE Education, Dr. K. Douglas Beakes. It was widely thought that "bad blood" existed between Dr. Beakes, some of his ESOs and Maryland. And, to a considerable degree, this was the case.

Why did this this negative relationship exist and what fueled it? Though it began in the 1960s, before my initial experience in Europe, I came to understand that contributing factors probably included the following:

- Some USAFE education officials believed and resented that Maryland's primary 'contractual' relationship was with U.S. Army Europe (USAREUR) and felt this meant that USAFE needs came secondary. Air Force has always considered itself to be the most supportive of the services with regard to voluntary education and this 'little brother' role in Europe rubbed some the wrong way.

- A feeling on the part of some educational officials that when Maryland was “the only game in town” in the 1950s and 60s its administrators took advantage of that situation arrogantly and were unresponsive and dismissive of government input. While this example of “power corrupting” may have once been true I can say with certainty that when I was an Area Director in the 1970s with Ben Massey as the Director, the opposite was the case. I never saw Ben interact with anyone in a manner that could remotely be described in such terms.
- On the other hand, to be fair, it was true that UMUC's senior staff believed that we understood academia more thoroughly than most government education officials. One of our guiding principles was to offer academically sound programs that would be respected whether on the campuses of major universities in the United States or overseas military installations. It is certainly possible and even likely that some Marylanders communicated this belief in a less-than-favorable manner.
- A belief of Dr. Beakes' that Maryland had not been according him appropriate respect. I recall his telling me that in the 1960s when the UMUC Dean and overseas program founder (Ray Ehrensberger) or UMUC Associate Dean (Stan Drazek) came to Europe, they never visited his headquarters at Wiesbaden Air Base. Rather, he complained, they always insisted that he come to Heidelberg. While both Ray and Stan assured me they had seen Doug in Wiesbaden, I do not know which version was correct.
- A complicating component of the “respect” issue was Dr. Beakes' 1968 letter to Dr. Ehrensberger suggesting that he receive a Maryland honorary doctorate at the 1969 European Division Commencement. Dr. Ehrensberger never replied to the request nor did UMUC ever bestow an honorary degree on Dr. Beakes. Over the years this incident had remained something of a contentious backroom issue
- A strong suspicion on Maryland's part that Doug Beakes was using his authority to invite universities to offer programs in Europe to undermine Maryland. Senior Marylanders have believed that since the European Division was not beholden to Dr. Beakes as were the universities he invited to Europe, he strongly resented that and wanted to see Maryland gone.

Regardless of what was involved, an extremely unfortunate situation had developed in Europe.

A NEW JOB

I had thought that my personal involvement with the academic chaos in Europe was coming to a close in summer 1975 when I accepted appointment as Director of UMUC's Far East Division (FED), which was later renamed “Asian Division.” In August 1975, I transferred from Heidelberg to Tokyo. Having taught with Maryland in Asia 1967–70,

served with the Army in Vietnam and worked as a researcher with an American think tank in Thailand, I felt at home and was pleased to return to Asia.

While serving as Director of the FED from August 1975 to January 1981, I was very lucky in several important respects but especially with regard to my supervisors. For my first year (1975-76), I reported to Dr. Mason G. "Bob" Daly, UMUC's Dean in College Park, who himself had been Director of both the Far East and European Divisions. Then in summer 1976, Bob Daly resigned as UMUC Dean and transferred to Heidelberg to become Director of UMUC's European Division (ED). Simultaneously, Ben Massey transferred to the home campus to become UMUC's Vice Chancellor. Thus, for the rest of my time with the FED, I once again reported to Ben Massey.

If one looked at an organization chart when I was FED Director, there were times when it might have seemed that I was of equal status with Ben and Bob. In 1975-76, Ben and I were both directing overseas divisions. Then again, in 1976-81, Bob and I were both overseas directors. Throughout, however, I understood that each was very much my superior and I was never shy about reaching out to them for advice and guidance. Both always responded freely and helpfully, which I always greatly appreciated.

CALMER WATERS IN ASIA

Soon after arriving in Japan, I realized that both Maryland and military education in Asia might be spared the situation that had developed in Europe. The two-year schools were much less ensconced than in Europe. Central Texas College (CTC) was primarily at Army installations in Korea and Los Angeles City Colleges (LACC) had just arrived in Asia a year or so earlier and was still getting its feet on the ground. Yes, both CTC and LACC were pleased to offer 'academic' courses, but the overall environment to do so was not nearly as conducive as in Europe.

Throughout the Pacific, the Air Force had been designated by Pacific Command (PACOM) to administer off duty education programs. The head of the Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) education program was Dr. Edwin Peterson, whose office was at Hickam Air Base in Hawaii where both PACOM and PACAF headquarters were located. Dr. Peterson and I knew one another from having met in the early 1970s at various military education conferences in the States and had discovered we shared a passion for basketball.

Maryland's administrative leadership in Japan had been through a difficult several years in the early 1970s. The Division Director (Joe Mabbett) had spent extended periods in the States for medical treatment and upon returning to Japan in 1974 died shortly after. His replacement (Ed Austin), another long-time Far East Division administrator, was to pass away only a few months later. Prior to my arrival in August 1975 a third veteran administrator (Emory Trosper) had been serving as interim director. Ed Peterson was hoping for some stability in Maryland's FED and was pleased to welcome me.

Even more importantly Ed was aware of the developing storm in Europe and clearly concerned. He encouraged me to share my views of the situation and asked for my

reactions and suggestions. I explained that the system that had developed, particularly at Air Force installations, of the various schools having to jump through hoops to get their course(s) on the schedule was not merely absurd but also directly harmful to education in the military community. This interaction about the situation in Europe became a constant discussion between Ed and myself for the entire period I was Far East Division (FED) Director. On an ongoing basis, I took every possible opportunity to bring home to Ed what should be avoided in Asia.

One example that I recall relating to him: At an installation in Korea in 1979, I spent some little time attempting to explain to the ESO why Bob Barcus, a Maryland faculty member, holding the Ph.D. in psychology from Ohio State University, should be assigned to teach Psychology 100 in the upcoming term rather than the Army lieutenant whom CTC planned to assign to their introductory psychology course. The lieutenant had applied to teach with Maryland and I had met him and had a copy of his transcript. He was a pleasant young man who had maintained a solid "C" average as an undergraduate psychology major and had no graduate work whatsoever. Such conversations with ESOs were, to put it mildly, taxing.

With Ed, I strongly suggested that there should be a rational manner to determine which institution would teach Psychology 100 as well as other courses on overseas military bases. If the Government preferred to have university courses taught by two-year schools with very different teaching requirements than required by major universities, that was the Government's prerogative. But, universities should not be compelled to negotiate and bargain at the individual installation level to get their PSYC 100s and other courses on the schedule.

Peterson had no trouble understanding this viewpoint. During the late 1970s he encouraged Education Services Officers to work closely with Maryland and the other schools to avoid harmful competition for students in the manner that had become common in Europe. Of equal importance, Peterson had no need to exercise his authority by inviting additional schools to offer programs. Rather, he stayed with the University of Southern California and the University of Oklahoma graduate programs, both of which had been in the Pacific for several years. And he also stayed with CTC and LACC while continuing to ask Maryland to offer undergraduate academic courses. In contrast to the chaotic situation in Europe, storm clouds did not gather in Asia, neither in the 1970s nor into the 1980s.

RETURN TO THE STORM ZONE

In December 1980, Ben Massey, informed me that Bob Daly had decided to retire. To say that I was surprised would be a considerable understatement. I had thought Bob was still several years away from such a decision. Ben went on to explain that he wanted me to transfer to Heidelberg and replace Bob as Director.

Ben knew how much I enjoyed Asia and how comfortable I was as Far East Division Director. But Ben also knew me quite well and knew that as a 'company man' I would do whatever he deemed best for UMUC. After saying "yes" I asked, "When?" Ben did not mince words: "As soon as possible." I arrived in early January 1981 and Bob Daly met me at

Frankfurt Airport. Although I have been met at many airports all over the world, I have never been met by anyone as happy to see me as was Bob Daly.

Bob remained in Heidelberg only a short time longer. Clearly, he was looking forward to leaving the Director position and getting on with the rest of his life. At the same time, he was more than willing to assist me in the new role. He provided a great deal of helpful information and made clear that he was always available to assist in any possible way in the future. I appreciated that and as the years went by reached out to him on many occasions. I am pleased to say that we developed an increasingly close personal relationship.

While still in Asia, I had been kept aware that the chaotic situation experienced in my European Division years had become increasingly dire. The "Revolving Door" was now the order of the day particularly at Air Force installations and competition to get Maryland undergraduate courses on the schedule had intensified.

At several USAFE installations, from Turkey to the United Kingdom, ESOs had become reluctant to put Maryland courses on their schedules. Rather, they were turning to other schools, particularly Troy State University, a school that Doug Beakes had invited to Europe in the mid-1970s to offer a graduate program in management. By the late 1970s Troy was also offering a range of undergraduate courses, particularly in business management and computing. At some USAFE installations only two or three Maryland courses were being offered, almost always in English, foreign languages and other humanities.

From Maryland's perspective, the situation that had been developing for over a decade had become extremely dangerous and was threatening the sustainability of the program. The structure of Maryland's overseas program was based upon being the primary provider of undergraduate academic courses on all military installations. This had been our *raison d'être* since 1949. If Maryland were to continue to offer the same high-quality program in Europe as it had for its first 30 year, these restrictions on its course offerings had to be stopped.

BACK ON THE GROUND IN EUROPE

After my 1981 arrival in Europe and a briefing by European Division senior staff regarding the precarious situation, I knew that our number one goal had to be establish a much better working relationship with USAFE and Dr. Beakes. In trying to accomplish this, luck was again on my side. The unfortunate reality was that, at the personal level, Doug Beakes and Bob Daly had not gotten on at all well. Simply not being Bob Daly was a considerable advantage for me.

I contacted Doug within days of my arrival and asked if, at his convenience, I could visit him in Wiesbaden. I had known him since the early 1970s and even when I was in Asia had interacted with him several times at military education conferences in the States. Our relationship was positive. I was several years younger than Doug and it was natural for me to accord him respect. In addition, my relationship with Ed Peterson worked to my

advantage because Ed was gracious enough to let Doug know that he (Ed) had found me reasonable and easy to work with. Indeed, during our initial meeting in Wiesbaden, Doug mentioned his conversations with Ed, which I took to be a positive sign.

During the remainder of 1981 and into 1983, I asked key European Division administrators to bend over backwards to work positively with all ESOs, particularly USAFE ESOs. I stressed to the Area Directors that they should make every effort to accommodate any, even borderline, reasonable requests from ESOs, especially in USAFE. Further, we in Heidelberg emphasized to Maryland faculty, the importance of working cooperatively with ESOs, especially going the extra mile assisting and counseling students. We wanted to be as certain as possible that there could be no reasonable complaints about our faculty. The faculty response was extremely positive and helpful.

Throughout this period I also made many trips to USAFE bases in Turkey, Greece, Italy, Spain, Holland and the U.K. to meet with ESOs, several of whom I knew from previous times in Europe and Asia. I asked, asked, asked and then listened, listened, listened.

SOME FORTUITOUS HAPPENINGS BEYOND OUR CONTROL

While UMUC focused on its problems with USAFE in Europe, two major challenges to military education programs were mounted on a broader scale. The first, beginning in the 1970s, was a strong critique within American academia of the quality of post-secondary education being offered to the U.S. military. The criticism that received the most attention was from a nationally respected professor at Harvard University. The second challenge, in the early 1980s, was an investigative series of articles that appeared in the newspaper, *Stars and Stripes*.

- The “Bailey Report.” After conducting research that involved many visits to off-campus, on-base post-secondary education programs for the U.S. military, Dr. Stephen K. Bailey published a report in the mid-1970s that maintained the programs on military installations were of low quality. In one oft-cited comment he noted that some programs were not collegiate level but more like a continuation of high school. Of equal importance was an overriding concern for how post-secondary education in overseas military communities was then being acquired and conducted.

The “Bailey Report” hit the military education world extremely hard, causing backlash from government officials and schools alike. Regardless of whether Dr. Bailey’s findings were accurate or overstated, the negative publicity was potentially damaging. Among the problems these allegations could cause was to make it more difficult for students to transfer the academic credits they earned in these programs to American colleges and universities that were not engaged with the military.

Ironically, though, this negative publicity generally worked to the advantage of the University of Maryland. Professor Bailey’s criticisms aligned with what Maryland senior staff had been saying as we interacted with ESOs to get and keep our courses

and programs on installation schedules. UMUC had repeatedly stressed the importance of academic quality, including especially that faculty had to meet the same standards as on major campuses in the States. Bailey's much-discussed report fit in exactly with what Maryland had been stressing.

- *Stars and Stripes Investigative Journalism*. In early March 1981, shortly after I arrived in Europe, we in Heidelberg were surprised by a front-page announcement that *Stars and Stripes* was launching an eight-part series, asking, "How good is military education?" The series was the work of three reporters who "gathered data from U.S. and European sources; their research included more than 200 interviews."

While the series covered a range of educational challenges for the government and service members (e.g., enlistees without high school diplomas, soldiers' difficulty reading manuals, discouraging atmosphere in public schools, etc.), four of the articles – half of the entire series – zeroed in on how badly, even corruptly, United States Air Forces Europe (USAFE) was managing its program of post-secondary education, especially with regard to Maryland.

Headlines of the major articles told the story. On **March 5, 1981** three articles appeared, entitled: "Contract schools 'revolving door' has USAFE in spin," "Abrupt dropping of degree program by Ball State left students out in cold," and "USAFE education official solicited honorary degree: Not illegal but not condoned." On **March 10, 1981**, there were three more articles: "Maryland feels squeeze," "The ax falls: Torrejon AB education officer chops away until Maryland program is nearly non-existent," and "Torrejon's Americans ask: What's going on?" **March 11, 1981** had one article: "Low tuition is no bargain." **March 13, 1981** the final article closed the series with a warning: "Numbers game' in – quality out."

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESPONDS

These criticisms were, to say the least, a major problem for the Department of Defense (DOD), which attached considerable importance to its voluntary education programs for service members. DOD had little choice but to investigate what was taking place and respond in a positive way that would satisfy the broader American academic community. In response the then Director of Voluntary Education, United States Department of Defense (Dr. Ike Tribble), was tasked to form and head an Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) team to travel to major American military installations in Asia and Europe to review voluntary education.

The OSD team consisted of senior civilian military educators representing the Air Force, Army and Navy, as well as a senior DOD contracting officer. During AY 1981-82, the OSD team visited several major military installations in Germany, Spain and the U.K. University representatives such as myself were invited to travel to the installations and meet with team members.

As the OSD team traveled, over a period of a couple of months in Asia and Europe, the contrast between the orderly nature of the post-secondary environment in PACOM compared to the chaotic EUCOM situation became evident. Given the OSD status of the team, its views and recommendations were not to be ignored in the overseas military world.

The Team's key recommendation was that the process by which DOD selected academic institutions to operate overseas should be changed to a manner similar to how DOD procured other goods and services. This meant bringing to overseas education an acquisition process that would see the Government issuing RFPs (Requests for Proposals), academic institutions submitting written proposals, followed by a thorough professional evaluation. Based on the evaluation DOD would determine "which institution was to offer which programs" for the number of years specified in the RFP and resulting contracts. Needless to say, this process was very different than the manner in which the Air Force had been operating in Europe over the previous 15 years.

We at Maryland were extremely pleased. If implemented as intended, schools would no longer be in the position of fighting to get their courses on schedules, and senior government education officials such as Doug Beakes would no longer have sole authority to invite post-secondary institutions to come to Europe to offer programs.

THE 1980s: A LIGHT AT THE END OF THE TUNNEL

Following the Tribble OSD team report, USAFE began to review its procurement process with the intention of moving in the direction of adopting the OSD team recommendation. During this time, I met informally several times with ESOs while visiting installations and at education conferences. I also met informally with USAFE contracting officials.

On these occasions, I always tried to elaborate on the advantages represented by the OSD recommendation. One particular example seemed always to help. I would point out that at all USAFE installations the Air Force police used the same type and make of vehicle, whether in Lakenheath, England or Incirlik, Turkey. Then, I would note that the vehicle had been selected by the Air Force in a rational procurement process. Always, I emphasized what had not happened. Representatives from Ford, Chevrolet and Dodge had not descended on Lakenheath and Incirlik to persuade the base commander to buy their vehicle.

THE USAFE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

In spring 1983, USAFE issued a request for proposal (RFP) for the undergraduate and graduate programs that it wanted to be available from academic years 1984-85 through 1989-90. This development pleased UMUC, but when the details of the RFP were announced, we were anything but pleased. In an apparent effort to make it as difficult as possible for us to successfully bid for the contract, USAFE structured the RFP and included academic requirements in ways that it hoped would severely handicap UMUC.

- **THE RFP STRUCTURE.** Regarding the structure of the anticipated program, the RFP did not call for the undergraduate curriculum to be divided into freshman-sophomore courses, which would have allowed two-year institutions to bid on that element of a four-year baccalaureate degree. Nor was there an element of the RFP requesting bids on junior-senior level courses. Rather, the undergraduate academic element of the RFP divided all courses – freshman through senior – into three disciplines: business management, computer related, and the traditional liberal arts. Institutions could bid on one of these distinct disciplines or any combination of them.

The reason for our concern was that for several years, USAFE had alleged, as a reason for inviting other schools, that UMUC was "weak" in business and computing. At several USAFE installations, we had not been allowed for the last several years to offer courses from either discipline. Rather, other institutions, almost always Troy State University offered all or most of these courses.

USAFE's structuring the undergraduate RFP that forced schools to bid for programs by individual discipline was – from an academic perspective – absurd. And, Maryland believed, it was also intentional. The result could have been one institution offering all business courses, a second institution offering all computer courses, and a third institution offering all courses in the liberal arts. Indeed, the European Division believed that the RFP had been designed to award TSU all of the business and computing courses, leaving Maryland and other schools to compete for the liberal arts. This view of USAFE's intention was widely shared in the European military education community.

- **RFP ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS.** It had always been the position of Maryland and other major academic institutions that a university, not the government, set degree requirements. In this RFP, however, USAFE mandated two new requirements that undergraduate institutions had to include in their degree programs.

The first new requirement outlawed the "final 30" rule. Like most state universities, UMUC accepted in transfer up to 90 semester hours (s.h.) of credit toward the 120 required for a bachelor's degree, so long as students completed their "final 30" credits with UMUC. The "final 30" rule was to ensure that graduates would complete their major fields of study with the university that granted them a degree.

The RFP, however, explicitly stated that to be awarded a USAFE contract, a university would have to allow "any 30" of its credits to qualify a student to earn its degree. Even if students took those credits many years before when they began their post-secondary educations. Over many years, UMUC leadership, to include Ray Ehrensberger, Stan Drazek and Bob Daly, strongly defended the "final 30" rule.

Another requirement that USAFE mandated in its RFP was a one-credit course teaching students how to use a library, especially for research. This course had to be one of the 120 credits required for a bachelor's degree. UMUC did not have a "library-skills" course but covered the topic in its freshman writing course, ENGL 101.

USAFE, especially Doug Beakes, knew of UMUC's long-standing insistence that the "final 30" rule be maintained and were also aware that UMUC did not have a library-skills course in its curriculum. The belief in Heidelberg, correctly or not, was that both the "any 30" and library course requirements were placed in the USAFE RFP to decrease the chances of Maryland being able to submit a qualifying proposal, another view widely shared in the European military education community.

The European Division understood that its proposal needed with certainty to incorporate all of the academic requirements in USAFE's RFP. Otherwise, no matter how well presented, Maryland's proposal would be automatically disqualified.

With the critical assistance of Ben Massey, this turned out to be an easier challenge to meet. He and I quickly determined that, while the "final 30" had been an understandable requirement, its time had passed. So, in the European Division's proposal, there was no "final 30" requirement. Furthermore, all of us in Heidelberg and College Park believed that the library course was, in fact, highly desirable. Thus, "LIBS 100" entered the UMUC curriculum as a baccalaureate degree requirement and was emphasized in the European Division's proposal.

Needless to say, that when the USAFE RFP initially appeared it alarmed both Heidelberg and College Park. The European Division realized that we had to leave no stone unturned to win all three undergraduate disciplines. We considered it to be a matter of life or death. Anything less, would see the Maryland program of almost 35 years fundamentally changed. We had to submit a proposal so well developed, so compelling that USAFE would have no choice but to award all three undergraduate disciplines to UMUC. We understood that our proposal had to be so well-crafted that USAFE would fear that if Maryland were not selected that USAFE would leave itself open to a strongly persuasive protest.

Thus, our proposal contained a variety of programs from which USAFE could choose. In addition to drive home the single greatest strength of the Maryland Overseas Program, the European Division committed in its proposal to provide a biographical sketch for each faculty member assigned to every course offered at USAFE bases. In fact, we had been doing this at many installations for several years, in order to highlight the difference between Maryland some of the other potential bidders.

The European Division worked extremely hard in the several months between the issuing of the USAFE RFP in spring 1983 and the submission date in late summer. Several staff members were in the office until well past midnight on a regular basis while others arrived before 05:00 AM. As the deadline date for submission approached, several of us worked through the entire night, went home, showered, slept a couple of hours and returned.

Gina Schmidt-Phillips who played a key role in the production of our proposal has submitted a memoir in which she describes eloquently the effort involved in the RFP effort. John Golembe, who was both one of the key writers and the primary editor, covers in some detail the 1983 European Division effort in one of his memoirs. I strongly recommend Gina's and John's memoirs.

Additional points regarding the 1983 USAFE RFP process:

- Recognizing the extreme importance of the RFP and the UMUC response, Ben Massey and Vida Bandis came from College Park to Heidelberg and assisted greatly in the approach, strategy, and writing of the submission.
- In acquisition processes of this sort, the members of the Government's evaluation team are not announced publicly and are supposed to remain a secret. But, almost inevitably, given the months involved, names leak out. Our concern was significantly heightened when we learned that some of the evaluation team members were ESOs who in the last couple of years had consistently scheduled courses with Troy State while greatly reducing the number of Maryland courses being offered. In one case, an ESO on the evaluation team was allowing Maryland to offer only language courses at his installation. Such information greatly concerned us while also increasing the incentive to submit a winning proposal.
- Given the marvelous effort that everyone involved in the RFP process made so willingly, I am reluctant to mention individual names and contributions from nearly 40 years ago. Rather, I will content myself by noting that if Denise Sokolowski had not had the technical word processing and computer-related skills that she did, and if she been anything less than the model of hard work and loyalty that she was, the European Division could never have submitted the proposal we did.
- Finally, our concern – paranoia if you wish – was so great, given the stakes, that we asked Mike Boyd, a Maryland veteran, to sleep in the room where the proposal was kept for the last week before submission. He was there the morning when we loaded the proposal into a van and drove to Wiesbaden to deliver to USAFE Contracting. Yes, that was the very last day USAFE would accept proposals.

In March 1984, in a message that arrived via a telex machine in the European Division offices in Heidelberg, USAFE Contracting announced which institutions had been awarded

which elements of the RFP. With ineffable pleasure and pride, we learned that Maryland had been awarded all three of the undergraduate elements.

Reading that telex remains one of the most pleasant, most rewarding memories of my life.

PUTTING IT TOGETHER: THE LATE 1980s INTO THE EARLY 1990s

With the awarding of the five-year USAFE contract beginning in AY 1984-85, the European Division was able to concentrate its energies on providing the strongest possible programs on Army, Navy and Air Force installations. In the case of U.S. Air Force, Europe (USAFE) installations, Maryland was, by virtue of the new contract, the "only game in town" for undergraduate humanities, business and computer studies. That meant that Maryland was the only school that could offer degrees *or courses* in these fields at USAFE locations. When students enrolled at undergraduate institutions like Embry-Riddle, City Colleges of Chicago, etc. had to fulfill humanities, business or computer requirements, they had to take those courses from Maryland and transfer the credits to the school from which they would earn their degree.

During the 1980s, the Army attempted to adopt a contractual arrangement similar to USAFE but was blocked by the City Colleges of Chicago (CCC). CCC, fearing that it could not bid successfully for an Army contract, used its congressional delegation to mount legal and legislative barriers that US Army, Europe (USAREUR) could not overcome. USAREUR, therefore, continued to rely on the less formal memorandum-of-agreement approach. This was fine with the University of Maryland because there had never been an Army "revolving door" or serious interpersonal problems. Army educational leadership and ESOs were pleased to follow the guidelines and logical approach of "who taught what" that had been in existence since 1949.

The Navy was much less well organized, much less centralized than the Air Force and Army. During the 1980s, Maryland continued to schedule the courses we had been offering at Navy installations since the 1950s. Some Navy installation came to prefer a bit more formal relationship, and so I signed several individual memorandums of agreement with Navy installations such as Bahrain, Holy Loch, Sigonella, and La Maddalena. Gradually, however, La Verne, Webster and other universities began to approach the larger Navy installations, such as Naples and Rota, about offering undergraduate courses as well as graduate programs.

The USAFE contract was to expire at the end of AY 1989-90 and Maryland assumed that we would need to deal with another RFP at that time. Ultimately, however, the Air Force decided to extend the contract on a year-to-year basis until the early 1990s. This was fine with UMUC. Given the now highly favorable environment, the European Division thrived for the rest of the 1980s. Enrollments reached record levels with more than 50,000 individual students enrolling with Maryland in Europe each academic year. Faculty and staff increased accordingly.

THE COLD WAR COMES TO AN END

The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 marked the beginning of the end of the Cold War, with, shortly thereafter, the start of a gradual reduction in the number of American military personnel stationed in Europe. From a post-WW II peak in the mid/late-1980s of about 340,000 active-duty military in the European Command (EUCOM), with 240,000 of these being stationed in Germany alone, U.S. troop numbers in Europe, particularly in Germany, began to decline, a process that of this writing (February 2021) has continued more or less regularly. Beginning with the First Gulf War in 1991, U.S. troops stationed in Western Europe were also increasingly subject to "down range" deployments, from the Balkans to the greater Middle East. This development also had enrollment implications for Maryland.

While all of us in Heidelberg applauded the ending of the Cold War, the European Division was nonetheless concerned that the accompanying drop in enrollments would negatively affect the Maryland program. In response, we spent substantial time considering possibilities that might allow the European Division to continue to keep staff and faculty employed and avoid painful "downsizing." Accordingly, we increased our efforts to provide more "non-credit training" of various sorts to the military.

A NEW ERA: "TRI-SERVICES" CONTRACTS

At the same time, during the early 1990s, the military leaders at the European Command (EUCOM) level began to think of joint efforts, combining Army, Air Force and Navy programs for voluntary education. The advantages of a tri-services educational approach became increasingly appealing. Ultimately, Air Force, Army and Navy agreed that a tri-services request for proposal (RFP) and resulting contract for voluntary off-duty educational programs on all military installations in EUCOM was desirable. The resulting RFP was issued in September 1992 with submissions due in January 1993.

Upon the issuing of the Tri-Services Educational RFP, I met with senior staff colleagues, particularly John Golembe, Lynne Whitaker and Paul Brewer to discuss our possible response. Quite quickly, we began to focus on perhaps submitting a proposal in which UMUC-Europe would bid not only for all undergraduate academic courses, but also for as many of the graduate programs being requested by the Government as possible. We were prompted by two primary considerations: a) to offer enough programs to prevent, or at least slow significantly, the loss of enrollments because of military force reductions, and b) to reduce the number of academic institutions offering programs in Europe. We believed that over the longer run having fewer institutions in Europe would be to Maryland's advantage.

Naturally, I contacted College Park and discussed the concept of pursuing graduate programs with Ben Massey and Vida Bandis. They agreed. Complicating matters, however, was that UMUC did not have in its curriculum all of the graduate programs requested by the Tri-Services RFP. Seeing the possibility of some productive partnerships, I reviewed in detail the graduate programs that the other ten institutions in the University System of Maryland (USM) offered.

We soon realized that if UMUC could partner with University of Maryland College Park (UMCP) to offer its graduate counseling and personnel services (CAPs) master's degree and Bowie State University (BSU) to offer its master's degrees in business administration-public administration and computer-information systems, the European Division could submit a bid that would include all requested graduate programs except international relations (IR). I was surprised that no USM institutions offered a master's in IR.

After some additional research, I approached Ben Massey again and informed him that the only Maryland public institution offering a master's degree in IR was Morgan State University. Ben in turn explained that the politics of public higher education in Maryland ruled out the possibility of a "Maryland bid" that involved Morgan State, which was not an institution in the University System of Maryland. With my own graduate work having been in international relations and given the opportunity to offer the degree in an international environment, I was quite disappointed.

A joint UMUC-UMCP graduate counseling program (CAPS) had been offered in Okinawa since the 1960s, and Ben and I both knew the departmental chair, Dr. Paul Powers, well. Paul was quite amenable for CAPS to expand to Europe. Indeed, in the early 1980s, following the withdrawal of one of the of the 'revolving door' institutions, we had offered CAPS for a few terms at several installations in the U.K. Next, Ben spoke with the President of Bowie State University, Dr. Nathaniel "Nate" Pollard, who was extremely receptive. Nate noted, however, "Bowie does not know anything about Europe." Ben: "UMUC knows a lot about Europe." The alliance was a done deal.

Mum was the word during the "proposal preparation" months of late 1992. Since coming to Europe in 1949, Maryland had been identified primarily with undergraduate courses. The widely held assumption was that UMUC would, as was case in the 1983 USAFE RFP, be going hard after the undergraduate elements of the RFP. And, yes, so we did.

This time around, however, the European Division very much wanted to win as many of the requested graduate programs as possible and were concerned that other institutions not become aware of our ambitions. Until just a few days before the January proposal deadline, only those few in Heidelberg who were most intimately involved in the preparation of our proposal(s) knew the specifics of our approach.

As with the 1983 RFP and proposal, the European Division again extended itself in the same hard-working, long-hours manner. Ben Massey and Vida Bandis again came to Heidelberg to assist. John Golembe was again one of the key writers and the primary editor. Denise Sokolowski once again worked to perfection her technical management and word-processing preparation of the final proposal documents. In addition, other staff members were importantly involved to meet the enormous production requirements of this multi-faceted proposal.

The Government announced the awards in April 1993: in addition to the entire academic undergraduate program, UMUC-Europe was awarded the four graduate programs for which we had bid: counseling, business management, public administration,

computing/information systems. We were greatly pleased and felt we had ensured that UMUC would continue until at least the 21st century as "The University" in overseas military education. We also felt we had done as much as possible to avoid unwanted downsizing.

After the awards, UMUC faced the task of beginning the four graduate programs noted above at 23 different installations in seven different countries: Turkey, Greece, Italy, Spain, Germany, Holland and the U.K. The European Division also needed to coordinate the student and curriculum transitions between the new graduate programs and the graduate programs of the departing institutions, which included Boston University, Troy State University, University of Oklahoma and La Verne University.

The complexities of the above consumed the European Division in the late spring and summer of 1993. In the final analysis, everything played out very well. AY 1993-94 in Europe began with a considerably expanded Maryland program in place and functioning smoothly. In Heidelberg, we were all very proud and greatly relieved.

TWO VIGNETTES:

1) Dr. Robert "Bob" Lamb, Director of the Boston University European program, and I had a good professional relationship and personal friendship for several years. Periodically, we would get together for lunch or dinner. I had no intention of saying anything to Bob about Maryland bidding for graduate programs.

Still, I felt awkward. Bob, a very decent person, seemed overly confident of Boston coming out well once awards were announced. I was struck by how very different his attitude seemed to be compared to mine and other key European Division senior staff. All of us were consumed with fear that we would not be selected and consequently approached proposal preparation accordingly.

I also worried that Bob might ask if Maryland were bidding for any graduate programs. I practiced replies that would not involve lying to Bob, but also that would not see me revealing our plans. Fortunately, he never asked.

2) Sometime during AY 1993-94, the first year of the resulting five-year Tri-Services contract, Bowie State President Dr. Pollard visited Heidelberg for the first time. He had taken his Ph.D. at the University of Oklahoma, as had I. In fact, we had been on campus at Norman, OK at the same time in the early 1960s. One night, we were having dinner, and I was relating to Dr. Pollard how pleased I had been the previous year when examining the BSU Catalog and realizing that some of its graduate programs matched precisely what EUCOM was soliciting.

He listened and then, in passing, remarked, "Of course as an Historically Black College and University (HBCU) having Bowie as part of the proposal, must have meant extra evaluation points." In fact, UMUC had not thought of the point Dr. Pollard was making. So, I explained

that extra HBCU points applied only to government contracts for services executed in the United States, not to overseas.

Nate was visibly surprised: "You mean, Joe, that being an HBCU institution was not a factor in asking Bowie to join the UMUC proposal?" I then explained to Nate that UMUC was most pleased to have been able to play a role in the coming of first HBCU institution to the overseas military community. It was, however, the quality and structure of the Bowie program, not its status as an HBCU that motivated the invitation for Bowie to work with us. Dr. Pollard was obviously quite pleased with this conversation.

POSTSCRIPT

When reviewing this memoir, it occurs to me the reader might come away with impression that I do not think well of most other institutions offering classes overseas and have negative feelings toward many of the ESOs with whom Maryland worked. In fact, this is not the case. Indeed, rather to the contrary

The other academic institutions, again primarily in Europe working with USAFE, acted reasonably and rationally. Specifically, they had their own best interests in mind, as did Maryland. For example, it was quite natural that schools invited to Europe to offer freshman-sophomore technical-occupational courses or to offer graduate courses, would want to offer courses that Maryland had been teaching since 1949. And naturally this threatened and upset Maryland. Equally, given the way promotion points were earned, ESOs were acting understandably when they wanted as many schools as possible offering courses at their installations.

Across the board, I enjoyed good personal relations with the senior educators from several of the institutions such as Fred Ostertag and Jim Anderson (CTC), George Ross and John Barbato (CCC), Lee Farley (BBCC), Don Saguchi (LACC), Dean Donner and Bob Lamb (Boston) and Bob Kelly (Troy) as well as others. In the case of ESOs, even now, I continue to be in periodic touch with some and have visited a couple at their homes when in the States. To further illustrate, as the 1980s moved along, Doug Beakes and I developed a good working relationship and after his retirement, we remained in regular touch for many years.

The unfortunate reality was that until the 1983 USAFE contracting process and the 1992 Tri-Services contracting process, we all were operating in an environment that on an ongoing basis, more or less forced us to act in a highly competitive manner. In short, during the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, there were no villains, no cowboys in white hats.

We all were just trying to do our jobs.